

German Cross-Cultural Psychology¹

Gisela Trommsdorff

Technical University Aachen

The present study deals with German-language cross-cultural research in different fields of psychology which attempts to achieve one or more goals of cross-cultural psychology. First, methodological problems are discussed, followed by a selective presentation of cross-cultural research in personality, clinical, ethological, developmental, and social psychology. The theoretical and methodological advancement of these studies is investigated with respect to four approaches – universals in cross-cultural comparisons, culture-psychological theories, studies in cross-cultural encounters, and applied research in different fields of psychology. Finally, the contribution of these studies is analyzed with respect to theoretical and methodological improvement and the widening of intra- and interdisciplinary perspectives.

What gives us an adequate picture of cross-cultural psychology in the German speaking countries? Membership in the “International Society for Cross-Cultural Psychology” is a questionable indicator for active pursuit in this domain of psychological research; very few German-speaking psychologists are registered in the society, though quite many psychologists include cultural variables in the empirical investigation of psychological phenomena. Space limits forbid a complete review of these studies. Instead, only a selection will be discussed with respect to its contribution to psychology in general².

The main goals of cross-cultural psychology are

- to describe psychologically relevant differences across cultures;
- to assess the usefulness of standardized methods in different cultural contexts;
- to improve the ecological validity of research instruments;

1 The author wishes to thank Maja von Westerman for her help with the bibliography.

2 A bibliography of cross-cultural research in the German speaking countries (Trommsdorff and von Westerman (1986) is based on the systematic study of research on cultural variables of psychological phenomena. This work includes (a) publications in the *International Psychological Abstracts* from 1965 to 1985, (b) publications in *International Sociological Abstracts* from 1965 to 1975, (c) documents collected by ZPID (Zentralstelle für Psychologische Information und Dokumentation, Universität Trier) from 1967 to 1984, (d) responses to my survey on cross-cultural research in German, Swiss, and Austrian psychological institutes (April 1985), and (e) other studies covered on account of my work in cross-cultural psychology. The present review includes a small selection of these studies.

- to test the universality of hypotheses and theories;
- to apply psychological knowledge in different cultures and study typical problems involved in this process;
- to study problems of cross-cultural encounters;
- to study the cultural basis of psychological processes as related to psychological foundations of cultures.

Since cross-cultural psychology does not stand for any simple, clear-cut field of research (cf. Jahoda, 1980, p. 105), a specific definition is generally avoided. One may prefer the general description of cross-cultural psychology as a domain of psychological research in which cultural variables are included – or a more specific definition of cross-cultural psychology as the method of systematically comparing psychological phenomena in different cultures. Both conceptions allow for descriptive and theoretical investigations, while the latter conception also stands for a specific methodological approach to testing the universality of theories in a quasi-experimental design (cf. Brislin, Lonner & Thorndike, 1973; Boesch & Eckensberger, 1969; Trommsdorff, 1978).

The present review includes studies relating to both, the more general and the more specific definition of cross-cultural psychology. It is biased toward rather theoretically based than descriptive studies, following Cronbach's (1976) discussion on the value of experimental psychology. Accordingly, cross-cultural research is understood here as a specific approach to studying psychological phenomena with respect to cultural variables in order to arrive at empirically tested general theories. This view is not at all generally accepted (e.g., on account of the assumed impossibility of arriving at universal theories). Nevertheless, it will serve to guide our discussion on German-speaking cross-cultural psychology.

Historical Background

Theoretical Roots

The term "cross-cultural psychology" dates from the 1960s. The *International Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* was established in 1970 under the editorship of W.J. Lonner, and the "International Association of Cross-Cultural Psychology" was founded in 1972. In the following years, cross-cultural psychology expanded considerably, as can be seen from the six volumes of *The Handbook of Cross-Cultural Psychology* edited by Triandis. Yet, only a few German psychologists are members of the association or authors in the handbook. This is particularly amazing because the problem of the relationship between the individual and culture is a classical theme of German psychology, as has been documented by Kruse & Graumann (in press) for ecological psychology.

Wilhelm Wundt (1911–1920), founder of experimental psychology, based the ten volumes of his *Völkerpsychologie* ("Ethnopsychology") on this idea. Recognizing the limitations of pure laboratory research, Wundt turned to the study of primitive cultures. He heavily drew upon ethnographic material to explain the

functioning of psychological processes. The term “Völkerpsychologie” was borrowed from Lazarus and Steinthal (the latter being a student of Humboldt and Hegel) – both editors of the *Zeitschrift für Völkerpsychologie und Sprachwissenschaft*. Wundt (1912) thought of “Völkerpsychologie” as the study of the national historical and prehistorical development, the national character, and the relations between societies, its sub-units and the individuum. His studies had considerable influence on famous anthropologists like Malinowski, Boas, Benedict, on Mead as well as on their studies on culture and personality. At about the same time, Freud (1913) was working on his universal theory of human behavior and individual development. In *Totem und Tabu*, he demonstrated similarities in the origin of strange behavior of primitive and civilized people. His influence on psychological anthropology was enormous, especially in the domain of personality development.

A few years later, the study of person/culture relationships was enriched by a very different point of view – the study of individuals and groups in their meaningful surrounds (Umwelten): Hellpach (1924) viewed psychological processes as dependent on natural, social, and cultural aspects of the environment.

A historical note on German roots of cross-cultural psychology would be incomplete without reference to Kurt Lewin (1931). His conception of human behavior as a result of and as a determinant for environmental conditions laid the theoretical foundation for modern cross-cultural psychology. However, his theory on the interactive processes between person and environment in a field of forces was too broad to specify cultural aspects of the environment.

Wundt’s culture psychology on the one hand, and Hellpach’s study of human surrounds and Lewin’s field psychology on the other, may be conceived of as the basic theoretical roots for psychology in general, especially for German cross-cultural psychology. But as Graumann (1972) has pointed out, these roots have been widely neglected in the following decades, which in Germany were largely dominated by behaviorism and a fundamental reorientation following the Second World War.

Still, these early studies on the relationship between human beings and their cultural environment entail basic ideas that guide the present work of some German-speaking scholars in cross-cultural research. Furthermore, these early studies could be viewed as the roots of present cross-cultural psychology, since they entail theoretical and methodological approaches that are highly relevant today: The one is concerned with the psychological study of cultures and its interrelations with the individuum, the other with differences and universals of psychological phenomena. The first approach relates to idiographic and hermeneutic methods, while the latter is rather nomothetic and makes use of cross-cultural psychology as a quasi-experimental method. These different orientations make it difficult to find a simple definition of cross-cultural psychology.

In the following, we ask whether and how far present cross-cultural psychology in Germany can be traced implicitly or explicitly to the one or the other approach, whether it carries on its ideas and contributes to an improvement of psychological theories.

Cross-Cultural Psychology in the Last 20 Years in Germany

This discussion focuses on some studies that could be regarded as representing unique German patterns of cross-cultural psychology; the view is based on the subjective judgments of the author. It would, of course, be desirable to undertake a systematic review of the international literature on cross-cultural psychology for comparison with German studies in this field. However, this cannot be achieved here.

This study does not exactly follow the traditional differentiation between the fields of psychology. For example, general psychology will not be discussed separately, since most cross-cultural studies in this domain pursue questions dealt with in another field (e.g., developmental or social psychology). In the following, cross-cultural psychology in the German-speaking countries will be discussed with respect to: (1) methodological problems, (2) personality and interpersonal differences, (3) clinical psychology, (4) ethology, (5) developmental and educational psychology, and (6) social psychology.

Methodological Problems

One important goal in cross-cultural psychology in general is to arrive at universal theories that include the relevant cultural aspects as an integral part of the theory (cf. Brislin, 1976; Jahoda, 1980). This seems desirable since most theories have been formulated and tested in Western industrialized countries and thus often implicitly include elements of the Western culture (e.g., literacy in case of Guilford's theory of the intellect). Necessary preconditions for testing theoretically assumed universal relationships are, of course, a precise description of the theoretically relevant cultural variables, determination of the culture-specific validation of methods, and the functional equivalence of research procedures (cf. Brislin et al., 1973). In Germany these problems are systematically discussed by Boesch and Eckensberger (1969) and Eckensberger (1973). Specific aspects are dealt with by Eckensberger (1978), Pawlik (1976) and Trommsdorff (1978, 1983).

Specific Problems

Organization. Some cross-cultural studies in Germany are carried out in collaboration with colleagues from other cultures, who may improve the choice of instruments and interpretation of data by their culture-specific knowledge (examples for Germany are Silbereisen, Boehnke & Reykowski, 1986; Trommsdorff & Iwawaki, 1986).

Methods. In various cross-cultural studies, "cultures" are considered as a *set* of variables allowing for quasi-experimental design. The extension of variance and separation of otherwise confounded variables can thus be used as methodological

advantages (Kornadt, Eckensberger & Emminghaus, 1980; Trommsdorff, 1978).

Most cross-cultural studies use more or less standardized paper-and-pencil tests or interviews. Experimental laboratory research is seldom employed. In a very few cases, field-experimental methods and observation of behavior are used (e.g., Schleidt, Schiefenhövel, Stanjek & Krell, 1980, in ethological research; Scherer & Scherer, 1980, or Grossmann, Grossmann, Huber & Wartner, 1981, for social interaction).

Validity and reliability of instruments. Various research in differential psychology and in personality aims at testing the validity of standardized methods across cultures; some examples are the MMPI (Stephan, Hess & Hock, 1971) the FPI (Matesanz & Hampel, 1978), the Guilford-Zimmerman temperament survey (Hentschel & Holley, 1978), Spielberger's test anxiety (Schwarzer, 1984) or Cattell's vs. Amthauer's intelligence test (Kettel, 1974). The structural equivalence of instruments has been studied by Koch (1971) for the semantic differential, and by Borg (1978) for facet theory and its multidimensional representations. Problems of cross-cultural validity of ratings are discussed by Fröhlich, Becker, Bengtson and Bigot (1969).

General Considerations on Functional Equivalence

The basic methodological problems of cross-cultural psychology is functional equivalence. Pawlik (1976) illustrates this issue by discussing studies on intelligence in the West and in a very different culture (Australian aborigines). He shows that research instruments may have sufficient ecological validity for one culture, but be useless for another one. For example, the natural social and cultural environment of the aborigines does not usually require cognitively structuring complicated environments. Accordingly, tests such as maze tasks are inadequate for measuring intelligence in this culture. Or classification systems are structured according to the system of social relations in the aboriginal culture and are based on principles of a multiple dual categorization, which are difficult to transform into our decimal system. Accordingly, observed problems in the counting ability of aborigines in our decimal system cannot be used as indicator for limited intelligence. Similarly, Western subjects will quite probably score lower on intelligence tests that have high ecological validity in the aboriginal culture.

The above example illustrates the necessity to ascertain the *symmetrical* ecological validity of instruments used in the respective cultures. Of course, besides the test, other relevant task conditions (e.g., interactions between subject and researcher, research situation etc.), have to be studied with respect to their ecological validity – that is, the representativeness of specific research conditions (and their combination) for the subjective experience and the actual occurrence in the respective cultures (cf. Eckensberger, 1973; Trommsdorff, 1978, 1984a/b). These problems are, of course not unique to cross-cultural psychology, but rather basically apply to most any other field of psychology.

A typical problem of cross-cultural psychology is ascertaining the culture-specific (emic) and cross-cultural (etic) validity. A major German contribution to this question shows that related methodological problems are not independent from the respective theoretical approach. In their discussion of functional equivalence, Eckensberger and Burgard (1983) start from a paradigmatic framework that implies different assumptions on the relation between individual and environment/culture: the non-psychological "paradigm of quantification" (*descriptive*); the "mechanistic paradigm" (e.g., learning theories) (*causal*); the "organismic paradigm" (e.g., Kohlberg's theory of cognitive development) (*functional*); the "eco-behavioral paradigm" (e.g., socio-biological and ecological theories) (*causal/functional*); the "self-reflecting paradigm" (e.g., modern action theories) (*dialectic*). Functional and score equivalence is defined according to the respective paradigm since each paradigm requires specific methods. For example, for the self-reflexive paradigm, observed behavior is studied in relation to reported reasons for such behavior. The interviews have to be conducted as "controlled dialogue" between "scientist" and "naïve subjects" (Eckensberger & Burgard, 1983). It remains to be seen how problems of this hermeneutic procedure can be solved in empirical studies. So far, Eckensberger's distinction between the five paradigms seems difficult to apply in empirical research. The study of complex phenomena, e.g., the development of a motive system, probably requires taking more than one theoretical approach into account, e.g., learning theory and action theory – a mechanistic and a reflexive paradigm and related methods.

Personality and Interpersonal Differences

Though early studies on the relationship between the individual and culture (cf. Wundt, 1912) may have established the roots of cross-cultural psychology, these questions have not been dealt with very successfully by cross-cultural psychology since. In the 1960s, a quantitative approach to the study of personality and its different aspects gave rise to a considerable production of standardized personality tests. In some German studies, these tests were employed to measure their cross-cultural validity or to test the universality of personality structures (see above). Following Cattell's approach, stable source traits (e.g., ego strength, anxiety, extraversion) (Cattell, Seitz & Rausche, 1971) and personality structures (Cattell, Schmidt & Pawlik, 1973; Schumacher, Cattell & Krug, 1980) were regarded as universals. Most studies focused on *single* variables, disregarding the *system* of personality. Rarely, functional relations between personality and culture were studied, such as in Cohen's (1976) work on the influence of culture-specific writing and reading habits on modes of visual perception.

In the 1970s, behavior was rather studied from the point of view of its situation-specific determinants (Mischel, 1968). The concept of personality and the study of global personality traits seemed to lose its attractions in psychology in general.

However, some promising contributions came from German cross-cultural studies. Culture-specific cognitive and motivational structures were discovered,

e.g., specific structural and functional aspects of the achievement motive (Kornadt, 1969, for Kenya; Park, 1980, for Korea). In the same line, Doi's (1973) study on the Japanese "amae" is discussed as a culture-specific phenomenon of personality (Kornadt et al., 1980; Trommsdorff, 1983). Also, the concept of control (Rotter, 1966) appears in a different light; its culture-specific nature becomes obvious if studied with respect to the Japanese culture and personality (Trommsdorff, 1985a). Furthermore, a new approach to the study of personality and culture is attempted by Eckensberger and Krewer (1985), and Krewer, Momper and Eckensberger (1984) from an action-oriented perspective. Here, the individual – interacting with the cultural environment – is regarded as using specific characteristics of the given culture (its dialects, traditions, symbols, etc.) as anchors for establishing self or cultural identity. Structures of culture and personality are seen as interdependent.

It seems that personality research in general could well profit from these new approaches to culture and personality, which are unique to German-speaking cross-cultural psychology.

Clinical Psychology

In clinical psychology, a large body of research has been carried out to ascertain the validity of diagnostic instruments. One line of research has focussed on culture-specific conditions for certain symptoms and their occurrence (e.g., Kitamura, 1982; Pschikal, 1982; Pfeiffer, 1974). This research became useful for studies of the problem of culture-specific diagnosis (Koehler & Jacoby, 1978; von Cranach & Strauss, 1978) and on selecting patients for psychotherapy (Blaser, 1982). An insightful collection of studies on these and related problems of behavior disorders in cross-cultural perspective was edited by Pfeiffer and Schoene (1980).

Cross-cultural studies may improve the validity of diagnostic instruments if theories on the conditions and symptomatology of psychological disorders are tested with respect to their universal and culture-specific applicability, and if culture-specific characteristics of lay and professional diagnosis are taken into account. These problems are discussed with respect to the perception and treatment of disabled children in different cultures by Trommsdorff (in press). This work in cross-cultural research invites cooperation between clinical, educational, and social psychology.

Ethology

Ethological studies necessarily make use of the cross-cultural method in order to test theoretically assumed universal patterns of human behavior. Beginning with his cross-cultural studies on greeting (1968) and on similarities and differences in expressive behavior (1972), Eibl-Eibesfeldt has developed a genetically based

theory of the fundamental strategies in human interaction (including sharing, giving, self-presentation or friendly encounters) (1980) as well as a theory on the origins of social groups and their function for human survival (1982).

On the basis of ethological studies, Bischof (1985) discusses the incest taboo as an example for the biological foundation of human behavior that is “explained” differently in different cultures, and which serves to legitimize social norms on sexual interactions within the family.

Developmental and Educational Psychology

The majority of the cross-cultural studies on development in Germany focus on the description of outcomes of development and only seldom deal with problems of comparability of measurements. It often remains unclear whether the actual age groups are comparable, what the culture-specific meaning of certain age levels with respect to the process of development is, and how the observed behavior could be interpreted. Only a few studies follow the goals as summarized by Thomae (1979) for cross-cultural developmental psychology:

- to contribute information on the cultural relativity or generality of global or specific sequences of development during the life cycle;
- to study interactions between culture and individual in the process of development;
- to test the generality of theories on development designed in the West, and
- to stimulate new theoretical orientations.

In the following, a selection of a very few German studies guided by these goals is discussed. These studies share the theoretical assumption that development can be explained as a continuous process of interaction between the person and environment; they focus on different aspects of developmental sequences (early childhood and adolescence), on different developmental processes and outcomes (cognitive and motivational development), and on different influences on development (socialization).

Mother-Child-Interaction

Attachment Theory. In their ambitious longitudinal research project on development in early childhood Klaus E. Grossmann and Karin Grossmann study the generality of Ainsworth’s attachment theory (1977). They follow Ainsworth’s suggestion to make use of cross-cultural comparisons in order to study the validity of the “Strange Situation” procedure and the universality of its underlying theory. Using systematic observations of infants and their mothers at home and in the laboratory during the first years of life, the Grossmanns’ look for differences in infant care practices and patterns of maternal behavior, and its possible effects on infant-mother relationships.

Their data from cross-national (Germany vs. USA) and intracultural (Southern vs. Northern Germany) comparisons support the author's assumption that cultural values and expectations influence mothers' behavior and attitudes toward their child (Grossmann, Grossmann, Spangler, Suess & Unzner, in press). The quantitative distribution of attachment patterns, and the relationship between attachment and maternal sensitivity as observed in the "Strange Situation" procedure, was strikingly different for German and American samples. The majority of the Bielefeld infants (50%) was classified as "unsecure attached" as compared to 26% of the Baltimore infants. The cross-cultural reliability of the observational data from the "Strange Situation" was ensured, though theoretically assumed relations with other variables question the validity of the classification. Qualitative analyses of interaction patterns showed that the Bielefeld mothers were less affectionate and tender, and that their holding of the infant was shorter as compared to Baltimore mothers. Also, no correlations between maternal sensitivity and rejection were found for the Bielefeld sample, as compared to significant correlations in Baltimore (Grossmann et al., in press). Maternal sensitivity is similar for A and B children in Germany, while it is higher for mothers of B children in the USA.

These results indicate that mothers' sensitivity and children's attachment behavior mean something very different in these cultures, so that the classification of observed behavior in the "Strange Situation" should be modified to measure the culture-specific facets of attachment. The need for theoretical and methodological refinement is supported by other cross-cultural research in a very different culture. Miyake, Chen and Campos (in press) have found a considerably higher proportion of C infants and unexpected relations between several variables of attachment behavior in Japan as compared to the USA. Perhaps the Grossmanns' can extend their project and cooperate with Miyake.

Besides the high value of longitudinal research for testing theories of development, the present research program uses the advantage of a standardized experimental method (in combination with standardized observations in natural settings) and allows for systematic cross-cultural comparisons. These studies have so far stimulated questions as to how to improve the validity in measuring attachment and how to explore the universal and culture-specific functions of attachment for personality development.

Development in Adolescence

The Berlin longitudinal study on developmental processes in adolescence has focused on the system and the determinants of drug use in adolescents in intracultural comparisons (Silbereisen & Eyferth, 1984); presently, it is extending its scope to cross-cultural tests (Silbereisen, 1984). The basic theoretical assumption is that developmental change varies according to the cultural expectations on adequate timing and adequate choice of behavior. These cultural "norms" are somehow transmitted in the process of socialization; they are perceived more or

less adequately by the adolescents and incorporated into their behavioral preferences.

If personal development is viewed from a normative point of view (social structuring of developmental tasks in a person's biography), cultural factors have to be studied as basic explanatory variables. Cultural factors also have to be taken into account if development is considered a process of individual goal-oriented behavior implying subjective interpretations of cultural circumstances.

The explanatory advantage of including cultural variables can be seen by recent studies of the Berlin project. Results on intracultural differences between German and Turkish adolescents living in Berlin (Silbereisen, 1985) demonstrate general and culture-specific functions of drug use: Certain drugs may serve as a positive balance of the adolescents' self-concept by offering them the rights and behavioral styles of adults. The use of certain drugs is sanctioned differently in different cultures. Thus, Turkish adolescents in Germany would demonstrate a behavior deviant from their parents' perspective in case of alcohol consumption. But faced with the developmental task of assimilation, they can expect social approval by their German peers. Stepwise regression analyses clearly demonstrate a high predictive value of cultural assimilation for alcohol consumption in this minority group (Silbereisen, 1985). Developmental tasks are pursued according to the prevalent cultural expectations and values. Thus, different kinds of behavior (drug use) may be functionally equivalent in the pursuit of developmental tasks.

This line of reasoning will guide the planned replication of this longitudinal and cross-sectional study in Berlin and in Warsaw. The study will profit from the experience of a recent collaborative cross-cultural project on prosocial behavior and culture-specific values in socialization (Claar, Boehnke & Silbereisen, 1984; Silbereisen et al. 1986).

These studies use cross-cultural comparisons as a methodological strategy (1) to increase the variance by including otherwise neglected variables (several generations living in the Polish family as compared to the nuclear family type in Germany); (2) to separate otherwise confounded variables (degree of consistency in values for different agencies of socialization like family and school); and finally (3) to test the universality of the assumed processes of development.

Cognitive Development

In the field of cognitive development, Piaget (1970) and Kohlberg (1968) have stimulated numerous cross-cultural studies on the universality of these theories. Though Piaget's assumption of a universal development of the sensorimotor and concrete-operational stage could be demonstrated in most cultures, at least with respect to the structure of the stages and their succession (Dasen & Heron, 1981), stages of formal-operational thinking imply cultural specifics. Accordingly, in her critical review, Ries (1977) asks whether performance on Piaget's tasks can predict achievement in school for cultures without experience in Western modes of abstraction. Recent studies on cognitive development focus on descrip-

tions of culture-specific modes of thinking, questioning what intelligent thinking means when taking into account specific cultural requirements (cf. Dasen, 1973, 1984).

If cognitive development is related to cultural (including socioeconomic) needs, cognitive development should be studied in relation to social change and processes of acculturation. In their study on learning and acquiring "knowledge", Boesch (1984) and Edelstein (1984) use this approach on children from traditional rural societies in transition to modern societies (Thailand and Ireland, respectively).

Kohlberg's general theory of cognitive development also has stimulated a variety of cross-cultural studies. In their summary of cross-cultural research on moral judgment, Eckensberger and Reinshagen (1977) question the assumed stabilization at the second stage within each level of development and the "cultural fitness" of the method (dilemmas). Such weakness in Kohlberg's definition of structure has encouraged Eckensberger and Reinshagen (1977, 1980), to reformulate Kohlberg's approach in an action-theory framework strongly leaning on Boesch (1976, 1980). The authors clarify how the structure and content of the stages of moral reasoning are theoretically related, and show that the dilemmas structurally represent a (goal-oriented) action that is disturbed by a barrier. To measure different stages of moral reasoning, the authors develop a procedure that ensures culture-specific measurement of perception and solution of the moral conflict and also allows for a consistent transcultural interpretation of culture-specific normative concepts (cf. Eckensberger & Burgard, 1983). Empirical testing of this unique procedure must still be carried out.

Motive Development and Socialization of Motives

If the development of motives — its structure and strength — is influenced by culture-specific socialization, culture-specific instruments have to be developed that ensure the emic validity of measurements. These, in turn, must be construed on the basis of a culture-psychological theory explaining such motive development and ensuring etic validity. Only then is adequate testing of this theory possible. Such theories may improve our knowledge in developmental psychology; they may also help to improve decision making in applied fields. In turn, applied research may help to improve such theories.

Kornadt (1969) started from an applied problem related to developmental aid — whether school performance improves achievement motivation in developing countries. Kornadt used the Heckhausen *TAT* for measuring achievement motivation in Kenya and found no relation between school achievement and achievement motive; also, fear of success could not be tapped. Rather, the *TAT* pictures activated the *affiliation motive* (which was related to a high value of authority, obedience to social rules, and fear of punishment). But how could achievement motivation be measured in this culture at all? How is the achievement motive related to the affiliation motive? And how do these motive systems develop?

Cross-cultural studies thus may initiate questions that may be useful for improving general theories. In the meantime, other cross-cultural research has demonstrated culture-specific relations between achievement and affiliation motives (DeVos & Caudill, 1973), and between achievement values and independence training (Kornadt, Eckensberger & Emminghaus, 1980; Trommsdorff, 1983).

Cross-cultural studies on motive development may also be useful for predicting and explaining phenomena like social change. This idea is also pursued by Kornadt (1970) in his discussion of relations between cultural and ecological conditions, child-rearing practices, cognitive and motive development (including achievement motivation), and orientation toward the future in mining communities in the USA and Germany (Saarland).

Starting from a general theory on the *aggression motive* (Kornadt, 1982), a cross-cultural study on its development is presently being carried out (Kornadt, 1969; Kornadt, 1984, in press). This basically action- and interaction-oriented theory assumes two components of the aggression motive – aggression inhibition and aggression motivation. The development (of the strength and structure) of the aggression motive is assumed to be influenced by genetic and sociocultural factors like cultural values, naive theories about the child and its development, parental goals and practices, and the specific style of mother-child interactions. The functional relation between these factors and the development of the aggression motive is assumed to depend on the given cultural context, especially the prevalent interpretations of certain situations by the child and the parents (or other relevant interacting persons) (Kornadt, Emminghaus & Trommsdorff, 1982; Kornadt & Trommsdorff, 1984; Kornadt, in press).

Hypotheses on the strengthening and inhibiting functions of certain conditions (including modes of mother-child interaction) on aggression (and pro-social motives) are presently being tested in a cross-cultural study. Urban and rural samples from Germany, Switzerland, Japan, and Indonesia were selected to represent theoretically relevant cultural conditions allowing measurement of effects of social change, for example, the impact of differently structured family systems and different degrees of social control on motive development. Data from the pilot study clearly show inter- and intracultural differences in the strength and structure of the aggression motive and its relation to socialization variables (Kornadt, in press).

Socialization

Traditional theories on parental socialization and its impact on child development disregard the interactional system between child and parents in the process of active development on both sides. Ecological approaches in socialization have widened the perspective, and the cross-cultural method further contributes to the shift away from a quantitative and mechanistic to an organismic-interactive and self-reflexive approach as described by Eckensberger and Reinshagen (1980) and documented by Schneewind (1983) or Kornadt and Trommsdorff (1984).

In their study on the relation between parental goals and practices in socialization Kornadt & Trommsdorff (1984) discuss the function of cultural variables (values, symbols, institutions) for child development. They argue that cultural conditions provide the cognitive-motivational frame of reference according to which situations are interpreted and action is guided in the process of socialization.

This assumption underlies a cross-cultural study on parent-child relations by Trommsdorff (1984a, 1985b), which is part of the above-mentioned cross-cultural project on motive development. Though the affective meaning of parent-child relations is similarly positive for German and Japanese adolescents, the latter report less conflicts and feel less rejected in case of parental demands and attempts at taking influence. In contrast to German adolescents, they interpret parental demands rather as a demonstration of their acceptance, warmth and caring. Data from interviews support this interpretation. Further data on socialization in these two cultures show that Japanese youths generally experience more parental acceptance than do German youths (Trommsdorff & Iwawaki, 1986).

It seems that culture-specific values, patterns of control orientation, naive theories on the nature of the child, and the parental role influence the process of socialization (e.g., interactions between parents and children) and thus the process of child development (Trommsdorff, 1985a; Trommsdorff, in prep.). This may explain why "objectively" isomorphic behavior is interpreted differently in different cultures, and why different behavior has the same meaning, depending on the prevalent cultural schemata.

An interdisciplinary group of Japanese and German scholars coordinated by Kornadt is presently studying aspects of socialization in Japan and Germany from a cross-cultural perspective, focusing on the function of values, naive theories, language, and social interaction for personality development.³

These activities will guide further theoretical and empirical steps, including the construction of instruments to ensure emic and etic validity. In the meantime, the transformation of theoretical concepts into specific instruments requires intermediate steps of testing and modifying hypotheses. The final methodological procedure must include culture-specific moderator variables and allow for an extension and specification of Western theories by taking into account culture-specific, theoretically relevant functional relationships.

Applied Studies

Applied cross-cultural research in development and education deals with problems of acculturation (see below); effects of schooling (Kornadt & Voigt, 1970),

3 With the kind support of the Werner von Reimers-Stiftung, Bad Homburg, and the support from the NHK and Hoshu-Daigaku, Tokyo. German members are: Herrmann, Kornadt, Trommsdorff (psychology), Hijia-Kirschner (Japanese culture and literature); Japan members are: Tsuji, Suzuki (German culture and literature), Mishima (philosophy), Takuma (psychology).

problems of teaching in developing countries (Eckensberger & Reinshagen, 1980), and problems in special education (e.g. Wedekind, Frank & Thimm, 1980). Schneewind (1983) suggests different social policies to improve the ecology of the family. Trommsdorff (in press) discusses problems of social policies in the treatment of handicapped children with suggestions based on the study of culture-specific perceptions of handicapped children, culturally structured classifications and attributions of symptoms, as well as patterns of interaction with handicapped children. These studies demonstrate the usefulness of taking into account cultural variables for planning and intervention.

Social Psychology

In the light of the theoretical and methodological advantages of cross-cultural research in general, and since social interactions always take place in a culturally patterned environment, it is especially astonishing that only a few German social psychologists engage in cross-cultural studies. These few scholars are mostly interested in social perception and attitudes – which is in line with the dominant interest of social psychologists in intrapersonal processes. Only a few studies deal with interpersonal, intra- and intergroup processes.

Interpersonal Processes

Very few scholars study the universality of theories on interpersonal behavior (for prosocial behavior, cf. Lück, 1976, 1978; for aggression, cf. Mantell's 1971 replication of Milgram's experiment). Scherer's (1974) study on emotions in different cultures has stimulated hypotheses on the function of voice quality as a basis for inferences and attributions in person perception (Scherer & Scherer, 1980). In his recent cross-cultural studies (in collaboration with several laboratories in Europe) Scherer has focused on the situational antecedents of emotions and their cross-culturally valid classification, on differential reaction patterns (physiological, nonverbal and person-specific), and on modes of social control and regulation of emotions (Scherer, Summerfield & Wallbott, 1983; Scherer, Wallbott & Summerfield, in press). Here, cross-cultural studies can be a useful method of studying universals. At present, various culture-specific results (e.g., on antecedents and regulations of emotions) require theoretical interpretations beyond speculations on cultural stereotypes.

Other approaches in interpersonal processes are being extended to neighboring fields of social policies in developmental aid, social change and ecology.

In 1962, an "Institute for Developmental Aid" ("Institut für Entwicklungshilfe") later named "Social-Psychological Research Center on Development Planning" ("Sozialpsychologische Forschungsstelle für Entwicklungsplanung") was founded and directed by Ernst Boesch at the University of the Saar, Saarbrücken. For German psychology, this institute is unique. It studies social-psychological problems of socio-economic change in developing countries and provides instru-

ments for developmental planning and evaluation of projects in developmental aid. Applied research is carried out in the fields of technical and agricultural cooperation, cultural problems of health, education and vocational training in developing countries, and problems of exchange and training foreign students.

On the basis of Boesch's theory of action (1971, 1976, 1978, 1980) and methodological studies (Boesch & Eckensberger, 1969; Eckensberger, 1973), practical action is transformed into psychological concepts and vice versa. Boesch's integrated culture psychology of action has its roots in Lewin's field theory, Piaget's theories of cognitive development, and Janet's dynamic action theory and psychoanalytic concepts. Action – the unit of analysis – entails the external (situational) field with specific opportunities for and barriers against action; the subject (ego) acts upon the environment, which in turn influences the action process.

Boesch's psychological theory of action and culture deals with interactions between the structure of the action field (including, e.g., symbols, rules, material resources) and the regulative processes of action. Accordingly, problems of socio-economic development can be studied as psychological processes. In order to relate collective and individual processes (e.g., how collective representations are accepted by the individual; or vice versa, how individual representations are transformed into collective ones), human behavior is studied in the given cultural context, thus integrating micro-sociological and ethnological approaches. Planning for development and practical developmental aid is embedded in this complex culture theory of action and starts from an emic perspective – the understanding of human interaction as integrated in a cultural context.

This culture-psychological approach allows for better theoretical analysis of socio-psychological problems in developing countries as well as in our own culture; it creates an awareness of possible onesidedness in Western psychological research and allows for relating basic and applied research. So far, however, Boesch's culture and action theory approach has been more influential outside than inside the institute, for instance, in ecological psychology (cf. Kruse & Graumann, in press). (The main body of studies from this institute are unpublished reports.)

The borderline between cross-cultural and ecological psychology is not rigid; both share the conception of persons in interaction with their cultural and ecological environment. Indeed, both approaches can be seen as closely interrelated, mutually stimulating and relevant for the advancement of psychology in general (Eckensberger & Kornadt, 1977). And they share basically the same methodological concerns – the advancement of ecological validity in measurement (cf. Pawlik, 1976).

Comparative social-psychological research is related to a further neighboring field – to sociology, especially the study of social change. Eckensberger, Krewer and Kasper (1984) have demonstrated the usefulness of the cross-cultural approach for the study of social change. This becomes obvious in Boesch's (1976, 1984) research on social-psychological processes in the transition from traditional to modern societies. In the same line, Trommsdorff (1983, 1984a) has studied

some conditions and implications of social change in a modern society like Japan. Social interactions in Japan are basically structured according to certain traditional value orientations, while some of the traditional values function as mediators for easier adoption of certain "modern" values. The flexibility of the Japanese cultural system seems to invite the assimilation of new Western values. Also, theoretical assumptions on the isolating effects of modernization are partly supported by data on intracultural comparisons between "modern" and "traditional" subgroups in Japan and Germany; observed differences in (reported) interpersonal behavior (between parents and adolescents, or among adolescents) indicate a loosening of social control and of positive affective bonds for the "modern" group (cf. Trommsdorff, 1983, 1984a).

Inter- and intracultural comparisons thus may allow study of the processes of social change from a social-psychological framework, relating micro- and macro-processes of social interaction. This is a unique aspect of German-speaking cross-cultural psychology.

Intercultural Perception and Interaction

Problems of intergroup behavior are related to problems of intergroup perception. In their study on social perception of ethnic minorities and prejudice Schönbach, Gollwitzer, Stiepel and Wagner (1981) and Wagner and Schönbach (1984) dealt with cognitive and behavioral correlates. They showed that some cognitive variables affect the impact of formal education on stereotyping; for example, persons of lower educational level may be more prone to stereotyping since a devaluation of outgroups heightens their positive social identity. A more specific relation between cognitive variables and stereotyping is demonstrated by Stapf, Stroebe and Jonas (1986), who studied the perception of Germans by American students. The authors start from an information-processing approach and show that (positive and negative) stereotypes are influenced by information on the attitude object.

Research on stereotypes is often related to the question how negative stereotypes can be changed. A variety of international research is based on the assumption that interpersonal contact provides positive information that reduces negative attitudes. This simple hypothesis was proved false relatively early by German empirical studies: Bergius, Werbik, Winter and Schubring (1970) and Winter and Klein (1975) showed that contacts of Germans with foreign workers abroad increase positive attitudes, while contacts within the Federal Republic have the reverse effect.

A variety of studies has dealt with acute problems of integrating foreign workers and their children into German society, focusing on problems of self-identity, learning in school, reintegration in the guest and home country (including problems of psychosomatic disorders, cf. Larbig, 1981). (For a bibliography: see Stiksrud & Kuliga, 1985.) These studies relate to problems of acculturation – that is interaction with members from other cultures because of migration, study exchange, tourism, or developmental aid. Some theoretical, methodological and practical

implications of acculturation are discussed by Breitenbach (1974) and in a recent reader edited by Thomas (1984).

Applied Studies

Besides applied research with respect to developmental aid and acculturation, applied studies have been carried out on aspects of cultural encounters in organizations (cf. a review by Thomas, in press), problems of leadership and participation in organizations (Wilpert, 1984a; Wilpert & Rayley, 1983; Heller & Wilpert, 1977, 1981); meaning of work in different cultural and sub-cultural groups and its relation to career history, personal and societal values (Wilpert, 1984b). Heller and Wilpert (1981) start from Hofstede's (1980) theory to cultural values in organization, though they fail to replicate the main dimensions with respect to behavioral measures. The authors demonstrate the impact of contextual factors on participative behavior and related effects on the individual and the organization.

In his review, Thomas (in press) points out the limits of existing organization theories, which neglect the influence of culture-specific variables on relations between individual achievement, work, and general satisfaction.

How empirical results from these studies could be transformed into programs of training and job design remains to be seen.

Concluding Remarks:

Contributions of German-Language Cross-Cultural Psychology

In general, only a few cross-cultural studies (of German or other scholars) take into account psychologically relevant cultural phenomena and go beyond the study of single variables – their similarities or differences in different cultures. And only a few projects explicitly follow the goals of cross-cultural research, as defined by Jahoda (1980): to provide systematic descriptive information on psychologically interesting culture-specific phenomena; to contribute to theoretical advancement in psychology; and to apply empirically based theoretical knowledge for programs in different fields of individual behavior and social interaction. The few cross-cultural studies in the German-speaking countries that follow these goals are related to one of four approaches – testing the universality of a theory, describing culture-specific psychological phenomena, studying interactions between cultures, and/or applying cross-cultural studies to psychological problems.

Universality of Theories

In some projects, cross-cultural comparisons are used as a strategic methodology that allows testing of general theories in several fields of psychology, e.g., genetic

foundations of social interaction (Eibl-Eibesfeld and his coworkers at the Max Planck Institute of Ethology, Seewiesen); interactional foundations of attachment (K.E. and K. Grossmann in collaboration with colleagues from the United States); problem-solving strategies and functions of development in adolescence (Silbereisen and his coworkers in the Berlin longitudinal study together with colleagues from the Polish Academy of Science); development of moral reasoning as a modification of Kohlberg's theory and methodology (Eckensberger and his coworkers); changes in learning environment in relation to socio-economic change (Edelstein and his coworkers at the Max Planck Institute in Berlin); development of the aggression motive (in the process of socio-economic change) in relation to culture-specific belief systems and patterns of socialization (Kornadt and Trommsdorff in collaboration with colleagues from Switzerland, Japan, and Indonesia); situational antecedents of emotions and types of culturally controlled emotional expressions (Scherer and Wallbott in collaboration with other European laboratories); factors related to the meaning of work (Wilpert and his internationally organized collaborators).

These cross-cultural studies ("Kulturvergleich") seek a universal theory of individual and social behavior, including culture-specific phenomena. This approach is not typically German. It contrasts to, but also needs the cooperation of, a unique German approach-cultural psychology.

Cultural Psychology

Cross-cultural research is hardly possible without extensive psychological knowledge of the respective cultures. The study of single cultures in a psychological framework – e.g., with respect to psychological foundations and consequences of a culture – are rare. An exception is Boesch's general theory of individual action, which integrates his empirical studies on social and individual development in specific cultures (e.g., Thailand) in a complex theory of culture and action (Boesch, 1971, 1976, 1978, 1980). Partly starting from Boesch's action theory, Eckensberger and his coworkers (Krewer et al. 1984) pursue a theory of cultural identity, studying how cultural products and symbols operate in the process of individual and social development.

The culture-psychology approach does not aim at systematic comparisons between different cultures, but rather studies cultures with respect to their psychological preconditions for and consequences of individual and social behavior. This approach goes back to Wundt's "Völkerpsychologie" and could be conceived of as a unique German contribution.

Interactions Between Cultures

Some questions of cultural psychology, e.g., how cultures function psychologically, how they transmit concepts of identity, and how they regulate social in-

teraction, are closely connected to questions of the processes, conditions, and consequences of intercultural interaction. These relate to problems of intergroup behavior (stereotyping, conflict, communication), intercultural learning, integration and assimilation of different cultural contexts (for nations, ethnic groups, cultural minorities, or subgroups in formal organizations). Thomas addresses some of these problems, mostly from the perspective of cultural exchange programs (1984) and organizational psychology (in press). Here, interesting approaches for the application of culture research in psychology may be developed in the future.

Application of Cross-Cultural Studies

Applied cross-cultural psychology has been quite effective in the field of clinical, educational and organizational psychology. Only a few studies deal with applied problems of social change and related problems of inter- and intragroup processes in the field of economic, technical, social, or health development. But solid basic research is at hand that could encourage the advancement of applied studies.

Conclusions

These four approaches in cross-cultural psychology are closely related. The first two – cross-cultural and cultural psychology – serve as the basis for activities in the other two fields. Theoretically relevant cross-cultural psychology in Germany has partly focused on the description and psychological explanation of culture-specific phenomena (“Kulturpsychologie”) and partly on the testing of general psychological theories (“Kulturvergleich”).

The *culture-psychology* approach describes culture-specific phenomena in order to achieve better knowledge of a theoretical construct without necessarily testing the universality of the theory. In contrast, the *cross-cultural* approach explicitly and systematically compares different cultures with respect to certain psychological phenomena. Here, cultures are used as contextual variables allowing one to proceed in a quasi-experimental design to test more or less general hypotheses for universality. The increase of variance of theoretically relevant variables and control of otherwise confounded variables has helped to discover hidden phenomena, and thus has opened new perspectives for theoretical advancement. The results have been used to modify the theory or the assumed functional relations, and to formulate new hypotheses in order to arrive at a nomothetic theory.

These two approaches, their goals and methods, could be seen as mutually exclusive. But this would be a superficial view.

The nomothetic approach has to cope with several methodological difficulties (e.g., problems of functional equivalence). One of its basic problems is to ascertain the culture-specific relevance of certain psychological phenomena. Psychological phenomena need adequate measurement, and empirical data need adequate interpretation in the framework of a psychological theory that takes the cul-

tural meaning of observed phenomena into account (cf. Kornadt & Trommsdorff, 1984, for socialization). Both approaches could be related in a mutually fruitful way if the advantages of each approach were combined to compensate for respective disadvantages. The culture-psychological approach may profit from systematic comparisons of the cross-cultural approach, while the latter may profit from the former's psychological knowledge about the culture-specific meaning of the observed phenomena.

Here, a unique contribution of German cross-cultural psychology is in sight: Combining and making use of the advantages of both approaches would allow for considerable theoretical and methodological improvements and possibly for the improvement of knowledge on the intervention in and between cultures.

Another unique contribution of German cross-cultural psychology is in relating psychological phenomena from different domains of human action. This requires crossing the borders between different fields of psychology and may thus stimulate research on new problems and integration of diverse fields of psychology (e.g., developmental and social psychology).

Moreover, some German scholars accept the challenge of cross-cultural psychology to cross the borders between psychology and its neighbouring disciplines (such as ecology, anthropology, sociology, or biology). The study of human behavior in its cultural contexts may require relating several theories of personality, social interaction, and social change; this would require extending our perspective beyond single, more or less isolated subfields in psychology and beyond an exclusive psychological perspective. Such intra- and interdisciplinary cooperation may stimulate mutual theoretical and methodological enrichment and serve for deeper scientific understanding of human behavior. Here could wait the most challenging task of cross-cultural psychology in general.

References

- Ainsworth, M.D.S. (1977). Attachment theory and its utility in cross-cultural research. In P.H. Leiderman, S.R. Tulkin & A. Rosenfeld (Eds.), *Culture and infancy* (pp. 49–67). New York: Academic Press.
- Bergius, R., Werbig, H., Winter, G. & Schubring, G. (1970). Urteile deutscher Arbeitnehmer über Völker in Relation zur Zahl ihrer ausländischen Bekannten. II.: Unterschiede zwischen verschiedenen Kontaktgruppen. *Psychologische Beiträge*, 12, 485–532.
- Bischof, N. (1985). *Das Rätsel Ödipus. Die biologischen Wurzeln des Urkonflikts von Intimität und Autonomie*. München: Piper.
- Blaser, A. (1982). Worauf achtet der Psychotherapeut bei seinem prospektiven Patienten im Erstinterview? *Psychologie – Schweizerische Zeitschrift für Psychologie und ihre Anwendungen*, 4, 287–295.
- Boesch, E.E. (1971). *Zwischen zwei Wirklichkeiten. Prolegomena zu einer ökologischen Psychologie*. Bern: Huber.
- Boesch, E.E. (1976). *Psychopathologie des Alltags*. Bern: Huber.

- Boesch, E.E. (1978). Kultur und Biotop. In C.F. Graumann (Ed.), *Ökologische Perspektiven in der Psychologie* (pp. 11–32). Bern: Huber.
- Boesch, E.E. (1980). *Kultur und Handlung*. Bern: Huber.
- Boesch, E.E. (1984). Moderne Erziehung und traditionelle Werte. In G. Trommsdorff (Ed.), *Erziehungsziele in Familie und Schule. Jahrbuch für empirische Erziehungswissenschaft* (pp. 171–190). Düsseldorf: Schwann.
- Boesch, E.E., & Eckensberger, L.H. (1969). Methodische Probleme des interkulturellen Vergleichs. In C.F. Graumann (Ed.), *Handbuch der Psychologie. Vol. 7, Sozialpsychologie, 1. Halbband: Theorien und Methoden* (pp. 515–566). Göttingen: Hogrefe.
- Borg, I. (1978). Ein Vergleich verschiedener Studien zur Lebensqualität. *Zeitschrift für Sozialpsychologie, 9*, 152–164.
- Breitenbach, D. (1974). *Auslandsausbildung als Gegenstand sozialwissenschaftlicher Forschung*. Saarbrücken: Verlag der SSIP-Schriften.
- Brislin, R.W. (1976). Comparative research methodology: Cross-cultural studies. *International Journal of Psychology, 11*, 215–229.
- Brislin, R.W., Lonner, W.J., & Thorndike, R.M. (1973). *Cross-cultural research methods*. New York: John Wiley.
- Cattell, R.B., Schmidt, L.R., & Pawlik, K. (1973). Cross cultural comparison (USA, Japan, Austria) of the personality factor structures of 10 to 14 year olds in objective tests. *Social Behavior and Personality, 1*, 182–211.
- Cattell, R.B., Seitz, W., & Rausche, A. (1971). Zur Konstanz der Persönlichkeitsstruktur von Kindern, gemessen durch Questionnaire – (Q) – Daten. *Zeitschrift für Experimentelle und Angewandte Psychologie, 18*, 513–524.
- Claar, A., Boehnke, K., & Silbereisen, R.K. (1984). Zur Entwicklung von Motiven prosozialen Handelns bei 12- bis 18jährigen deutschen und polnischen Schülern. In A. Stiksrud (Ed.), *Jugend und Werte. Aspekte einer politischen Psychologie des Jugendalters* (pp. 166–183). Weinheim: Beltz.
- Cohen, A.S. (1976). Asymmetrien in der Wahrnehmung von Bildern. *Psychologie – Schweizerische Zeitschrift für Psychologie und ihre Anwendungen, 35*, 28–38.
- Cronbach, L.J. (1976). Beyond the two disciplines of scientific psychology. *American Psychologist, 30*, 116–127.
- Dasen, P.R. (1973). Biology or culture? Interethnic psychology from a Piagetian point of view. *Canadian Psychologist, 14*, 149–166.
- Dasen, P.R. (1984). Social intelligence and technological intelligence: The divergence between two models. In *Abstract Guide of the 23rd International Congress of Psychology*. Acapulco, Mexico, Vol. 1, p. 17.
- Dasen, P.R., & Heron, A. (1981). Cross-cultural tests of Piaget's theory. In H.C. Triandis & A. Heron (Eds.), *Handbook of cross-cultural psychology. Vol. 4, Developmental psychology* (pp. 295–341). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- DeVos, G.A., & Caudill, W. (1973). Achievement, culture, and personality: The case of the Japanese-Americans. In G.A. DeVos (Ed.), *Socialization for achievement* (pp. 220–247). Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Doi, T. (1973). *The anatomy of dependence*. Tokyo; Kodanisha.
- Eckensberger, L.H. (1973). Methodological issues of cross-cultural research in developmental psychology. In J.R. Nesselroade & H.W. Reese (Eds.), *Life-span developmental psychology: Methodological issues* (pp. 43–64). New York: Academic Press.
- Eckensberger, L.H. (1978). Kulturvergleich als interdisziplinärer sozialwissenschaftlicher

- Forschungsansatz. — Seine Bedeutung und methodische Probleme aus psychologischer Sicht. In K.M. Bolte (Ed.), *Materialien aus der soziologischen Forschung* (pp. 351–399). München: Luchterhand.
- Eckensberger, L.H., & Burgard, P. (1983). The cross-cultural assessment of normative concepts: Some considerations on the affinity between methodological approaches and preferred theories. In S.H. Irvine & J.W. Berry (Eds.), *Human assessment and cultural factors* (pp. 459–480). New York: Plenum Press.
- Eckensberger, L.H., & Krewer, B. (1985). Die kulturvergleichende Perspektive. In T. Herrmann & E.D. Lantermann (Eds.), *Persönlichkeitspsychologie — Ein Handbuch in Schlüsselbegriffen* (pp. 116–124). München: Urban & Schwarzenberg.
- Eckensberger, L.H., Krewer, B., & Kasper, E. (1984). Simulation of cultural change by cross-cultural research: Some metamethodological considerations. In K.A. McCluskey & H.W. Reese (Eds.), *Life-span developmental psychology: Historical and generational effects in life-span human development* (pp. 73–107). New York: Academic Press.
- Eckensberger, L.H., & Reinshagen, H. (1977). *Cross-cultural research as a touchstone for Kohlberg's stage theory of moral development*. Paper read at the 4th Biennial Conference of the International Society for the Study of Behavioral Development, Pavia, Italy.
- Eckensberger, L.H., & Reinshagen, H. (1980). Kohlbergs Stufentheorie der Entwicklung des moralischen Urteils: ein Versuch ihrer Reinterpretation im Bezugsrahmen handlungstheoretischer Konzepte. In L.H. Eckensberger & R.K. Silbereisen (Eds.), *Entwicklung sozialer Kognitionen: Modelle, Theorien, Methoden, Anwendung* (pp. 65–131). Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta.
- Edelstein, W. (1984). Entwicklung, kulturelle Zwänge und die Problematik des Fortschritts. In T. Schöfthaler & D. Goldschmidt (Eds.), *Soziale Struktur und Vernunft. Jean Piagets Modell entwickelten Denkens in der Diskussion kulturvergleichender Forschung* (pp. 403–439). Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp.
- Eibl-Eibesfeldt, I. (1968). Zur Ethologie des menschlichen Grußverhaltens. *Zeitschrift für Tierpsychologie*, 25, 727–744.
- Eibl-Eibesfeldt, I. (1972). Similarities and differences between cultures in expressive movements. In R.A. Hinde (Ed.), *Nonverbal communication* (pp. 297–314). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Eibl-Eibesfeldt, I. (1980). Elementare Interaktionsstrategien. *Gruppendynamik*, 11, 273–296.
- Eibl-Eibesfeldt, I. (1982). Kriegführung, Indoktrinierbarkeit des Menschen und Gruppenselektion. *Zeitschrift für Tierpsychologie*, 60, 177–198.
- Freud, S. (1913). *Totem und Tabu. Einige Übereinstimmungen im Seelenleben der Wilden und Neurotiker*. Wien: Heller.
- Fröhlich, W.D., Becker, J.P., Bengtson, V.L., & Bigot, A. (1969). The problem of cross-national reliability in ratings, some tentative approaches and findings. In R. Havighurst, J. Munnichs, B. Neugarten & H. Thomae (Eds.), *Adjustment to retirement: A cross-national study* (pp. 18–34). Assen: Royal van Gorcum.
- Graumann, C.F. (1972). The state of psychology. *International Journal of Psychology*, 7, 123–134, 199–204.
- Grossmann, K.E., Grossmann, K., Huber, E. & Wartner, U. (1981). German children's behavior towards their mothers and their fathers at 18 months in Ainsworth's strange situation. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 4, 157–181.
- Grossmann, K., Grossmann, K.E., Spangler, G., Suess, G., & Unzner, L. (in press).

- Maternal sensitivity and newborns' orientation responses as related to quality of attachment in Northern Germany. In I. Bretherton & E. Waters (Eds.), *Monographs of the society for research in child development*.
- Heller, F.A., & Wilpert, B. (1977). Limits to participative leadership: Task, structure and skill as contingencies – a German-British comparison. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 7, 61–84.
- Heller, F.A., & Wilpert, B. (1981). *Competence and power in managerial decision making*. Chichester/New York: Wiley.
- Hellpach, W. (1924). Psychologie der Umwelt. In E. Abderhalden (Ed.), *Handbuch der biologischen Arbeitsmethoden. Abt. VI. Methoden der experimentellen Psychologie* (Teil C. Heft 3). Berlin: Urban & Schwarzenberg.
- Hentschel, U., & Holley, J.W. (1978). On the applicability of the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey in a different sociocultural milieu. *Archiv für Psychologie*, 130, 297–311.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences. International differences in work-related values*. Beverly Hills/London: Sage.
- Jahoda, G. (1980). Theoretical and systematic approaches in cross-cultural psychology. In H.C. Triandis & R.W. Brislin (Eds.), *Handbook of cross-cultural psychology: Vol. 1, Social psychology* (pp. 69–143). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Kettel, K.J. (1974). Eignungsuntersuchungen mit ausländischen Probanden. *Psychologie und Praxis*, 18, 146–149.
- Kitamura, A. (1982). Eine vergleichende Untersuchung der Suizidversuche deutscher und japanischer Jugendlicher. *Praxis der Kinderpsychologie und Kinderpsychiatrie*, 31, 191–201.
- Koch, U. (1971). Ein neuer Ansatz des Kulturvergleichs, demonstriert am Beispiel der semantischen Räume Japans und Deutschlands. *Psychologie und Praxis*, 15, 57–64.
- Koehler, K., & Jacoby, Ch. (1978). Schneider-oriented psychiatric diagnosis in Germany compared with New York and London. *Comprehensive Psychiatry*, 19, 19–26.
- Kohlberg, L. (1968). Early education: A cognitive development view. *Child Development*, 39, 1013–1062.
- Kornadt, H.-J. (1969). *The cognitive organization of achievement motivation and some cultural differences between Kenya and Germany*. Paper presented at the International Conference of Subjective Culture, Athen (mimeo).
- Kornadt, H.-J. (1970). Psychological and sociological problem areas for cross-cultural research on social change in mining communities. In H.-J. Kornadt (Ed.), *Social change in mining communities. Psychological and sociological aspects of social and adaptive processes* (pp. 1–44). Saarbrücken: University of the Saar.
- Kornadt, H.-J. (1982). *Aggressionsmotiv und Aggressionshemmung*. Bern: Huber.
- Kornadt, H.-J. (1984). Development of aggressiveness: A motivation theory perspective. In R.M. Kaplan, V.J. Konečni & R.W. Novaco (Eds.), *Aggression in children and youth* (pp. 73–87). The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.
- Kornadt, H.-J. (in press). Aggression motive and personality development: Japan and Germany. In F. Halisch & J. Kuhl (Eds.), *Motivation, intention and volition*. New York/Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag.
- Kornadt, H.-J., Eckensberger, L.H., & Emminghaus, W.B. (1980). Cross-cultural research on motivation and its contribution to a general theory of motivation. In H.C. Triandis & W. Lonner (Eds.), *Handbook of cross-cultural psychology, Vol. 3, Basic processes* (pp. 223–321). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

- Kornadt, H.-J., Emminghaus, W.B., & Trommsdorff, G. (1982). *Erziehung and Aggression im Kulturvergleich*. Bericht über die im Rahmen der Voruntersuchung und mit Mitteln der VW-Stiftung durchgeführten Arbeiten. Unpublished manuscript, University of the Saar.
- Kornadt, H.-J., & Trommsdorff, G. (1984). Erziehungsziele im Kulturvergleich. In G. Trommsdorff (Ed.), *Erziehungsziele in Familie und Schule. Jahrbuch für empirische Erziehungswissenschaft* (pp. 191–212). Düsseldorf: Schwann.
- Kornadt, H.-J., & Voigt, E. (1970). *Situation und Entwicklungsprobleme des Schulsystems in Kenya. Teil 2: Empirischer Beitrag zur sozialpsychologischen Funktion der Schule, besonders der Sekundarschule*. Stuttgart: Klett.
- Krewer, B., Momper, M. & Eckensberger, L. (1984). Das Saarland war zumeist Objekt der Geschichte. *Der Bürger im Staat*, 34, 178–186.
- Kruse, L., & Graumann, C.F. (in press). Environmental psychology in Germany. In D. Stokols & I. Altman (Eds.), *Handbook of environmental psychology*. New York: Wiley.
- Larbig, W. (1981). Heimweh als Krankheitsfaktor. *Medizinische Klinik*, 76, 36–39.
- Lewin, K. (1931). Environmental forces in child behavior and development. In C. Murchinson (Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology* (pp. 94–127). Worcester, MA: Clark University Press.
- Lück, H.E. (1976). Some cross-cultural aspects of prosocial orientation. In *Abstract Guide of the 20th International Congress of Psychology, Paris* (p. 223).
- Lück, H.E. (1978). Aspects of a trans-national theory of prosocial behavior. In L.G. Wispé (Ed.), *Altruism, sympathy and helping* (pp. 209–228). New York: Academic Press.
- Mantell, D.M. (1971). The potential for violence in Germany. *Journal of Social Issues*, 27, 101–112.
- Matesanz, A., & Hampel, R. (1978). Eine interkulturelle Vergleichsstudie mit dem FPI an deutschen und spanischen Probanden. *Zeitschrift für Experimentelle und Angewandte Psychologie*, 25, 218–229.
- Mischel, W. (1968). *Personality and assessment*. New York: Wiley.
- Miyake, K., Chen, S., & Campos, J.J. (in press). *Infant temperament, mother's mode of interaction, and attachment*. Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development.
- Park, K. (1980). *Leistungsmotivation in Korea*. Unpublished manuscript, Freie Universität Berlin (mimeo).
- Pawlik, K. (1976). Ökologische Validität: Ein Beispiel aus der Kulturvergleichsforschung. In G. Kaminski (Ed.), *Umweltpsychologie* (pp. 59–72). Stuttgart: Klett.
- Pfeiffer, W.M. (1974). Kulturelle Determinanten von Verhaltensstörungen (psychoreaktive Störungen in außereuropäischen Kulturen). In L.H. Eckensberger & U. Eckensberger (Eds.), *Bericht über den 28. Kongreß der deutschen Gesellschaft für Psychologie in Saarbrücken, 1972* (pp. 113–126). Göttingen: Hogrefe.
- Pfeiffer, W.M., & Schoene, W. (Eds.) (1980). *Psychopathologie im Kulturvergleich*. Stuttgart: Enke.
- Piaget, J. (1970). Piaget's theory. In P.H. Mussen (Ed.), *Carmichael's Manual of Child Psychology, Vol. 1* (pp. 703–732). New York: Wiley.
- Pschikal, E.H. (1982). *Selbstmord – seine soziale Kausalität und Interdependenz (Eine binationale Studie)*. Unpublished manuscript, Universität Wien.

- Ries, G. (1977). Zusammenhang zwischen der Entwicklung operationalen Denkens nach Piaget und der Schulleistung. *Psychologie in Erziehung und Unterricht*, 24, 351–364.
- Rotter, J.B. (1966). Generalized expectancies for internal control of reinforcement. *Psychological Monographs*, 80, (Whole No. 609).
- Scherer, K.R. (1974). Voice quality analysis of American and German speakers. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, 3, 281–298.
- Scherer, K.K., & Scherer, U. (1980). Nonverbal behavior and impression formation in naturalistic situations. In *Abstract Guide of the 22nd International Congress of Psychology, Leipzig* (p. 481).
- Scherer, K.R., Summerfield, A.B., & Wallbott, H.G. (1983). Cross-national research on antecedents and components of emotion: A progress report. *Social Science Information*, 22, 355–385.
- Scherer, K.R., Wallbott, H.G., & Summerfield, A.B. (in press). *Experiencing emotions: A cross-cultural study*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schleidt, M., Schiefenhövel, W., Stanjek, K., & Krell, R. (1980). "Caring for a baby" behavior: Reactions of passersby to a mother and baby. *Man-Environment Systems*, 10, 73–82.
- Schneewind, K.A. (1983). Ungleichheiten von Familien und Kindern im kulturellen Kontext. *Behindertenpädagogik*, 22, 194–226.
- Schönbach, P., Gollwitzer, P.M., Stiepel, G., & Wagner, U. (1981). *Education and intergroup attitudes*. London: Academic Press.
- Schumacher, G., Cattell, A., & Krug, S. (1980). Sekundäre Persönlichkeitsfaktoren im deutschen HSPQ und ihr Gebrauchswert für die Diagnose, für interkulturelle Vergleiche, für eine empirische Überprüfung tiefenpsychologischer Modellvorstellungen sowie für die Konstruktvalidität des HSPQ. *Praxis der Kinderpsychologie und Kinderpsychiatrie*, 29, 47–51.
- Schwarzer, C. (1984). The adaptation of an American test anxiety inventory to Koreans. In *Abstract Guide of the 23rd International Congress of Psychology, Acapulco, Mexico, Vol. 2* (p. 285).
- Silbereisen, R.K. (1984). The role of substance use in normal adolescents' development. In *Abstract Guide of the 23rd International Congress of Psychology, Acapulco, Mexico, Vol. 1* (p. 156).
- Silbereisen, R.K. (1985). Jugendentwicklung und Drogengebrauch: entwicklungspsychologische Perspektiven. In L. Montada (Ed.), *Bericht über die 7. Tagung Entwicklungspsychologie in Trier* (pp. 161–173). Trier: Druckerei der Universität Trier.
- Silbereisen, R.K., Boehnke, K., & Reykowski, J. (1986). Prosocial motives from 12 to 18: A comparison of adolescents from Berlin and Warsaw. In R.K. Silbereisen, K. Eyferth & G. Rudinger (Eds.), *Development of action in context* (pp. 137–164). New York: Springer.
- Silbereisen, R.K., & Eyferth, K. (1984). Substance use as habitual behavior: A German longitudinal study. In *Abstract Guide of the 23rd International Congress of Psychology, Acapulco, Mexico, Vol. 1* (p. 186).
- Stapf, K.H., Stroebe, W., & Jonas, K. (1986). *Amerikaner über Deutschland und die Deutschen: Urteile und Vorurteile*. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.
- Stephan, A., Hess, H., & Hock, K. (1971). Adaptation und Reduzierung des MMPI – Saarbrücken. *Psychiatrie, Neurologie und medizinische Psychologie*, 23, 695–702.
- Stiksrud, H.A., & Kuliga, M.G. (1985). *Literatur-Dokumentation zur psychosozialen*

Lage der Migranten der 1. und 2. Generation. Institut für Psychologie der Freien Universität Berlin.

- Thomae, H. (1979). Personality development in two cultures: A selective review on research aims and issues. *Human Development*, 22, 296–319.
- Thomas, A. (Ed.) (1984). *Interkultureller Personenaustausch in Forschung und Praxis.* Saarbrücken: Breitenbach.
- Thomas, A. (in press). Kulturelle Bedingungen. In E. Roth (Ed.), *Organisationspsychologie. Enzyklopädie der Psychologie*, Band D/III/3. Göttingen: Hogrefe.
- Trommsdorff, G. (1978). Möglichkeiten und Probleme des Kulturvergleichs dargestellt am Beispiel einer Aggressionsstudie. *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie*, 2, 361–381.
- Trommsdorff, G. (1983). Value change in Japan. *Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 7, 337–360.
- Trommsdorff, G. (1984a). Familiäre Sozialisation im Kulturvergleich: Japan und Deutschland. *Zeitschrift für Sozialisationsforschung und Erziehungssoziologie*, 4, 79–97.
- Trommsdorff, G. (1984b). Cross-cultural aspects of socialization. In *Abstract Guide of the 23rd International Congress of Psychology, Acapulco, Mexico, Vol. 1* (p. 80).
- Trommsdorff, G. (1985a). Kontrollorientierung aus kulturvergleichender Sicht. In L. Montada (Ed.), *Bericht über die 7. Tagung Entwicklungspsychologie in Trier* (pp. 309–310). Trier: Druckerei der Universität Trier.
- Trommsdorff, G. (1985b). Some comparative aspects of socialization in Japan and Germany. In I.R. Lagunes & Y.H. Poortinga (Eds.), *From a different perspective: Studies of behavior across cultures* (pp. 231–240). Lisse: Swets and Zeitlinger.
- Trommsdorff, G. (in press). Behinderte in der Sicht verschiedener Kulturen. In K.J. Klauer & A. Reinartz (Eds.), *Handbuch der Sonderpädagogik, Vol. 11.* Berlin: Marhold.
- Trommsdorff, G. (Ed.) (in prep.). *Sozialisation im Kulturvergleich.* Stuttgart: Enke.
- Trommsdorff, G., & Iwawaki, S. (1986). *Socialization of sex roles.* Paper presented at the Congress of Cross-Cultural Psychology, Istanbul (mimeo).
- Trommsdorff, G., & Von Westerman, M. (1986). *Kulturvergleichende Psychologie 1965–1985. Eine Bibliographie von Arbeiten deutschsprachiger Autoren.* Unpublished manuscript, Rheinisch Westfälische Technische Hochschule Aachen (mimeo).
- Von Cranach, M., & Strauss, A. (1978). Die internationale Vergleichbarkeit psychiatrischer Diagnostik. *Monographien aus dem Gesamtgebiet der Psychiatrie*, 17, 209–219.
- Wagner, R., & Schönbach, P. (1984). Links between educational status and prejudice: Ethnic attitudes in West Germany. In N. Miller & M.B. Brewer (Eds.), *Groups in contact* (pp. 29–52). New York: Academic Press.
- Wedekind, R., Frank, H., & Thimm, W. (1980). Normalization and rehabilitation as objects of socio-political measures concerning the mentally retarded in Denmark and the Federal Republic of Germany. An intercultural comparative study. *International Journal of Rehabilitation Research*, 3, 327–338.
- Wilpert, B. (1984a). Participation in organizations: Evidence from international comparative research. *International Social Science Journal*, 36, 355–366.
- Wilpert, B. (1984b). The meaning of working (MOW): Rationale and design of an international project. In *Abstract Guide of the 23rd International Congress of Psychology, Acapulco, Mexico, Vol. 1* (p. 71).
- Wilpert, B., & Rayley, J. (1983). Nationale Mitbestimmungssysteme und ihre Wirkungen

auf Partizipationsverhalten. *Psychologie und Praxis – Arbeits- und Organisationspsychologie*, 27, 3–12.

Winter, G., & Klein, P. (1975). Urteile deutscher Arbeitnehmer über Völker in Relation zur Zahl ihrer ausländischen Bekannten: V. Arbeits- und Freizeitkontakte der Befragten im Ausland im Vergleich mit analogen Kontakten in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland. *Psychologische Beiträge*, 17, 527–555.

Wundt, W. (1911–1920). *Völkerpsychologie. Eine Untersuchung der Entwicklungsgesetze von Sprache, Mythos und Sitte* (Vols. 1–10). Leipzig: Kröner.

Wundt, W. (1912). *Elemente der Völkerpsychologie. Grundlinien einer psychologischen Entwicklungsgeschichte der Menschheit*. Leipzig: Kröner.

Gisela Trommsdorff, PhD, Professor of Psychology, Technical University of North Rhine Westphalia (RWTH), Eilfschornsteinstr. 7, D–5100 Aachen, Germany.