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Three Things

Bill Gabrenya, Editor

IACCP was founded in 1972, just as I was being ejected for bad behavior from the first university that I attended, General Motors Institute of Technology in salubrious Flint, Michigan. The two faculty members who had the most influence on me there were both fired around the same time; all three of us deserved it. One was a history instructor who was obsessed with the effects of modernity on early 20th Century history, an awful 50 years indeed. The other was a communication instructor who had a bad attitude in general but sensitized me to the power of media. This Bulletin issue reprises these three things, the founding, modernity, and communication, although my own role is negligible.

At the excellent Bremen Congress, several senior members held a symposium on the founding of IACCP—John Berry, Pieter Drenth, Gustav Jahoda, Walt Lonner, and Harry Triandis. Harry has contributed a paper to this issue that covers much of what he said in the symposium. Some or all of the remaining papers will be added to the Online Readings in Psychology and Culture (ORPC) site (see orpc.iaccp.org). The symposium was held as part of a larger effort to create a historical archive of Association materials and documents.

Modernity or modernization is a destabilizing force at all levels of analysis, especially science. The field of “psychology and culture studies” is undergoing rapid change and experiencing, perhaps one could argue, a great transformation akin to modernization; the field is unstable. In this issue, I report on the results of two attempts to understand how IACCP members view the Association in this environment. The original title of the article was “Wither IACCP?,” reflecting my sense of the urgency of this question. Various sources of quantitative and qualitative evidence may provide an answer, but you’ll have to read the article...

And the power of media: innovation and development of new media, as well as attempts to repackage old media as new media, continue. The blending of social networking technology (Facebook, twitter, texting, blogs) with mass media, an unfortunate recent example of which was CNN’s coverage of the 2009 Iranian election, amazes and frightens (me). In science, the blurring of expert and amateur knowledge creation and dissemination is unacceptable, but inevitable at the popular level of discourse. Have you read any term papers recently that were collages of web sources, the most reliable of which was probably Wikipedia? IACCP is participating in this melding of knowledge dissemination in several ways that you will see in sidebars in this issue: the expanding ORPC and the online proceedings books; new web resources in the making. Please take a look at eBooks.iaccp.org. One answer to “wither IACCP?” is that we have the intellectual resources to participate in the new media movement by disseminating traditional, high quality science in novel, engaging ways.
Warm greetings to the IACCP membership! Thank you again for giving me the opportunity to serve as your president. I am proud to stand in a line with great personalities and good friends who have served in this office before. We are an ambitious organization and have achieved a lot in the past. IACCP provides a leading journal in the field, the *Journal of Cross Cultural Psychology*, that continues to increase in quality and reputation. Thanks to David Matsumoto and the associate editors, but also their predecessors for doing such a great job! Speaking of the Journal, we always have to thank Walt Lonner for his continuous involvement and now especially for the recent expansion of the special issues program. Exciting topics are coming up! We have one of the best newsletters in the field, the *Cross Cultural Psychology Bulletin*, for which we cannot thank Bill Gabrenya enough, the editor and long-term (former) chair of the Communication and Publications Committee. Our Congress proceedings book program has undergone some difficulties and we are behind schedule with the Spetses book, but it is now published and in the mail. In the future, Conference books will be mainly published online. *The Handbook of Cross Cultural Psychology* has also gone online. IACCP now owns the *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture* (ORPC), a great teaching resource that will be continuously expanded and improved. Check out our website http://www.iaccp.org.

We can look back at a tradition of wonderful conferences. We had a lively and stimulating regional conference in Mexico in 2007, organized by Rolando Diaz-Loving and Isabel Reyes Lagunes. The all day keynote session in the anthropological museum was a particular highlight. We had a wonderful international conference in Bremen last year, organized by Klaus Boehnke and Ulrich Kühnen. Although it was the third consecutive international conference in Germany in 2009, it drew an attendance as large as that of our previous international conference, surrounded by the spectacular scenery of the island of Spetses, Greece. We also danced in Bremen! The quality of the program was fantastic. The Bremen conference really changed the minds of people who previously saw our association rather skeptically. Thanks to the whole Bremen crew for such an outstanding event.
The new Executive Council (EC) will face some challenges and I am very happy that we have a devoted crew on board. Special thanks go to Sharon Glazer, our Treasurer, who took over this office in a very difficult situation. We had lost many members and there was considerable dissatisfaction among the membership. Thanks to Sharon’s unremitting and competent efforts, we are today in a better standing than we were before. Bill Gabrenya had already started to take care of our legal situation, tax exemption and incorporation as a nonprofit corporation in the United States of America before he was elected Secretary-General. It is a great relief for me to realize he is at my side for all the tasks to be accomplished. To his eternal credit, he spent some of his sabbatical as a nearly full time unpaid employee of IACCP. John Adamopoulos is the new chair of the Communication and Publications Committee; he also faces some challenges—new structures need to be developed in order to keep up with new developments in the field. Márta Fülop, our new Deputy Secretary-General, brings in a lot of expertise concerning organizational structures and has the great responsibility of coordinating our Triandis dissertation award. Special thanks goes to Jim Georgas, our past president, for his engaged leadership. I know that I can count on his advice and experience. I also want to thank Shalom Schwartz, past-past-president, for his valuable advice and support. I can also always count on my two female predecessors, Debbie Best and Cigdem Kagitcibasi, as well as Ype Poortinga.

So what do I envision for the future of our society? My agenda comprises mainly two issues that are most important for the further development of our society: One is attracting colleagues who do great cross-cultural/cultural/indigenous research, but up to now have preferred other societies and other meetings, to become active members of IACCP. Some initiatives are under way to broaden our membership in this respect; maybe in the next issue of the Bulletin we can report on these developments. Among these activities is the discussion of intensifying cooperation and collaboration with other international associations. We had a very fruitful meeting with IUPS, IAAP, SIP and other Central and South American societies recently in Guatemala during the SIP conference.

Furthermore, we intend to attract more young scholars and to encourage them to become active in the society, bringing their ideas and their visions of the future. We also aim at attracting more people from the applied fields, so that the overarching importance of culture for education, counseling, and therapy finds its way into practice and policy.

The second topic is the further development of a worldwide workshop program. Our flagship activity, the Advanced Research Training Seminars (ARTS)
Your July 2010 is Booked: XX Congress of IACCP

The XX Congress of IACCP will be held in Melbourne, Australia in 2010. The organizers include Amanda Gordon, past-president of the Australian Psychological Society, as chair of the organizing committee and Yoshi Kashima as chair of the scientific committee. The Congress is being held in conjunction with the International Association for Applied Psychology conference, also in Melbourne, Australia.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Conference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-7 July</td>
<td>Asian Psychological Association, Darwin, Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-10 July</td>
<td>IACCP, Melbourne, Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-16 July</td>
<td>IAAP: International Association for Applied Psychology, International Congress of Psychology, Melbourne, Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-22 July</td>
<td>ISSBD: International Society for the Study of Behavioral Development, Lusaka, Zambia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

has recently been completely reorganized. We now have a steering committee, comprising representatives of the three participating professional associations. Gonca Soygut represents the International Union of Psychological Science (IUPsyS), Tom Oakland the International Association for Applied Psychology (IAAP) and Nandita Chaudhary, our former Deputy Secretary-General, represents us. The three will develop the biennial ARTS program and oversee its evaluation. They are supported by an ARTS coordinator: Sun Xianghong, who is funded by IUPsyS. In May, an organizational meeting was held in Würzburg, Germany, chaired by Merry Bullock from IUPsyS, in which I also participated. Merry has created an ARTS website, which is a very useful resource for the ARTS history and current developments (http://www.am.org/iupsys/arts).

Our general philosophy concerning workshops is interactive: bringing together young scholars from all over the world in order to build and develop capacity that enhances our field. Doing so, we do not ascribe to one-way influence from the West to the majority world, rather we also support the development of local knowledge and indigenous approaches. To put this idea into practice, workshops are a vital part of our regional conferences. In addition, we plan to have workshops in between the conferences in various parts of the world. For designing these workshops to best reflect our society, we are waiting for your input and ideas!

Our next regional conference will be an African one: Thanks to Therese Mungah Tchombe and A. Bame Nsamenang for taking over this responsibility in a difficult situation and organizing our conference at the University of Buea, Cameroon, August 2-6, 2009. You can find information about the conference at the website http://cameroon2009.iaccp.org.

Our next international Congress will be held in Melbourne, Australia from July 7 to 10, 2010. We thank Amanda Gordon for being the local organizer and Yoshi Kashima for serving as the scientific committee chair. More news will be on our website soon.

We all look forward with curiosity and devotion to the new challenges. I wish you a good year, health, peace and success with all your projects. I hope to see many of you during these forthcoming events.
A few days before I travelled to Bremen in the summer of last year to take part in the “Archives Symposium” at the conference of the International Association for Cross-Cultural Psychology I received a letter from Paul Durojaiye with the sad news of the passing of his father, Michael Durojaiye. I conveyed the news at the symposium and Jim Georgas and John Berry remembered the former President of the IACCP with a few well chosen words.

With Michael Durojaiye’s death we lost an inspiring colleague, an enthusiastic researcher in the field of cross-cultural educational psychology, an eloquent speaker and teacher, but above all, a most amiable and cordial friend. He was always an interested colleague, a hospitable host and a good-humoured guest. He is survived by his three children Olufela Dawodu, Linda and Paul. Our sincere sympathy lies with them.

Michael Oladele Akanbi Durojaiye was born on the 4th December 1932 in Abeokuta, Nigeria. He was educated at various Catholic schools and finished his teacher training in 1955. He taught at a grammar school in Ibadan, Nigeria, until he won a government scholarship for a study at Loughborough College, England, in 1961, and, later, at the Victoria University of Manchester. In July 1968 he received his Ph.D. in psychology at this university. While at Manchester he met the English literature student Suzan Beswick, whom he married in 1964. In 1968 they left England for Nigeria, where they both took up lectureships at the University of Ibadan.

In 1970 they moved to East Africa, where Michael became Professor of Educational Psychology at Makerere University in Kampala, Uganda. It is there that he started to gain international recognition as an authority in (African) psychology and education. He was active and often the organiser of various international conferences in Africa and abroad, he was regularly invited as a consultant, a speaker and guest lecturer, and he became Acting Dean of the Department of Educational Psychology, and later of the Faculty of Education at Makerere.

That was also the time that our collaboration and friendship started. Michael had taken up the idea of developing a series of “indigenous” intelligence tests for East Africa. (Uganda, Kenya and Tanzania had much closer ties at that time, and there was a strong educational alliance between the three countries.), He travelled to the Netherlands Organization for International Cooperation in Higher Education (NUFFIC) in The Hague to solicit financial and expert support. NUFFIC referred him to my department at the VU University in Amsterdam, knowing that I had been involved in similar projects in Surinam.
and Indonesia. This was the beginning of a successful test development project in East Africa, as well as a dear friendship. Unfortunately Uganda had to be abandoned soon, because of the brutal reign of Idi Amin Dada, who was responsible for the imprisonment and killing of several prominent Ugandans, and even foreign nationals. Life in Uganda became more and more difficult for Michael and his family, and in August 1975 he was fortunate to leave Uganda to take up a chair of Educational Psychology at the University of Lagos, Nigeria. Soon again his intellectual and organisational competencies were recognised at the University of Lagos, where he became Dean of the Faculty of Education from 1975 to 1979, Deputy Vice Chancellor from 1979 to 1981, and Acting Vice Chancellor in 1981.

Michael remained a true cosmopolitan. He travelled widely in Africa, Europe, Australia, Asia, and North and South America. He attended and spoke at international conferences, and was a respected participant and lecturer at workshops, symposia and committee meetings. He was eminently present at most of the conferences of the International Association for Cross-Cultural Psychology in the 70’s and the 80’s.

Among others he was a long time executive member of the International Union of Psychological Sciences, he was Vice President (1974-1976) and President (1976-1978) of the International Association for Cross-Cultural Psychology, he was Fellow of the Netherlands Institute for the Advancement of Social Sciences (NIAS) (1981-1982), member of the Royal British Psychological Society, and (consulting) editor of various international journals. His Presidential Address to the IACCP at its 1978 Munich Congress was “The need for international cooperation in cross-cultural psychology with special reference to action research in Africa.”

Michael was a lively, charming, extraverted Yoruba. At the same time and probably stemming naturally from his committed membership in the Catholic Church, he nourished strict principles in education and social behaviour and had a strong sense of justice. This brought him a few times in a dangerous confrontation with the Amin regime in Uganda. And this was also the primary cause for a conflict at the University of Lagos. His knowledge of corruption brought him to bring charges against the university leadership, which of course was demurred and countered with contra-accusations. The case was handled at various courts and only after more than two years the High Court decided in Michael’s favour. Until that time he was suspended from the university and could not teach or take part in the administration. Disappointed, Michael left the country after the High Court decision.

The last years of his professional career were spent in the Faculty of Education at the University of the West Indies, Trinidad and Tobago. From there he travelled regularly to Nigeria, almost always via Amsterdam. He often took the time to visit us for a few days. I also visited him once in Trinidad on my way to a conference of the Caribbean Academy of Sciences in Barbados that we attended together. The Trinidad period was not the happiest time of his life. He worked below his level of competence in what was basically a teachers’ seminary, and felt burdened with routine teaching and administrative duties. In May 2004 he settled back down in Lagos and lived peacefully at his home in Magado, adjacent to the University of Lagos Estate, amidst relatives, friends and former colleagues. He died on the 19th June, 2008. We will hold him in loving memory.
The Early Stages of Cross-Cultural Psychology

Harry C. Triandis
Champaign-Urbana, Illinois

The study of the relationship between culture and psychology goes back to Herodotus (1966), who in his history wrote about cultural differences in the 4th century before our common era. Anthropologists, historians, sociologists, and political scientists were interested in culture in the intervening centuries (Jahoda, 1993; Triandis, 2007). However, up to about 1960, psychology was “culture blind” in the sense that it was assumed that all psychological discoveries were independent of culture.

In other disciplines, such as anthropology, history, sociology and political science culture did play an important role, but in psychology it did not. Of course, there were a few exceptions to the lack of interest in culture in psychology, for example the work of Wilhelm Wundt (1900-1914) who not only established the first psychological laboratory in the world, but also wrote extensively about culture. But, on the whole, in the 1960s psychology was culture blind. The development of cross-cultural psychology was aided by the experience of collectivist students in Western individualist universities, the appearance of important seminal concepts and supporting methodologies, foundational conferences, the publication of comprehensive handbooks, and finally entered mainstream psychology as an important intellectual influence.

Collectivists Encounter Individualists

An important, now-familiar dimension of cultural variation is collectivism–individualism. Most cultures, especially rural traditional cultures, are collectivist, but as cultures become affluent and urban, and as people become educated and travel widely, they become cognitively complex (they see themselves belonging to groups, but are also independent of groups), and then they become individualist (Triandis, 1989, 1995).

A shift away from the culture blindness of psychology mentioned above occurred when individuals from collectivist countries studied psychology in individualist countries, such as the United States. For example, I was raised in Greece, which was at that time collectivist, but studied at Cornell University in New York State, which was individualist.
Later, Cigdem Kagitcibasi, from Turkey, studied at the University of California, Yang Kuo-Shu, from Taiwan, studies at the University of Illinois, and later developed an indigenous Chinese psychology, and Shinobu Kitayama, from Japan, studied at the University of Michigan. These individuals became important cross-cultural psychologists.

The small trickle of cross-cultural psychologists of the 1950 to 1990 period became a flood after about 1990 when many students from China, Korea, and India studied in the West and became important cross-cultural psychologists. The reason this change occurred is that many of the findings of individualist psychology did not make sense to individuals from collectivist cultures. This suggested that it was desirable to examine if what was found in the West replicated in the non-West.

Seminal Ideas Shape a New Intellectual Domain

A number of new ideas were developed early on that have guided the field and fueled its intellectual debates since. For example, borrowing from anthropology and linguistics, Triandis (1964) introduced the concepts of etics and emics. These concepts are now widely taught and debated in psychology as well as anthropology. My position is that, if we are to perform culture-comparative research correctly, we need to use the etics of all cultures being compared, but at the same time know and understand the emics of the cultures in order to describe each one accurately. Concepts such as “intelligence” lend themselves readily to such dual etic and emic approaches. When we use emics we might end with descriptions of indigenous psychologies, such as the psychology of the Chinese developed by Yang Kuo-Shu, and the psychology of the Mexicans, developed by Rogelio Diaz-Guerrero (2003).

These developments were greatly aided by several foundational conferences.

Early Conferences Crystallize the Field

In January 1967, a conference took place in Ibadan, Nigeria. The organizers were Herbert Kelman and Henri Tajfel. The purpose of the conference was to bring psychologists and others social scientists from Africa and the West together, and hope that they could develop research collaborations. In that conference I was most impressed by the paper of a Tunisian sociologist, who argued that social scientists engage in “intellectual colonialism.” That is, they visit a country, collect data, and go back to their country and publish their findings, without giving any credit to the local scientists or helping the country that provided the data.

That seemed unfair, and ethically questionable. Thus, I changed the way I did research. After that conference, I included local social scientists in the design, theoretical development,
provided insights, based on emics, that were not available to mainstream psychology. Consequently, most publications in cross-cultural psychology now have many coauthors. This became the standard way of operating in cross-cultural psychology, so that in some cases the publication has hundreds of coauthors.

**Ethics and Indigenization**

The new way of doing research was codified in Tapp, Kelman, Triandis, Wrightsman, and Cohelio (1974) in ethical standards for cross-cultural research. The standards require researchers to make sure that their methods are ethically acceptable in each culture. They must use both etics and emics. To control rival hypotheses they must discover both similarities and differences among cultures (with differences embedded in the similarities), and they must use more than one method to establish a cultural difference. They must leave something of value in the culture that they study (e.g., useful information, procedures, material goods, payments). Not harming their collaborators is discussed in great detail, because in some cases collaboration with “an outsider” may be politically incorrect in the local culture, and getting paid by outsiders can result in serious problems (e.g., envy) with local colleagues. Attempts to include this code in the ethical standards of the International Association of Cross-Cultural Psychology were unsuccessful, because the code was deemed too restrictive, not allowing sufficient freedom for cross-cultural psychologists. Details about cross-cultural methodology, developed mostly after the Ibadan conference, can be found in Triandis (1972) and are more easily accessible in Triandis (1994).

**Communication Among Culturalists**

An important outcome of the Ibadan conference was the agreement to publish a Newsletter to report on developments in cross-cultural psychology and give cross-cultural psychologists a channel of communication with each other. The Newsletter was first edited by Triandis, later by Yasumasa Tanaka, and finally it was made the official publication of the International Association of Cross-Cultural Psychology, with the name *Cross-Cultural Social Psychology Newsletter*. It is now the *Cross-Cultural Psychology Bulletin*.

**Establishing Leadership in a Young Field**

The conference brought together many psychologists (e.g., M. Brewster Smith, who was the mentor of the Turkish developmental psychologists Cigdem Kagitcibasi, who later became one of the leaders of the field of cross-cultural psychology), and Rogelio Díaz-Guerrero, who developed an indigenous Mexican Psychology (see Díaz-Guerrero, 1997; Diaz-Loving & Adair, 2005).

*The small trickle of cross-cultural psychologists of the 1950 to 1990 period became a flood* after 1990 when many students from China, Korea, and India studied in the West and became important cross-cultural psychologists.

They must leave something of value in the culture that they study (e.g., useful information, procedures, material goods, payments). Not harming their collaborators is discussed in great detail, because in some cases collaboration with “an outsider” may be politically incorrect in the local culture, and getting paid by outsiders can result in serious problems (e.g., envy) with local colleagues. Attempts to include this code in the ethical standards of the International Association of Cross-Cultural Psychology were unsuccessful, because the code was deemed too restrictive, not allowing sufficient freedom for cross-cultural psychologists. Details about cross-cultural methodology, developed mostly after the Ibadan conference, can be found in Triandis (1972) and are more easily accessible in Triandis (1994).

**Subjective Culture and the Junta**

In 1968, a conference was organized in Lagonissi, near Athens, Greece, to stimulate work on the analysis of subjective culture (Triandis, 1972). It was organized by George and Vasso Vassilou and myself. The conference was attended by several leading psychologists who had an interest in culture, such as Otto Klineberg. However, Henri Tajfel refused to come, because after most of the planning for the conference had been done, a group of Greek colonels established a dictatorship in that country. Triandis argued with Tajfel that the people who will be hurt if he does not come were not the colonels but the local psychologists who had done all the work of organizing the conference. Tajfel did not attend, but many others did, including Cigdem Kagitcibasi and Wallace Lambert, who became a major psycholinguist. In the same year, Cronbach & Drenth (1972) organized a conference in Istanbul, Turkey on the cross-cultural use of mental tests.
Founding of IACCP

Such conferences gave psychologists an opportunity to get to know each other, and at about the same time John Dawson, of the University of Hong Kong, convened a conference in Hong Kong in 1972 that established the International Association of Cross-Cultural Psychology. Among the most important participants in that conference were John Berry, who also developed the first Directory of cross-cultural psychologists (now www.iaccp-directory.org), as well as important theories on the influence of culture on cognition (Berry, 1976) and on acculturation (Berry, 2001); Walter Lonner, who established the Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology; Jerry Bruner, who was elected President of the Association; Gustav Jahoda, who became the most important historian of the relationship of culture and mind (Jahoda, 1993, 1997), and many others. Dawson and Lonner (1974) edited the proceedings of that conference.

Handbooks and Publications Establish the Field

As research on culture and psychology increased it was summarized in handbooks. The first Handbook of Cross-Cultural Psychology (Triandis, 1980-81) appeared in six volumes. Lee Cronbach thought that the publication of this handbook established cross-cultural psychology as a distinct branch of psychology. The second handbook (Berry, 1997) was published in three volumes, and two single-volume handbooks appeared later, The Handbook of Culture and Psychology (Matsumoto, 2001) and the Handbook of Cultural Psychology (Kitayama & Cohen, 2007).

Culture really entered mainstream psychology in a big way after the paper by Markus and Kitayama (1991), which showed that their construct interdependence–independence, which is related to collectivism and individualism, is closely tied to cognition, emotion, and motivation. The field had grown to the point of contributing more than 100 publications per year to psychological science.
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**Harry and Pola Triandis Doctoral Thesis Award**

**Description**

The purpose of the International Association for Cross-Cultural Psychology is to promote and facilitate research in the areas of culture and psychology. The IACCP believes that it is important to encourage high quality intercultural research at the predoctoral level. The Harry and Pola Triandis Doctoral Thesis Award is intended to honor and reward good research and to advance the early careers of dedicated researchers. Support for the award is provided by the Harry and Pola Triandis Fund that was established in 1997 (see *Bulletin*, June, 1997). The first award was given in Pultusk, Poland in 2000 and at all subsequent Congresses.

**Prize**

US$500, one year membership in IACCP, free registration at the next IACCP biennial Congress, and partial airfare to the Congress. The winner will be asked to give a presentation of his or her research at the Congress and to write a short summary for the *Bulletin*.

**Submission and Deadlines**

Your doctoral thesis (dissertation) must be relevant to the study of cross-cultural/cultural psychology, with particular emphasis on important and emerging trends in the field; scholarly excellence; innovation and implications for theory and research; and methodological appropriateness. Doctoral theses eligible for an award must have been completed (as defined by your university) during the two calendar years ending on December 31 of the year prior to the Congress year (i.e., between January 1, 2008 and December 31, 2009). Submissions must be received by the IACCP Deputy Secretary/General by October 31 of the year before the Congress year (i.e., October 31, 2009).

**Application Procedure**

Details of the application procedure are available online at iaccp.org/teaching/triandis_award.html

**Deadline:** October 31, 2009

Send your application and inquiries to:

Márta Fülöp: fmarta@mtapi.hu

---

Cross-Cultural Psychology Bulletin
IACCP, the Universe, and Everything:
Results of the Membership Survey, and Some Musings on Organizational Culture

William Gabrenya
Melbourne, Florida USA

The place of culture in psychology and psychology’s relationship to the cultural sciences have changed since IACCP was conceptualized in the 1960s and formally founded in 1972. In this article, I provide the results of the IACCP member survey that we conducted in March and April of 2009, and I use these data and other commentary to try to address some difficult questions such as, “what are we?” “where are we going?” “how should we respond to change?”

In some respects—membership, resources, conferences, the Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology—IACCP is doing well, arguably at the top of its game. However, we face some challenges, externally as well as internally. Has IACCP been too long associated with research and theoretical traditions that are being superseded by new ideas and young researchers? Does IACCP suffer from organizational problems (structural, social, etc.) that prevent the Association from reaching its full potential? What is our potential? Over the last couple decades, new organizations and scientific communities have appeared that approach culture and psychology from perspectives that differ from those commonly associated with IACCP (albeit perhaps as stereotypes) or with JCCP (perhaps correctly). Is there indeed a value to a “big tent” scientific association that brings together a broad range of disparate approaches, or is the “field” (fields) better off fractionated in smaller societies, linked to journals of varying quality and reach?

We posed these questions to IACCP members in early 2009 through our discussion list and email distribution system, as well as in a more comprehensive survey that the Association conducted in April 2009. These two initiatives came out of my and others’ subjective sense that 2008-2009 marks a turning point in the field. The Association held still another large, successful Congress in Bremen, Germany in 2008. Like all of our Congresses, it had a unique flavor reflecting its cultural context, and evaluations were extremely positive. (See Congress Report, this issue.) Nonetheless, in individual conversations during and after the conference, I sensed an ennui among some people involving the Association and its conferences (generically, not the Bremen conference in particular) along the lines of “I don’t feel like I quite fit in” or “I hear the same ideas over and over” or “the Associations seems to be dominated by an inner clique.” I have heard such comments for decades, in fact, and although the Association grows and develops, we also experience high year-to-year turnover, conspicuous individuals stop attending conferences, and our overall size has not kept up with the increased popularity of cultural studies in Psychology. What’s going on? What is to be done?

Apologies to Douglas Adams, RE the title.
The Member Survey and Email Commentary

The member survey was conducted online in April, 2009. Both full and probationary (one year lapsed) members were invited to participate, about 780 people at that time. About 300 respondents completed at least part of the questionnaire for a 38% response rate, assuming that all members received the email solicitations. We were able to assess the representativeness of the sample by comparing a few items to information in the member directory. Overall, it looked good, although North America was underrepresented and Europe was overrepresented. Males were underrepresented, for reasons on which I will not speculate. 85% of respondents were full members in the sense of having paid their 2009 dues.

Prior to conducting the member survey, in December 2008 and January 2009 I solicited short essays on the future of IACCP through the IACCP discussion list and member directory. I asked members to respond to the types of questions posed in the first two paragraphs of this article. I received 18 responses of various kinds, referred to below as “email commentary.”

Who is IACCP?
The modal/mean IACCP member is a European or North American female who received her degree in 1995 in social psychology and is now 46 years old. She works on a university faculty conducting research and teaching, specializes in acculturation or migration, and is a self-described “cross-cultural psychologist” who uses primarily quantitative methods. She has never published a paper in JCCP. But IACCP is highly diverse, and in fact 64% of members are not social psychologists (Table 1) and 41% are males, a third of members live outside the European and North American IACCP regions (Table 2), a quarter do not work in academia (Table 3), and 37% have published in our journal. Indeed, IACCP is one of the most diverse non-divisional scientific societies I know of, as many of the survey results illustrate.

The problematic relationship between (indeed, the definitions of) cross-cultural and cultural psychology appeared again and again in these two inquiries. An item in the survey asked respondents to self-identify primarily or secondarily as “cross-cultural psychologists,” “cultural psychologists,” or “indigenous psychologists.” Because these fields are poorly defined and are not mutually exclusive, respondents were allowed to endorse all or none of the options. 69% of respondents claimed to have a very high identification with cross-cultural psychology, 49% with cultural psychology, and 24% with indigenous

Table 1. Field of Highest Degree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social, Personality</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical, Counseling</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial/Org/Work, Management</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Psychology</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Cross-) Cultural</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside of Psychology</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample size</td>
<td>292</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. IACCP Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region as Defined by IACCP</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central/Southern Africa</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Asia</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Japan</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico, Central Am, Caribbean</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>36.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Germany</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- United Kingdom</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The Netherlands</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insular Pacific</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Australia</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Africa and Middle East</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North America</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- USA</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Canada</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South America</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asia</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- India</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Asia</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Indonesia</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 2008 Membership</td>
<td>728</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 I would like to thank the EC members who generously reviewed several drafts of the survey. Remaining errors are mine.
IACCP

psychology. I return to this surprising finding later in this article.

The survey included enough intrusive questions to create an “engagement index,” a rough measure of the extent to which the respondent was an active member. The index included number of years of membership, frequency of IACCP conference attendance, use of Association electronic resources (web sites, etc.), publication frequency in JCCP, and whether or not the respondent has been involved in governance such as serving as a regional representative. Surprisingly, engagement was not related to any items assessing evaluation of the Association or its activities.

One measure of the health of a scientific movement is the extent to which its ideas are carried forward by new members of the discipline. A primary transmission process is the supervision of doctoral student research. Respondents were asked to estimate the number of graduate students (doctoral and Master’s level) they had supervised in the previous 10 years. Although 33% of respondents had supervised no graduate students, 31% had supervised 11 or more students. Without comparison data, it’s hard to interpret this level of student supervision, but the absolute values—and the large proportion of members in doctoral-granting universities—seem to indicate a considerable opportunity for transmission. A closer analysis would require following the students’ careers.

Two measures of the health of a scientific organization are changes in its overall size and in the average age of its membership. Organizations that shrink or age are in trouble. The IACCP membership directory provides reliable membership information back to about 1997. Full (paid) membership has hovered around 600 since 1998, with a recent large increase in 2008 to more than 700. In most years there are 150-200 probationary members. Over this time, USA membership has steadily declined from a high of 40% in 1999 to less than 27% in 2008. The Association began requesting members’ birth dates in 2002. Since 2002, the average age has been stable (about 47) with a recent slight drop to about 46. The failure of IACCP to grow while cultural studies were catching on in psychology during this decade is worrisome, but it is heartening that we are not aging as an organization.

Why IACCP?

A starting point for a discussion of the future of IACCP is learning current members’ sense of what they expect of the Association and why they joined. The survey included two related questions, “what is the purpose of IACCP?” and “why did you join?” Table 4 shows the six or seven response options. Respondents said that IACCP is for science (95%), but none of the purposes were endorsed at less than 63%. 79% endorsed social interaction. The main reason people said they joined was for science (73%), but 62% endorsed social interaction.2 Communicating with psychologists from developing or majority nations was endorsed highly across both questions. In other words, members have a wide set of expectations for IACCP and they join for many reasons, only one of which directly involves science.

IACCP’s main event is its yearly conference, so it is crucial that our conferences meet participants’ needs. An item asked the extent to which biennial Congresses meet these six expectations. They do meet science (89%), social interaction (89%) and international communication (83%) needs. Practice (52%), networking (55%) and aiding majority nation psychologists (44%) expectations were less well met. We asked in open ended questions what features of our conferences are attractive. The most commonly mentioned qualities were social interaction and the overall atmosphere, followed by networking and intel-

---

2 Percentages in this table cannot be compared across items due to the use of different response scales.
lectual benefits. What’s bad? They cost too much, senior members with familiar ideas are overly dominant, keynote addresses are repetitive. Why didn’t you attend the previous several Congresses? No time, no money…

**Four Legs**

I interpret these findings to indicate that IACCP is broader than a scientific society. The Association rests on four “legs” or missions: *intellectual*, including publications, collaborative research, and stimulation; *social*, including social interaction generally as well as career-oriented networking; *majority nations relations*, encompassing both intercultural interaction between minority and majority nation culturalists and programs designed to provide opportunities to majority world psychologists from less wealthy nations; and *application*, not just applied psychology but also a desire to effect social change. Each of these legs entails ongoing challenges and some endemic problems, however.

**Challenging the Intellectual Foundation of IACCP**

IACCP is itself highly intellectually diverse, and now exists in an increasingly diverse intellectual milieu. My email invitation for comments about the future of IACCP yielded some eloquent, if sharp statements. Forrest Tyler, a 25-year member, wrote the articulate essay that is reproduced in full in the sidebar on page 18. Survey results suggest that, while his point of view is a minority opinion in IACCP, it represents the views of many members.

A common thread in this commentary is a call for a broader approach to cultural studies and greater inclusiveness, the latter usually pointing to the newer community that is collectively known as “cultural psychology.” Pawel Boski:

Today, however, cultural psychology can no longer be dismissed: with high visibility in the best journals, often outside JCCP, it has gained in influence. In my view, it is not very productive to conduct “the who is right-wrong” debates, or to ignore “them”; more productive is to strengthen the inclusive tendency by opening the doors of our association and of the journal more widely. Hence my proposal for a cosmetic change in the names of the [Association and the Journal], which in fact could be quite revolutionary: “International Association for Cross-&Cultural Psychology,” “Journal for Cross & Cultural Psychology.”

A joint statement from the Center for Applied Cross-Cultural Research (Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand) picks up on this idea and points out the diversity within the diversity:

…from the outset IACCP has understood “cross-cultural” psychology to incorporate emic and etic perspectives, to encompass cross-cultural, cultural and indigenous approaches, to rely upon field based and lab based research and to be undertaken in an international arena.

### Table 4. Purpose of IACCP, Reason for Joining, and Satisfaction with the Association

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advancing science in the field; building a better science of psychology; providing a forum for presentation of research findings</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancing practice and solving applied problems; develop methods and information that are useful</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social interaction with like-minded professionals in attractive Congresses and conferences</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking for career advancement (finding research collaborators, resources, jobs, etc.)</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributing to the development of psychology in developing nations</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishing or maintaining international communication among psychologists</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal: someone urged me to join, such as my graduate school supervisor</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data source:** Member Survey. **Purpose:** sum of “Very important” and “Extremely important” on 5-point scale; **Reason:** count of “Very important” on 3-point scale; **Satisfaction:** sum of “Agree” and “Strongly agree” on 5-point scale.
Times have changed. North America has (re)discovered culture. Experimental psychologists are publishing in top APA journals, changing the nature, rules and field of cross-cultural research. Comparative experimentalists have laid claim to the area, even appropriating the label cultural psychology—a label that has been attached for at least two decades to a group of scholars who favour field-based observational research on culture and behaviour. At the same time, indigenous voices are becoming stronger. The indigenous psychology movement is growing in Asia, Latin America and amongst native peoples around the world as a reaction to both the domination of Western academic psychology and different research priorities based on community needs. Can IACCP accommodate all of these changes and still remain at the forefront of the exploration of cultural, cross-cultural and indigenous issues within psychology? Or do we retreat and become more specialized, perhaps limiting our scope to cross-cultural, comparative research?

In responding point-by-point to the statement of purpose in the preamble to the current IACCP Constitution (see iaccp.org), Valery Chirkov concluded:

Our statements are dusty and century-old propositions that have been laying on the shelves of the IACCP storehouse from the days when a group of white, male, Anglo-Saxon highly-respected social psychologists, trained mostly in North America and Western Europe within the framework of positivist, experimental model of psychology, decided to organize a "Gentlemen Club" to spread the "word of truth" about human psychological functioning to the developing nations and also use these nations as another interesting "independent variables" to play with in order to verify the truthfulness of their "fundamental knowledge" about humans.

With no disrespect to the founders of our Association, I am suggesting to bring these propositions to light, wipe the dust from them and revise. We are living in the different world and we need new thinking about it.

Specific intellectual pathways were advocated by a few commentators. Here is Ype Poortinga, a founder:

Although there is major progress in volume and sophistication, the last decades have seen more consolidation than innovation. ... In a nutshell my diagnosis is that most leading models are at a high level of abstraction and simple, if not simplistic. ... Empirical studies explain only a small percentage of the total cultural variance, and the models are further examined in designs geared towards finding convergent evidence rather than attempting to falsify existing ideas and to obtain progress through the "ratchet" effect of (quasi-) experimentation. I am not criticizing Hofstede, Triandis, Markus and Kitayama, or Schwartz for defending the ideas they generated, but the rest of us for having been less critical than we should have been.

The path to renewed progress in my view will require an orientation on culture as a shared human characteristic and not mainly as a source of differences between groups. Biology rather than cultural anthropology should be our closest neighbor. However, "biological" should not be understood as referring so much to genetics as to ethology, including human ethology.

Along similar lines, Geert Hofstede advocated for greater attention to evolutionary psychology. Dominik Güss, in contrast, advocated for cognitive psychology:

Research of cultural differences and similarities in cognition has grown over the last years and follows mainly two different approaches. One line is born out of classic experimental cognitive research [such as Richard Nisbett]. ... Another line follows more an anthropological paradigm and could be associated with Douglas Medin at Northwestern University who studies for example folk biology... Neither one of them and most of the other researchers following the two lines have published their research in JCCP. Instead they publish in cognitive psychological or experimental psychological journals often with higher impact factors than JCCP and a specific target audience in mind.

Why? One reason could be the classic link between culture and social psychology and the dominance of social psychological cross-cultural research in JCCP. Another reason could be related to the methodological approach. Whereas social psychologists often use self-reports as data, cognitive psychologists tend to favor classic experiments or performance data. A third reason could be competing journals such as Journal of Cognition and Culture, Cognition, or Cognitive Science. Those journals might be more open to cognitive anthropological studies, theoretical papers, and modeling research. The lack of theoretical models in the study of culture and cognition ... has already been discussed by Weber and Hsee in 2000. Not only cognition but also other emerging theoretical paradigms in psychology are underrepresented in JCCP. I found for example only 8 articles when searching for the keyword "evolution" in JCCP from 1960-2008.
Responses to this email solicitation may well have been unrepresentative of member opinions. The broader member survey included several questions on the same theme, one of which was a multiple-choice item, “To what extent do you believe that IACCP currently meets these goals?” (See Table 4.) These quantitative results seem to discredit the email-solicited commentary, in that 84% said their expectations for advancement of science were being met by IACCP.

However, an open-ended question accompanied this item, “What’s good or bad about IACCP?” This and some other items were meant to replicate the email commentary in a larger, more representative sample. I content analyzed the responses using “less-than-research-quality” techniques, discovering 49 relatively distinguishable criticisms that could be summarized in 11 larger categories. The most frequent criticism was low quality science (25% of all respondents mentioned this problem), in particular narrow theoretical and methodological approaches (mainly clinging to old ideas and ignoring newer, qualitative methods), JCCP’s narrow publication policies, and weak research overall. What is low or high quality research seems to be in the mind of the observer. Several respondents pointed to poor relations with cultural psychology. Taking these three sets of data together, I suspect that IACCP members are aware of the scientific shortcomings of the field but most are not strongly alarmed by them. A substantial minority of members are at odds with the perceived majority approach to cultural studies and disagree with the publication priorities of our journal.

We asked a very general question, “How would you evaluate the quality of research that is currently being reported in the field of cross-cultural psychology,” to get a sense of respondents’ global assessment of the field. 66% evaluated it as

---

**IACCP and Its Future**

Forrest B. Tyler

University of Maryland, College Park

The current ethos of IACCP emphasizes detached objectivity, reductionism, and a reliance on quantitative and analytic methods as the most legitimate avenue to empirical truth. IACCP’s further basic assumption is that a North European/North American conception of individuality represents the basic form of human nature. Cultures and the individuals in them who do not manifest those characteristics and rely on that methodology need to be “developed” or acculturated accordingly. To accomplish that purpose, we continue to fractionate ourselves and others by conducting more and more studies to refine the nature of and differences among people’s psychometrically and experimentally defined characteristics. People and cultures cannot be separated into collections of universals and particulars or of objective and subjective components. Those findings yield little information relevant to understanding the reasons for culture-based differences or how a culture’s members and their culture form a coherent whole that is relevant to their context. We are progressively distancing ourselves from interacting with ourselves and others as context-based but self-determining individuals and societies.

What psychologists need as a guide about how to enter, understand, and function meaningfully in any context is a holistic conception of how people form, follow, and understand the narrative psychosocial nature of their lives and of their cultural contexts. Abstractions directly related to the goals, expectations, and goal-attainment skills which guide people’s individual choices throughout their lives are most likely to prove of value for these purposes. Cross-cultural psychology will be enriched to the extent that we view ourselves as integrated context-based biopsychosocial individuals whose activities are oriented to (a) gratifying our own desires and those of others and (b) enriching our individual and collective lives. Making that kind of paradigmatic shift will redirect cross-cultural psychology and enrich our cross-cultural understanding and patterns of interaction by viewing people in all contexts as organizing their individual and collective lives in the same kinds of culturally embedded goal-oriented ways. Finally, making these changes will (a) lead IACCP to become a society that is more open to diverse cultural perspectives and knowledge traditions, and (b) influence IACCP members to interact with colleagues from other cultures and organizations on an egalitarian basis.
“good,” 8.3% as “excellent,” and 26% as “neutral,” “poor,” or “very poor.” This assessment did not differ with engagement, generation (founders, new PhDs, and two intermediate age cohorts), or self-identification as cultural or cross-cultural. Again, we see moderate satisfaction with the scientific state of the field, within a backdrop of considerable diversity of opinion.

Social Interaction

The opportunity to meet, interact with, and network with other culturalists was rated highly in the survey as both a reason for the existence of IACCP and as a reason to join the Association. In the open-ended item “What’s good/bad about IACCP,” 33%—the highest proportion—named social interaction as a positive quality of the Association. 14% of respondents singled out the high quality of IACCP conferences for praise, and other items in the survey showed that the most positive aspects of our conferences are social interaction and intellectual stimulation.

On the other hand, a common complaint about IACCP that I hear at each conference is a sense that IACCP is dominated by an inner network of prominent members who have disproportionate organizational control and professional visibility, especially at conferences. This inner group is perceived as difficult to break into.

Robin Goodwin makes this point in his email commentary:

IACCP has enabled me to establish and develop several strong research collaborations, and of course has helped me make many new friends from across the globe. However, I am increasingly concerned that some of the more “institutionalised” aspects of the IACCP meetings are serving to alienate younger colleagues of the organisation, and fail to promote the openness and innovation that first drew many of us to IACCP. The Keynote speakers rarely disappoint in their presentations, but they do tend to be the same familiar faces that have presented previous keynotes to the organisation; there is a whole generation of younger and inspirational researchers who need to be recognised in this role. New presenters—postgraduate students and young faculty in particular—are often “drowned out” in increasingly packed conference schedules, where one Presidential Address may occupy the same time as six parallel sessions or 30 speakers. Newer members in particular need to be given priority—we need “welcome the juniors,” rather than “meet the seniors”—and we need to actively embrace other disciplines (anthropology, sociology etc.) at our meetings. If we don’t do this, we run the risk of becoming exactly the hierarchical and complacent organisation many of us joined IACCP to avoid.

Floyd Rudmin makes the case more strongly:

The IACCP seems to me to be more of an admiration society than a science society. I was going to write, “a mutual admiration society”, but there is an immense asymmetry in this. The IACCP serves as a venue for a relatively few celebrity psychologists who dominate our conferences, journals and textbooks. … This aspect of the IACCP has several negative consequences. First, … we neglect the close scrutiny and criticism that is essential to science. … Second, we end up writing research that has very little utility. In the words of James, “true is useful”; the corollary is that a science which seeks to avoid confrontations with critics must also avoid confrontations with reality. Third, young scholars, and those with fewer resources and opportunities, become frustrated by the monopolized focus on our celebrities. Members who hold high the ideals of science become discouraged and withdraw.
In the open-ended “what’s good/bad” item, 11% echoed this criticism.

I suggest this characteristic of our organizational culture stems from our early history as renegades from mainstream psychology, working in a field that enjoyed little acceptance and few job prospects until the ascent of diversity studies and multiculturalism. Prominent leaders and organizers, the first generation of cross-culturalists who led the charge against mainstream psychology and went on to develop popular research programs, are for the most part still active in the field. Not surprisingly, this handful of culturalists as well as a second cohort of highly productive individuals are still held in high esteem by later generations. In social psychology we might recognize Lewin, Sherif, Asch, the Allports, French, Schachter, Pepitone, Kelman, and others in such an influential group. However, the “inner circle” critique is so persistent and strongly held by some members, especially younger ones, that it must be addressed by the Association.

This survey comment from a young member with a recent Ph.D. in social psychology captures the interplay between science and social interaction:

Bremen was my first IACCP conference. Socially, the atmosphere was amazing, the conference is friendly and welcoming to newcomers (unlike many leading social psych conferences). The quality of presented research was somewhat dichotomous, some research was internationally leading, some research was rather sub-standard. I think here lies the true challenge for IACCP: maintaining the social standard but aiming for better research in the future (through training).

Majority World Interactions

The development of IACCP from African and Asian roots is described in Harry Triandis’ article in this issue. IACCP’s affinity to majority world nations sets it apart from most scientific societies, including most of the other culturally oriented organizations. The governance structure of the Association is defined geographically more than through proportional representation, we set aside funds to support travel by majority world psychologists to our Congresses (Witkin-Okonji Award; see Bremen Congress report, this issue), fund ARTS (see ARTS report, this issue), and we regularly provide financial support for conferences and special events in majority world nations. Our sliding scale dues schedule makes membership benefits available to 34% of our members below actual cost.

That this is important to IACCP members, albeit to a lesser extent than science and social interaction, is seen in the survey data as well as in criticisms of our shortcomings in this area. Dominik Güß:

Regarding IACCP, I believe that our conferences should not only involve highest quality research, but also represent activities to demonstrate us as a global community. We could be an example of how people from different cultures and ethnic background come together work together and live together. I believe this would make us more authentic and credible. Related to credibility, in my opinion, IACCP has still not succeeded in supporting researchers from developing countries (I hate the word “developing” or “Third world”) adequately in their endeavors and participation at conferences.

Only 46% of respondents felt that we are meeting our goal of reaching out in various ways to majority world nations, and additional comments pointed to the desire to do more. The format of the survey items unfortunately precluded asking the harder question, if you had to choose, which comes first, science or majority world outreach? Perhaps this is a false dilemma, but some choices, such as the priorities we set in organizing our conferences, necessarily reflect such value judgments.

Practice and Effecting Change

The fourth leg upon which IACCP stands is applied psychology and an action orientation. IACCP includes a significant minority of applied psychologists who value practical accomplishments as much as advancing theory. The goal of advancing practice and solving applied problems was viewed by survey respondents as less well met (46%) than other goals, but respondents who are consultants reported being more satisfied than this (61%) while clinicians were even less satisfied (39%). Several lamented our lack of efforts in promoting social justice. The importance to members of both applied work and interaction between minority and majority nation psychologists is reflected in our vision for the future, described below.

3The familiar ranking versus rating issue.
The U.N. of Psychology?

What is the superordinate construct that explains this four-part mission? How do we make sense of the commentary and survey data, as well as our accumulated experience with the Association?

I suggest that a good metaphor for IACCP might be the United Nations—we are the United Nations of Psychology. Perhaps the International Union of Psychological Science (IUPsyS) and the ever-expansionist American Psychological Association would lay claim to this metaphor, but we encompass nearly the whole package, as represented by our four legs (peacekeeping missions excepted).

If IACCP is indeed much more than a scientific society, what is its place in the larger community of culturists? Answering this question requires addressing the complicated relationship between cross-cultural and cultural psychology.

(Cross-) Cultural Psychology is Dead, Long Live (Cross-) Cultural Psychology

That 49% of the IACCP membership self-identifies as cultural psychologists is fascinating and begs the questions, what is cultural psychology and how is it different than cross-cultural psychology? The acrimony between these two groups is well known and erupts between factions within IACCP as well, as the commentary reproduced above shows. But cultural psychology is itself diverse, characterized by at least two orientations or “wings” that diverge in important ways.

At the risk of oversimplifying the argument, I will divide cultural psychologists into two broad groups, those who advocate for some form of social constructivist or Völkerpsychologie metatheory, qualitative research, single-culture studies, and field research; and those who employ traditional experimental psychology methods, regardless of metatheoretical or epistemological orientation. (Markus & Hamedani [2007] provide a more fine-grained set of distinctions.) The former wing is probably more internally diverse than the latter, and of course there is no necessary conflict between qualitative research and neo-positivist epistemology. Simplifying still further, I will call these approaches the Shweder and Kitayama wings, respectively.

To get a sense of what IACCP member think cultural psychology is, we asked respondents to name three prominent cultural psychologists. In order of frequency of nomination, they named Shweder, Cole, Kitayama, Valsiner, Heine, and Markus. How many versions of cultural psychology do you count in this set? Three of these individuals are or have been IACCP members.

We asked respondents to distinguish the two fields in the domains of epistemology, methods, theory building, applied work, sampling, and topical focus. Compared to “cross-cultural psychology,” respondents viewed “cultural psychology” as more relativist, qualitative, and deeply theoretical. They said that cultural and cross-cultural psychology differ greatly in research design and sampling methods and that cross-cultural psychology is somewhat more applied. They perceived little difference in research topics. Overall, it seems that IACCP members see cultural psychology primarily in terms of the Shweder wing but tend to assimilate the active leaders to a common perspective. I fear that an insufficiently articulated view of cultural psychology poses a problem for understanding the relationship between IACCP and cultural psychology and resolving their differences.

Three current or recent IACCP regional representatives (Veronica Benet-Martinez, Ron Fischer, Uli Kühnen) and I attended the Cultural Psychology Preconference at the February 2009 Society for Personality and Social Psychology (SPSP) conference in nearby Tampa, Florida. About 100 self-described cultural psychologists were in attendance, including several identified leaders. Neither Shweder’s name nor any of the

---

4Hopefully the moniker “(cross-) cultural” will be supplanted soon by something palatable.
5Who can forget the heated exchange between Ype Poortinga and Anand Paranjpe at the 1994 Pamplona, Spain Congress over the implications of Heisenberg’s Uncertainty Principle for epistemology in social sciences.
6These items did not provide any way for respondents to express distinctions among two or more approaches, however, so these findings may overstate my case. In an open-ended item that followed this section of the survey, three respondents pointed out the diversity within cultural psychology and several added additional features that would be classified as the Shweder approach. Two respondents criticized the superficiality of this part of the survey, reflecting perhaps the overly-broad distinctions that the items implied.
ideas associated with this version of cultural psychology came up in the excellent presentations and discussions during the day. This, surely, was not the wing of cultural psychology that survey respondents recognized.

In Gabrenya (2008), I argued that some distinctions between cross-cultural psychology and the Kitayama wing of cultural psychology can be understood by considering the career contingencies of psychologists who want to study culture but must survive within a psychology department. Some find ways to justify large-scale multi-nation self-report studies, the “dimensional model,” and some find ways to justify two-country laboratory experiments, the “experimental model.” Only a few can get away with doing fieldwork. (I wondered at the mysterious process through which epistemological beliefs inevitably align themselves with career affordances.)

I am left with the impression that, if the Shweder wing were viewed as the cultural psychology, then IACCP would have to be considered a natural home for cultural psychology (based on the work of many of its members) while the SPSP cultural psychologists should be regarded as quantitative cross-cultural psychologists, similar to the majority of IACCP members.

Such are the ironies in the present state of culture and psychology research. What is to be done?

**Visions for IACCP**

We included an open-ended item that tentatively addressed this question, “What do you see as the ideal future of IACCP, for example, in 10 years?” Eight categories of responses could be distilled from an initial set of 27. The most frequently nominated idea was to broaden participation by, and interaction with, majority world psychologists—the “3rd leg” (27%). Of nearly equal importance, respondents desired greater theoretical and methodological diversity in the Association’s membership, publications, and activities (26%), specifically the inclusion of cultural psychology and cultural psychologists. 21% hoped to see the Association grow in size and influence, 17% advocated for a greater focus on applied research and social action, and 14% provided suggestions for various professional development activities, such as supporting, training, and mentoring young members. A substantial number of respondents said we should maintain our present course (12%), several of whom hoped we would not lose our current identity.

**A State of Becoming**

These hopes, and the survey results that conjure a four-legged structure or invite a U.N. metaphor, suggest that any changes to IACCP that would diminish our work to that of a “mere” scientific society would be unwelcome, a narrowing of our implicit missions. We in fact seem to seek a more expansive Association program, perhaps one that would normally be carried out by a larger organization.

But...why four legs? Why not one or two? Why is our Association, as one discovers by perusing 30 years of old Bulletins and Newsletters, so persistently reflective about what it is and what it should be?

I will speculate. IACCP seems to provide a projective-expressive function in the Kardiner or Whiting sense, offering a vehicle through which psychologists who have been infected with the “culture bug” express or channel their professional and personal aspirations. We work at the intersections of several disciplines, caught in the middle not unlike a character in a V. S. Naipaul novel stranded between cultures. IACCP may never fully meet members’ projective-expressive needs, but we continue to try to mold the Association to our purposes. For some, these purposes are entirely scientific, but for others, the “culture bug” is about two or three of four of IACCP’s missions—science, interaction with fellow travelers, internationalism, and action orientation. Because of its multifaceted nature and its members’ multiple visions, IACCP is forever in—as the symbolic interactionists say—“a state of becoming.”

**References**


When I arrived in northern India in the fall of 2000 to begin a one-year field visit in the Tibetan refugee settlements there, it was with plans to conduct a quite different, clinically-focused research project. Before describing what ensued, a bit of back-story on how I arrived at that point might be in order.

From English Lit to Cultural Psychology

I came to an interest in cultural psychology later than many of my peers. I had been an English literature major as an undergraduate, and, over the years that followed, I had drifted into the field of psychology through work in a community mental health program in my home state of Virginia. My schedule was flexible, and, when I could save the money, I enjoyed traveling internationally. It was actually while backpacking through South Asia in 1995 that I decided to pursue doctoral training as a clinical psychologist. More precisely, it was while staying at a Tibetan monastery on the rim of the Katmandu Valley, while taking part in an extended Buddhist retreat.

Although I had been intrigued by Buddhism for years and had keenly anticipated taking part in such a retreat, my actual response to the experience was the opposite of what I expected. There I was immersed in a Buddhist community, and yet, I felt less Buddhist than at any point in my adult life. As I was confronted for the first time with the full breadth of the values, beliefs, and assumptions that comprised a Tibetan ecclesiastical worldview, I realized how profoundly American I was. My cultural beliefs seemed to pervade every aspect of my being: my ways of learning and thinking, my bodily sense of self, and the ways I related to others. I began to realize my cultural experiences growing up in the United States had contributed in no small measure to my basic sense of what it was to be an American.

Last Summer at the IACCP proceedings in Bremen, Germany, I was honored to receive the Henry and Pola Triandis Doctoral Thesis Award for my work comparing Tibetan and American understandings and experiences of “anger.” The project came together only through a series of frustrations and false starts.

Randall Horton
Seattle, Washington, USA
means to be human.

During that retreat, I had taken to passing time after the midday tea break in the monastery’s library. I recall reflecting on these impressions and, around the same time, discovering, among the ornately wrapped Tibetan woodblock prints of sutras and commentaries, a small cache of books in English, which included volumes by Maslow, Adler, and James. I was quickly engrossed with them. While I was struck by the accuracy of these writers’ observations as an account of my own values and experiences, I registered a deep skepticism about whether their theories offered a meaningful account of Tibetan psychological life. Although I had no name for it at the time, in retrospect, this was probably the moment at which I became a cultural psychologist.

Finding an Interdisciplinary Doctoral Program

Upon my return to the United States, I was determined to find a doctoral program that would allow me both to train as a clinical psychologist and to pursue long-term field based research on culture and mental health issues. I was dismayed to discover how few programs would accommodate such interests. I eventually found a home at one of the few, a joint degree program at the University of Chicago in the departments of Psychology and Comparative Human Development. There, while pursuing doctoral research as student of Richard Shweder, I was able to take coursework in clinical psychology and anthropology, as well as South Asian languages and history.

Diss Research Plan #1

In launching my dissertation research, I obtained a year’s worth of competitive funding from the Social Science Research Council. I proposed studying a project called the Tibetan Torture Survivor’s Program (TTSP), a psychosocial rehabilitation program for former Tibetan political prisoners based in the north Indian town of Dharamsala. During an earlier stay in the region, I had discussed the program with its administrators in the Tibetan Government in Exile’s Department of Health. The stated goals of the TTSP were to adapt European clinical interventions for posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD) for use with traumatized Tibetan refugees, and to train local health care workers to administer culturally appropriate care for these individuals. The program was said to include group therapy sessions for former prisoners led by senior Tibetan lamas. As an aspiring cultural and clinical psychologist, I must say, I was quite intrigued by the possibility of studying the operation of this program. The town where I would be based also boasted the main offices of a general psychiatric and psychological treatment program serving the Tibetan refugee communities. With support of the Government in Exile, two European clinicians, a psychologist and a psychiatrist, had established and overseen the operation of this clinic for over five years.

This, then, was my research plan in fall of 2000. I would spend a year in the Tibetan communities, improve my language skills, develop research contacts, pilot interview protocols, and make detailed ethnographic observations of one or both of these clinical programs. In the year that followed, its every facet fell apart.
Things Fall Apart

Within two months of my arrival in India, I learned that since I had visited the settlements, the psychological dimensions of the torture survivor’s treatment program, while thriving on paper, had largely withered away in the real world. Attendance at the Buddhist group therapy sessions, for instance, had become so bad that the organizers had been obliged to schedule its meetings immediately before the monthly disbursement of living stipends. Recent meetings had been poorly attended, then cancelled entirely. The senior lama leading the sessions was engaged in activities outside of the area, it was uncertain when the meeting would resume. Administratively, the Health Department staff was reticent about having an outside researcher observe the program. Though the Tibetan and Western allopathic medical components of the program were strong, these were outside the purview of my interest and expertise.

Diss Research Plan #2

Though disappointing, I still had the psychological clinic as a potential focus for my work. I redoubled my efforts at developing contacts within it. The organizers of the clinic were welcoming, but overburdened. They suggested I meet with one of the two Tibetan mental health workers, offering that I might serve as a mentor to the young man, sharing with him perspectives from my clinical training and work in community mental health, and learning from him in turn about the local Tibetan communities and the activities of the clinic. We began to meet regularly. After the first month, he approached me with a request to help develop a proposal to provide social work outreach services to the Dharamsala community. We began to draw up such a proposal, one that included distributing blankets and material support to elderly monks and nuns living alone in the community, providing periodic shelter and meals for some individuals with chronic alcoholism, and some other projects. The proposal got no further than a first clean draft.

In quick succession, the clinic’s organizers, the two European doctors who had dedicated years of selfless service to sustaining it, announced it would be closing its doors. They had decided to scale back their involvement. They would be turning over the remnants of the program to the Tibetan mental health care workers whom they had trained. Two weeks later, one of the two most senior of those individuals, my research collaborator, informed me, apologetically, that he would be leaving the settlements indefinitely. As a competent bilingual Tibetan-English interpreter, he had been presented with an opportunity to translate for a Tibetan lama on a speaking tour of New Zealand. Once there, he said, he would try to settle permanently if he could. Onward migra-
Frustrations in Language Learning

The language learning was not going well either. My stateside language classes had left me ill-prepared for the proliferation of regional dialects in the exile settlements. Unaware of the pitfalls, early in my stay I had engaged language instructors from two different regions of Tibet. My main instructor, Ajam, was a youthful former literature teacher from the province of Amdo in Eastern Tibet who had gotten into political trouble after sharing with his students his discovery there were two differing versions of Tibetan history, a Chinese and Tibetan version. Sporting a lush ponytail, denim jacket, and an oval rim pair of John Lennon specs, he was constantly enlisting my help in composing letters of ardent romantic longing (in English) to his German fiancée. Ajam would spend two hours each morning trying to groom my tonally deficient Tibetan accent and prose style to the graceful contours of literary Amdo intellectualism.

I had engaged a second instructor for conversational practice in the evenings. Deykyi, a young woman from Central Tibet, was employed during the day cleaning rooms in one of the town’s more upscale tourist hotels. Competing directly with Indian-born locals for cleaning and restaurant work, newly arrived refugees faced chronically difficult wages and working conditions. It was a measure of my confusion with the language that it actually took me several weeks to figure out that Ajam and Deykyi were giving me contradictory instructions. Things improved only marginally when I brought them together to discuss the problem, as each thought his/her own dialect and pedagogy was the preferable one.

By now, almost seven months into my fieldwork, all of my research plans had gone bust. Casting about for ideas, I decided to try to develop a study of coping responses to PTSD and acculturative stress among former political prisoners in the settlements. I could employ, I thought, something like Arthur Kleinman’s explanatory models of illness framework and seek to document ethnographically the conditions of life for these individuals. Toward this end, I approached the leaders of the Association for Former Political Prisoners, the Gu Chu Sum, a non-governmental organization based in the town. They were open to the project.

Still Another Disaster

At this point, one final mishap struck. I left town for two weeks to attend to some business in Delhi, and on my return, Deykyi came in quite excited to the teashop where we met for conversational practice. A group of Westerners had been in town, she said. They had been staying at the hotel where she worked, and they had been interviewing the ex-political prisoners all week long. “When they left,” she said, “they left piles of these in their trash can.” She pulled a set of stapled pages from her backpack and slid it toward me. I looked at the first few pages. It was an interview protocol—well-translated—in Tibetan and English. Whoever her hotel guests had been, they appeared to be studying PTSD among the former...
political prisoners and assessing Western and indigenous coping responses. The head of the Gu Chu Sum confirmed a team of researchers from the United States had arrived, decamped, and just as quickly pulled out of town. I never found out who they were, and, in the years since, their study seems not to have found its way into print. At the time, however, in my now entirely demoralized frame of mind, it did not matter. Having looked at a copy of their research protocol, I decided I could not ethically move forward with the project I had in mind. Likewise, it made no sense to duplicate efforts and research so similar a topic. My sole consolation at the time was the approach of the Tibetan New Year’s celebration. The nights, which had been bitterly cold at the town’s 5,000 feet of elevation, were turning temperate again. Tourists were returning and the town was abuzz with news that His Holiness the Fourteenth Dalai Lama would be giving two weeks of public teachings in observation of the Monlam, the great Buddhist prayer festival.

Diss Research Plan #3: Success At Last

I do not recall exactly when the idea for a cultural psychological study of anger in the settlements occurred to me, but I think it was while attending public talks that spring given by some of the ex-political prisoners. Earlier in the United States, and now in India, I had observed dissidents like the Venerable Palden Gyatso speaking to Western audiences. In a typical talk, after discussing their lives and the political history of Tibet, the dissidents would describe—often quite graphically—the details of torture and human rights abuses they experienced in Chinese-run prisons. When their accounts were finished and appeals for political support had been made, I noticed that often a Western audience member would stand and ask some form of the following question: “After all that you have been through, all that has happened to you and to your people, do you hate the Chinese for doing these things?” And the answer from the Tibetan speaker was almost always the same, a simple, “No.” Instead of angry demands for justice or retribution, they spoke about basic Buddhist teachings that rejected anger and hatred. Some went so far as to suggest the need to extend compassion (Tib: snying rje) to those who have committed acts of serious violence.

Observing these interactions, the question occurred to me: Do Tibetan culture and the Buddhist philosophical views that permeate it extend to its members an unusual capacity to transcend anger and hatred? Here was the question at the heart of the Western interest in the adjustment of Tibetan political prisoners. Interest in it explained why teams of researchers might travel halfway around the world, translated PTSD measures in hand, to interview these individuals. As soon as I began to entertain it as a research topic, I sensed it was a good one.

Readers familiar with Tibetan Buddhism will know that anger-related emotional states are marked as profoundly destructive mental states within the Mahayana teachings. Further, a culturally distinct set of Buddhist practices, referred to as the mind-training tradition (Tib: sblo sbyong),
address specifically the goal of transforming anger and overcoming it in practitioners’ lives. Although it has been widely assumed that such cultural understandings influence the experience of emotion among Tibetans, a search of anthropological, religious, and psychological writings on the topic confirmed that no one had ever made a systematic attempt to study whether and how Tibetans actually used these techniques in their day-to-day lives. The most difficult question the project entailed was how could one investigate this set of questions about comparative emotional experience rigorously and scientifically?

Mixed-Method Research Design

Drawing on the work of my advisor in Chicago, Richard Shweder, I eventually adopted a two-branched, mixed-methods approach. First, I would study anger in the day-to-day lives of the Tibetans. I would conduct interviews, make ethnographic observations, and research the classical Buddhist ethno-psychological and ethno-medical doctrines on anger. To be able to comment reliably on possible cultural differences, I would collect data from three sample groups and conduct formal cross-cultural comparisons. I would recruit a sample of adult lay people from the Tibetan settlements, a sample of Tibetan Buddhist monks and nuns, and a comparison sample of adults from Chicago. Some questions would be quantitative, to allow tests of formally hypothesized cross-group differences, others would be open-ended, designed to elicit and allow systematic coding and analysis of culturally-rooted constructs related to anger and emotion.

For the second branch of the study, I would look at anger in the Tibetan struggle for political independence, examining its place in public and private debates about political violence and non-violence.

For the last two months of my stay, I was in constant motion; grilling my instructors on the nuances of colloquial and formal Tibetan linguistic resources on emotion, developing potential questions, interviewing monks, nuns, and anyone who would sit down with me about emotion and the Buddhist teachings. In the end, completing data collection for the project entailed a second, year-long field stay in the settlements, with much of the work undertaken in the south Indian Tibetan settlements. This time, the planned project came off seamlessly.

Tibetan-American Differences in Anger

The following were some of the main findings from the study that resulted. Consistent with key doctrines from Mahayana Buddhist ethno-psychology, Tibetans regarded “rlung langs” (a modal emotion in the family of anger) as uniquely harmful and destructive. Citing views grounded

Bruce Lee can read  Children in the southern Tibetan settlements. One shows off his reading skills to the researcher, another gives his best Bruce Lee.
in Mahayana Buddhist ethical and metaphysical thought, Tibetan respondents, lay and clerical, tended to view “lung lang” as unequivocally morally bad. They assimilated it to the sentiment “she dangs” (anger/hatred), one of the “three moral poisons” (Tib: ’dug gsum) held to be the root sources of suffering for all sentient beings.

Americans, by contrast, viewed anger as a morally ambivalent, neutral, or natural process. While Americans recognized the potential harmful effects of anger for others, they were significantly less likely than Tibetans to insist on anger’s harmful effects for the person who experiences it. Indeed, Americans emphasized several positive aspects of anger: it gives one energy that can be used in a positive way; it can lead to problems being addressed that might otherwise persist; it can be beneficial to society. Tibetans, by contrast, viewed anger/lung lang as a fundamentally destructive sentiment. They viewed it as arising from an intrinsically flawed motivational state (a desire to harm another sentient being) and generative of ultimately bad results. Reflecting the local understandings of karma, they insisted upon the symmetry of lung lang’s harmful effects for all parties involved. Tibetans were much more likely than Americans to believe that anger/lung lang can be prevented and even permanently transcended. Further, many were able to point to individuals whom they believed had achieved such a state. Americans, by contrast, actively pathologized the hypo-expression of anger, doubting whether anger-free living was either possible or desirable.

When the characteristics of recent incidents of anger were examined, both lay and clerical Tibetans reported angry feelings of shorter duration than did Americans. Tibetan Buddhist clergy reported less intense feelings of anger than other respondents. These differences were significant when respondents’ age, gender, education, and time since incident were controlled in stepwise regression analyses. Tibetans, both lay and clergy, were much less likely than Americans to judge the other person’s provocative actions as typical or usual for them. American respondents, by contrast, tended—chronically and spontaneously in open emotion narratives—to connect the other person’s provocative behavior in the current situation with their past behavior and to assert that a dispositional pattern existed for the individual to act in that way. This attribution bias is consistent with prior cross-cultural research on the Fundamental Attribution Error and attributional differences across collectivist- and individualist-oriented cultures.

Online Readings in Psychology and Culture

The eBook, Online Readings in Psychology and Culture (ORPC) was created by Walt Lonner and the Center for Cross-Cultural Research at Western Washington University in 2002. Center members Dale L. Dinnell, Susanna A. Hayes and David N. Sattler were instrumental in all phases of the development of the publication. Since then, ORPC has become a useful and important resource for teaching cross-cultural psychology, providing short, focused, readable chapters that can supplement a printed textbook or contribute to the reading list of a class that does not use a text.

In late 2008, the Center agreed to give the ORPC to IACCP for future development. The ORPC has been moved to the IACCP web site and ported to a new “content management system” (CMS) technology that will facilitate maintenance, expansion, and incorporation of new teaching-related features. The ORPC is an official publication of IACCP under the auspices of the Communication and Publications Committee (chaired by John Adamopoulos). An editor and editorial board will be recruited.

The ORPC can be seen at: http://orpc.iaccp.org

If you would like to contribute a chapter to the ORPC, please use the contact information on the web site to initiate correspondence with the editor.
Crossing Borders: (Cross-)Cultural Psychology as an Interdisciplinary Multi-Method Endeavor

Report of the XIXth International Congress of the IACCP
Jacobs University Bremen, Germany, July 27-31, 2008

Ulrich Kühnen, Franziska Deutsch, & Klaus Boehnke

We are writing this report on the 19th International Congress of IACCP on a rainy day in March 2009. While the winter season that is just going by brought a lot of snow to most regions in Germany, the last couple of months in Bremen have been filled primarily with — well, rain. It’s not that the past winter’s weather has been particularly awful. As a matter of fact, about one year ago, we had our regular meetings of the Local Organization Committee and the weather was just as bad as this year. In other words, this is a typical day for Bremen. “If only the weather is fine during the congress!” was one of our notorious, half optimistic, half fearful sayings in these meetings. We knew how beautiful the Jacobs University campus can be during summer and we believed that this campus, with its then three residential colleges (dorms) and well-equipped seminar buildings would provide a perfect setting to make the congress a success. But what if it were pouring rain? Such can happen here. It turned out we were very lucky in various respects.

Attendance

The congress was attended by 637 delegates from 57 countries. All continents were represented among the attendees save Antarctica. Roughly two thirds of the participants stayed in one of the residential colleges on campus. The offer of an “all inclusive” type of registration (including conference participation, full board and accommodation) was appreciated by many participants. We believe the fact that so many congress participants stayed on campus—which is located, admittedly, not in the most interesting area of the city of Bremen—was conducive to the familiar and friendly atmosphere that characterizes IACCP congresses anyway.
Our conference’s theme was “Crossing Borders: (Cross-) Cultural Psychology as an Interdisciplinary Multi-Method Endeavor.” We chose this theme for several reasons. Firstly, we believe that it is worthwhile to bring the two orientations closer together that have characterized the study of cultural aspects of psychology in the past: On the one hand, the idiographic or indigenous approach (sometimes referred to as “Cultural Psychology”), that focuses primarily on the analysis of specific cultures, and on the other hand, the nomothetic or comparative approach (often labeled “cross-cultural”), that aims at identifying general processes and psychological universals across cultures while also assessing the extent to which these general principles are shaped by culture.

A second reason for choosing the conference theme “Crossing Borders” was our conviction that the traditional cleavages between scientific disciplines need to be transcended. An analysis of the effects of culture on human behavior can be performed on different levels of abstraction. Psychology is the study of how individuals think, feel and act and as such it focuses on the consequences of cultural meaning systems for individual functioning. Thus, as compared to other social sciences such as sociology and political science, psychological explanations typically reflect a micro-level of analysis. These other social sciences, in contrast, are more likely to take supra-individual phenomena and variables into account when studying the impact of culture on human behavior, thus favoring meso- or macro-levels of analysis. A full understanding of this impact, however, presupposes an integration of all three levels. Yet, the necessity of this integration is often neglected within the traditional borders of scientific disciplines.

Finally, the conference theme reflects our intention to stress the importance of Cross-Cultural Psychology for societal developments outside the academia. The world is experiencing the age of globalization and the worldwide financial and economic crisis of the past few months has made dramatically clear that the major challenges humankind is currently confronted with can only be mastered on global scales. Understanding how culture shapes our view of the reality and our interaction with individuals from other cultural
backgrounds is, as we believe, conducive to global cooperation that is so urgently required.

The thematic emphasis was implemented in the scientific program in several ways. First, we are grateful that the former president of the International Political Science Association (IPSA) and previous Dean of the School for Humanities and Social Sciences at Jacobs University, Max Kaase served as Honorary President of our conference. In his address during the opening ceremony, Max Kaase illustrated the scientific landscape in Germany with a focus on the role of private universities.

Second, one of our nine State-of-the-Art lectures was given by a speaker not from Psychology: Chris Welzel, a renowned political scientist from the steering committee of the World Values Survey. He and Bernhard Nauck, a sociologist, also served as members of the Local Scientific Committee. The remaining eight State-of-Art Lectures were given by Sara Harkness and Charles Super (USA), Erhabor S. Idemudia (South-Africa), Cigdem Kagitcibasi (Turkey), Gerda Lederer (USA), Peter Smith (England), Harry C. Triandis (USA), Gisela Trommsdorff (Germany), and Evert van de Vliert (Netherlands).

Furthermore, one of the invited Keynote Addresses was given by a most prominent political scientist, Ron Inglehart (USA). We were fortunate to find truly outstanding scholars as presenters also for the seven other Keynote Addresses: Shinobu Kitayama and Heidi Keller (USA and Deutschland), Marwan Dwairy (Israel), Susan Pick (Mexico), Chi Yue Chiu (USA), Patricia Greenfield (USA), Elaine Hatfield and Richard L. Rapson (USA) and Nalini Ambady (USA). “The Human Adaptation for Culture” was the title for this year’s Walter J. Lonner Distinguished Lecture held by Michael Tomasello, Director of the Max-Planck-Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology in Leipzig (Germany), again reflecting our wish to open the congress to neighboring disciplines.

Chiapis, Mexico “Gender change, identity development, and social change in Chiapas, Mexico.” (Adriana Manago and Patricia Greenfield, UCLA)
In his Presidential Address James Georgas presented an overview of his large scale research program addressing the question “How different and similar are families across cultures—a 30 nation psychological study.” Another highlight of the scientific program were the lunchtime interviews with Harry Triandis (interviewed by Michael Bond) and Cigdem Kagitcibsi.

The largest part of the scientific program consisted of course of individual oral presentations and symposia. A total of 557 oral presentations were given at IACCP 2008. In addition, we had 153 poster presentations, a round table discussion, and a workshop.

During the General Meeting, held on Wednesday, July 30th (minutes to be published separately in the Bulletin), James Georgas and others underscored the importance of the Witkin-Okonji Awards, which funded the participation of 17 scholars from low-income countries. Due to a grant from Jacobs Foundation to Klaus Boehnke, we were able to spend significantly more money than usual on the Witkin-Okonji Awards.

We were extremely pleased by the large number of participants and presentations (as a matter of fact, a high number of participants was required for our budgetary plans). At the same time, it was not easy to squeeze all these presentations into the schedule. We wanted to give the Keynote Addresses and State-of-the-Art-Lectures as well as the poster sessions the full attention that they deserve and therefore, no paper symposia were scheduled parallel to them. This, of course, could only be achieved if the number

**Congress dinner and dance party** Left: Kehinde Ayenibiowo (Nigeria), Right: Esther Nzewi (USA).
of paper symposia held in parallel was relatively high. This resulted in a tight scientific program of three and a half days with often eight sessions taking place at the same time slot.

To be quite honest, as conference hosts we did not have the chance to attend many presentations (which we regret), but we have received numerous times positive feedback on the generally high quality of them. So, on Thursday afternoon most participants started their travel back home, filled with inspirations, new insights and research ideas, newly established cooperation relationships or refreshed long-standing ones.

Following the congress, Tom Weisner (USA) held the Advanced Research Training Seminar (ARTS) on “Qualitative and Mixed Method Research in Cross-Cultural Studies,” secured by then president-elect, Heidi Keller and her team. This three day seminar ended on Sunday, August 3rd, 2008.

Social Program

On Sunday, July 27th the congress began with the Opening Ceremony in the cinema on campus. The welcome addresses by Max Kaase, James Georgas, and Klaus Boehnke were framed by musical interludes. The Steindinger Shanty Chor added some local flavor to the program and formed an intended contrast to the also presented pieces of classical music, performed by Jacobs alumna, Julia Klotz, and Jacobs psychology graduate, Konstantin Mihov. Of course, the clear highlight of the ceremony was the bestowal of Honorary Fellowships upon Deborah L. Best (USA) and Peter B. Smith (United Kingdom), long time ‘activists’ of IACCP, and of the Harry and Pola Triandis Doctoral Thesis Award upon Randal Horton (USA). Citations

Klaus Boehnke and Mandy Boehnke Juggling jobs, doctoral research projects, a child and a baby to organize the Congress with Uli Kühnen and Franziska Deutsch.

Konstantin Mihov entertains at the opening ceremony. Konstantin is an administrator in the Jacobs University Bremen Career Services Department.
of the awards were presented by then past-president Shalom Schwartz, who also handed over award plaques, designed by Samuel Johnson, the College Office Manager of Mercator College, one of Jacobs University’s residential colleges. After the opening ceremony a barbecue was held in front of the central building on campus.

The Bremen Senate (i.e., the State Government) invited all IACCP participants to a reception in the “Überseemuseum” (Overseas Museum) on Monday, July 28th. After the welcome addresses by representatives of the Bremen Senate and the Überseemuseum, we had the chance to visit some parts of the exhibition and collections from natural science, ethnology, and the local history of Bremen, and of many places around the globe, and were entertained by a jazz combo. Many participants took also the chance of being downtown to visit the beautiful city-hall of Bremen and the Roland Statue, which together are part of the Unesco World Heritage List.

On the last evening of the IACCP conference the traditional Congress Dinner (and dance!!) took place in one of the best Hotels around Jacobs University, close to the river Weser, the Strandlust. The food was delicious, the wine was excellent, and so we had a great party.

Organizing a conference of this size was an exciting and new experience for us. But not only for us: It was by far the largest conference that was held at Jacobs University ever. We were extremely fortunate to find an enthusiastic team of students, staff, and volunteers, even from the neighboring public University of Bremen, who helped us tremendously. We owe them our deepest gratitude. Mandy Boehnke secured a financial break-even of the congress as its treasurer. We also want to warmly thank the members of our local and international scientific commit-
Shanty Chor vocalist and Julia Klotz, opera singer  Julia Klotz graduated from Jacobs University Bremen.

tees, chaired Heidi Keller and Shalom Schwartz. We are indebted to the staff and leadership of Jacobs University for their support. Furthermore, the conference could not have been held without the financial support of IACCP, the German Science Foundation (DFG), Jacobs Foundation, and Mercator Foundation totalling about US$50,000.

When we think back of the congress last year, pleasant memories come to our minds. We received very nice and rewarding feedback from many colleagues for which we are also very grateful. Yes, we were lucky in various respects. Oh, and the weather was ... well, we think it was marvelous! For sure, those few days were the hottest in a long time in Bremen. For some congress participants, it was even too hot, missing air condition in the colleges: No, we usually do not need that. Looking outside the window again on a rainy day in March 2009, this seems almost unreal! Yes, we were lucky!
Volunteers  A few of the many volunteers from Jacobs University, mostly students, chaperoned on stage by Mandy, Uli and Franzisca.
Report on the Advanced Research and Training Seminars (ARTS) 2008

Ingrid Lunt, University of Oxford, UK
Heidi Keller, University of Osnabrück, Germany
ARTS Coordinators

The ARTS Program

The Advanced Research Training Seminars (ARTS) program, co-sponsored by the International Association of Applied Psychology (IAAP), International Union of Psychological Science (IUPsyS) and the International Association of Cross-Cultural Psychology (IACCP), provides intensive training in research methodologies and new directions in psychological science to early career scholars from low-income countries. ARTS seminars have been held biennially since 1992 in conjunction with and near the location of major international congresses of psychology (the International Congress of Psychology (ICP), the International Congress of Applied Psychology and the International Congress of Cross-cultural Psychology).

The ARTS program has three main objectives:

- Enhance the research skills and knowledge of scholars (normally early career) from low income countries through advanced research training
- Bring to international congresses scholars from low-income countries who might otherwise be financially unable to attend
- Provide a space where researchers from different countries may learn from each other, develop collaborative networks, and develop a more international understanding.

In addition the ARTS program enriches international psychology in a number of ways. It provides an important but rare opportunity for interaction and shared experiences among colleagues from low-income and other countries, it helps ensure the representation of psychology from all countries at international congresses and it contributes to a broader perspective on theory and method by allowing different perspectives on psychology to be shared among scholars from different regions of the world.

Selection of Topics and Conveners

The general aim of the ARTS program is to provide three different but complementary seminars. Typically one or two seminars are focused on basic science or methodology, and one or two address substantive topics of relevance to potential participants. The coordinators attempt to develop seminars that have not been offered in recent ARTS programs.

In the two years year prior to ARTS 2008, proposals were solicited from potential conveners and were evaluated and selected by the coordinators. The selection was also based on information gathered at previous meetings with ARTS participants and ARTS alumni who are asked to provide feedback on the program and suggestions for future topics. Three ARTS workshops were offered for 2008 in Germany, two in conjunction with the ICP in Berlin and one in conjunction with the IACCP Congress in Bremen.

ARTS Seminar #1: Structural Equation Modelling with EQS 6.1
Selection and Support of Participants for ARTS 2008

The ARTS program was advertised broadly on web sites and association newsletters. Participants were selected according to a set of criteria including a match between the applicant’s credentials and the specific seminar topic; an assessment that the participant would benefit from the seminar; a judgment that the participant’s presence would lead to a ‘multiplier’ effect, that is, that it would carry forward to impact others (colleagues and students) in the applicant’s home country, and geographical diversity.

ARTS 2008 had 50 participants altogether: 23, 13, and 14 in ARTS #1, #2 and #3, respectively. Applicants were broadly geographically distributed over 21 countries. The modal age was in the 40-49 age range. Participants received tuition, accommodation and partial travel support.

Contribution to ARTS and Raising Funds

The success of the ARTS program rests on donations from individuals and organizations. Until now, fundraising for ARTS has presented a major challenge as it has been carried out individually for each program in each ARTS year. The 2008 ARTS were generously supported by the following organizations. Sponsoring organizations: International Union of Psychological Science; International Association of Applied Psychology; International Association for Cross-cultural Psychology. Contributing Organizations: American Psychological Association/USNC; The Royal Society, UK; British Psychological Society; Canadian Psychological Association; German Psychological Society; Norwegian Psychological Association; Netherlands Institute of Psychologists. Contributing Institutions: These institutions made substantial contribution through staff time of those organizing the ARTS programme: University of Oxford, UK; University of Osnabrück, Germany; Tilburg University, Netherlands; Humboldt University, Freie University and University of Bremen, with local arrangements.

Evaluation of ARTS 2008

The ARTS programs were evaluated the final day of each seminar. Overall, the instructors were rated very positively. Several participants expressed that they appreciated that the training included material from concrete research projects. Some suggested to use material from ongoing research projects of the participants themselves in the exercises. There was also a general wish for more time to practice various methodological techniques. Overall, the open climate and fruitful opportunities for establishing networks with other participants was highly appreciated.
International Collaboration in Teaching - An Experiment

New collaborative technologies may enhance or enable opportunities for incorporating cross-cultural psychology into university curricula. Responding to the need to broaden its cultural expertise within the constraints of faculty staffing resources, the Industrial/Organizational Psychology program at Florida Institute of Technology tried a new technology for cross-cultural classroom instruction. Using Adobe Connect software (www.adobe.com/products/acrobat-connectpro), the I/O program arranged a colloquium for its students and faculty in which Zeynep Aycan of Koc University, Turkey, presented “Cross-Cultural Approaches to HRM: Theory, Research and Practice” from her university office. Fifteen people gathered for the 2-hour session in a multimedia room at Florida Tech, as well as some alumni and some students who were performing out of town internships, such as one woman working in Beijing. Cameras were set up in Zeynep’s office and in the multimedia room as the audience watched Zeynep on a computer projector and she watched them watch her on her computer monitor. Zeynep gave a classroom-style presentation aided by PowerPoint slides and held a question and answer session afterwards.

Adobe Connect and similar Internet conferencing applications (e.g., WebX, Microsoft NetMeeting) allow communication among individuals and work groups or classrooms over several channels, including video, audio, graphical presentation, text chat, and file sharing. This type of communication is “synchronous,” that is, communication runs in both directions simultaneous. The audience could see and hear Zeynep and she could see and hear the audience.

This new technology offers some exciting opportunities for cross-cultural psychology. Gabrenya, van Meurs, and Fischer (2008) describe in detail the many technological innovations that can support the field. Internet conferencing is now essentially free once yearly licensing fees are paid to the software vendor. Florida Tech pays Adobe US$300 per “seat” or connected worksta-
tion per year. A minimum of two seats was required for Zeynep’s colloquium, but some additional seats were used by off-site participants. Other technical requirements include high speed internet access, video cameras or “webcams” at each end, and microphones. A mic that can be shared, such as a wireless mic, is required for an audience.

We learned several lessons in this experiment:

• A complete test or “dry run” of the system, or two dry runs, is needed in order to be confident that the system will work as expected. (The First Law of classroom multimedia is that it will fail the first time.)

• Technical support at both ends is needed to set up the system, and tech support must be on call the first time it is used. Florida Tech was fortunate to have a web conferencing expert sitting through the colloquium who ran a chat backchannel with Zeynep as the communication link waxed and waned.

• The high speed internet connection must be tested under realistic conditions, at the same time of day as the event.

As this technology matures and bandwidth increases with the advent of Internet 2, collaborative teaching, international colloquia, joint classes, and online conferences become feasible. IACCP could provide a venue through which faculty can arrange collaborative projects much like it facilitates international research collaboration.

Reference

Slides on Flash on Web  Powerpoint slides are converted to Flash media objects and displayed in the Connect workspace.

Global People Resource Bank
The Global People Resource Bank is a new resource to help with the process of international partnerships and collaborations. It includes: a “landscaping study” reviewing the literature on intercultural effectiveness, a practical “toolbook” for managing the life cycle of intercultural partnerships (with case studies, activities, tips and tools); a comprehensive “framework of intercultural competencies”; and other resources.

See http://www.globalpeople.org.uk
Minutes of the General Meeting of the IACCP

Bremen, Germany
July 30, 2008 18:45-19:45

Approximately 110 members of IACCP attended the General Meeting.

(0) Approval of the Spetses Minutes

The minutes of the General Meeting held at Spetses in July 2006, earlier published to the membership in the Cross-Cultural Psychology Bulletin, 40, 36-39, and once again made available to the members present at the General Meeting, are unanimously approved.

(1) President’s report

James Georgas presents the President’s report to the General Assembly. He thanks Klaus Boehnke, Ulrich Kühnen, Franziska Deutsch, and Mandy Boehnke, all the other members of the organizing committee, and all the student volunteers who have been organizing one of the most successful congresses of IACCP, both in terms of the high scientific level of its program and the large number of participants. In the remainder of his report he states:

“Klaus Boehnke has been the Secretary-General of IACCP for the part 8 years. I want to thank him for his competence, hard work and dedication to IACCP and its membership, which was clearly manifested by the extraordinary success of the Bremen Congress.

“It is my great pleasure to honor Shalom Schwartz, who during the past six years as President-Elect, President, and Past-President, has contributed so much to IACCP. His leadership, his dedication to the goals of IACCP, have greatly augmented the position of cross-cultural psychology in the scientific world. His wise counsel to me and to the EC during the past two years are greatly appreciated.

“The term of office of a number of members of the Executive Council ends this year. I would like to thank Nandita Chaudhary as Deputy Secretary-General, Dharm Bhawuk as Treasurer, and Regional Representatives Susumu Yamaguchi and Andrew Mogaji, for their services to IACCP during these past two years.
“It was particularly gratifying to me personally and to the EC, to see the bestowing of Honorary Fellowships upon former presidents Deborah L. Best and Peter B. Smith, for their outstanding services to cross-cultural psychology and to IACCP.

IACCP has matured these past few years, despite a number of problems that all psychological associations encounter. IACCP has had a distinguished influence on psychology these past years through its theories, its conceptual approaches, its methodology, and its paradigmatic research in cross-cultural psychology. Its influence has changed theories, methods and research findings in many areas of psychology, and will continue to raise the bar of cross-cultural psychology in the future. Our *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* is the most respected in the areas of cultural/indigenous psychology and cross-cultural psychology. We owe thanks to our recent editors, Peter Smith and Fons van de Vijver for this accomplishment, and gratitude to Walter J. Lonner for his guidance during the past four decades in making JCCP what it is today. I am certain that David Matsumoto, its current editor, will make even stronger efforts to increase its influence in cross-cultural psychology.

“It has been a great honor to have been your president these past two years. I pass the baton to Heidi Keller, your new president, and to the new EC and I look forward to serving as Past-President for the next two years.”

(2) Secretary-General’s report

Out-going Secretary-General Klaus Boehnke reports on plans for future IACCP congresses. He elaborates on difficulties IACCP is having in finding appropriate dedicated hosts for both the 2009 Regional Congress of IACCP as well as the 2010 20th International Congress of the organization. He gives an account of EC deliberations on a planned 2009 Regional Congress of Cross-Cultural Psychology in Africa. The EC has revoked its interim decision to possibly hold that congress in Lagos, Nigeria and is meanwhile seriously examining other options in West Africa. As for the next International Congress, which is to be staged as a satellite congress to the 27th International Congress of Applied Psychology in Melbourne, Australia, July 11-16, 2010, initial plans to have this congress hosted in Adelaide have not materialized. Initiated by President James Georgas, the EC is currently venturing into holding IACCP’s next international congress in Melbourne. A formal proposal is being solicited.
As for a Regional Congress in 2011 and the 21st International Congress in 2012, the Secretary-General reports a much more favorable state-of-affairs. The EC has decided to accept a proposal by former president Çiğdem Kağıtçibaşı to host the 2011 Regional Congress of IACCP in Istanbul in conjunction with that year’s European Congress of Psychology (ECP) in the same city. Planned dates for the regional congress are June 30-July 3, 2011, immediately preceding the ECP.

Klaus Boehnke then reports that the EC has accepted a proposal by Deon Meiring and Leone Jackson to hold the 21st International Congress of IACCP in Stellenbosch, South Africa, in conjunction with that year’s International Congress of Psychology in Cape Town. Congress dates are planned to be July 17-21, 2012. The Secretary-General then gives the floor to the successful South African applicants, who draw the attention of the General Meeting to the most important characteristics of the chosen venue. They emphasize that the organization will be modeled after the Bremen congress, in the sense that inexpensive accommodation in university dormitories will once again be offered. Under the “Any Other Business” agenda point of the General Meeting the South African congress organizers show a video of Cape Town, Stellenbosch and the university premises.

Concluding, the Secretary-General reminds the General Meeting that for 2013 proposals for a regional congress are sought, preferably from a region of the world that has not recently seen an IACCP regional or international congress. For 2014, proposals from Europe are once again in place, as that year’s International Congress of Applied Psychology will be taking place in Paris.

(3) (Associate) Treasurer’s report

The Chair of the Communications and Publications Committee, Bill Gabrenya, reads out a brief report by the associate treasurer Sharon Glazer, who was appointed to act as such by the EC during the current EC’s term of office, but cannot be present at the General Meeting.

Sharon Glazer was appointed Associate Treasurer effective October 1, 2007. Her report is based on data available to her since that time.

Resources of the Association have been quite stable. Membership is approximately the same as it was at the Spetses conference with some increase in the number of probationary members. Currently, the IACCP consists of 922 members from 65 countries. Of these members, 644 are in good standing and 278 are probationary members whose dues are in arrears one or two years.

Current total equity of the association is $138,908.05. Of this, at least $15,000 is to be dedicated to the Triandis fund.

Dues were solicited for the 2008 calendar year by postal mail and email. An online payment system using PayPal was initiated on January 27, 2008.
following a long development period. About 40% of members used the new online system to pay their dues, about $22,000. Other payments were processed by the office of the Associate Treasurer, 35% by credit card, 25% by cash or check.

Royalties to Sage included $48,502.41 in April, 2007 and $50,128.39 in April, 2008. The Department of Psychology of San Jose State University has donated photocopying and telephone resources.

The major expense during this period was subscription payments to Sage for the Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology (nearly 30%). About $12,000 was paid to support JCCP editorial processes. Funds were distributed for the Witkin-Ononji Award, the ARTS program, this Congress, and the Harry and Pola Triandis Doctoral Thesis Award.

Caleb Smeraldo, a graduate student in I/O Psychology at San Jose State University, was hired as Assistant Associate Treasurer in October 2007 and has been a tremendous help. Bill Gabrenya was thanked for his work on setting up the online payment system.

(4) Report from the Communications and Publications Committee

The Chair of the Communications and Publications Committee, Bill Gabrenya, reports on the status of IACCP print and online publications.

Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology: David Matsumoto took over as editor of the Journal in June, 2008. JCCP’s impact factor dropped from its high of 1.92 in 2006 to 1.52 in 2007. This change is considered random error. The overall trend is upward. In 2007, JCCP was ranked 15th among 47 social psychology journals. Bill presents the most-cited articles in 2005-6, the first of which was Çiğdem Kağıtçibaşı’s “Autonomy and relatedness in cultural context – Implications for self and family.” Online accesses of JCCP articles have increased dramatically since 2006, from 400,000 to a projected 900,000. Full-text downloads increased from 100 to a projected 185. IACCP members were given online access to JCCP through iaccp.org in mid-2008, implying greater online access in 2009 and beyond. As online accesses are important to publishers, these trends enhance the value of the journal to Sage. Bill presents the 10 most-downloaded articles for June 2007-June 2008. Highest on this list was Sun-Mee Kang’s “Measurement of acculturation, scale formats, and language competence: Their implications for adjustment.”

Cross-Cultural Psychology Bulletin: Bill describes the current status of the Bulletin. The Bulletin will be published twice per year, in print and online, for the foreseeable future. The recent switch to a larger format has facilitated a more professional looking magazine. The School of Psychology at Florida
Institute of Technology has donated all or most of an Associate Editor position for 12 years.

**Congress Books:** Bill reviews the status of four recent Congress books. The Pultusk (2000) book will be placed online in late 2008 (or early 2009). The Yogyakarta (2002) book was placed online a couple years ago. The Xi’an (2004) book has been printed but only partly distributed due to problems on the part of the Congress organizers in securing sufficient funding for mailing. The Association has decided to pay for distribution of the remaining copies in cooperation with the Institute of Psychology of the Chinese Academy of Sciences. The Spetses book (2006) is due out in late 2008 and should go online in mid-2009. (See sidebar elsewhere in this issue for news of the Spetses book.)

**Web site:** The Association’s primary web site, iaccp.org, continues to develop with new member-only features. Most recently, a member book section was added to the home page.

**eBooks:** In addition to the online Congress books and the online Bulletin, the Online Readings in Psychology and Culture project, created at Western Washington University by Walt Lonner, will move to the IACCP website and become an IACCP publication in 2009.

**Online Directory:** The Association’s other website, iaccp-directory.org, has added several functions, including a way for members to see the history of their dues payments and print customized membership certificates. Most notably, dues may now be paid online through PayPal.

(5) **Report on the Bremen Congress**

As representative of the Local Organization Committee (LOC) of the 19th International Congress, EC member-at-large Ulrich Kühnen gives a report of the Bremen Congress. He states that the congress program encompasses the Walter J. Lonner Distinguished Lecture, the Presidential Address, 10 Keynote Addresses, 9 State-of-the-Art Lectures, the Harry and Pola Triandis Dissertation Award Presentation, 10 Invited Paper Symposia (with usually 5 papers), 51 Paper Symposia (usually 5 papers), 51 Paper Sessions (4-6 papers), 2 Workshops, 2 Information Sessions, 2 Lunchtime Interviews, and 1 Round Table. Furthermore, 152 Single Posters and 1 Poster Workshop were part of the program. As social events the congress encompassed the Opening Ceremony followed by a barbecue, a Reception of the Senate of Bremen at the Überseemuseum, a boat trip and dinner on the River Weser (not included in registration fee), and the
Congress Dinner. Registered participants of the congress came from 54 countries (see separate Congress Report in this Bulletin Issue).

Ulrich Kühnen also assures the General Meeting that the congress will break even financially. In concluding, he thanks political scientist Franziska Deutsch, who acted as the congress’s Secretary-General with great enthusiasm, sociologist Mandy Boehnke, who took to the duty of Treasurer of the congress, and all other members of the local organizing committee as well as the numerous student assistants of the congress, among them most prominently Natalie Schnelle and Lidet Tadesse, for their engaged work that guaranteed the smooth running of the 19th International IACCP congress.

(6) Results of the Elections for the EC

President James Georgas announces the results of the 2008 IACCP elections: President Elect, Kwok Leung; Secretary-General, Bill Gabrenya; Treasurer, Sharon Glazer; Deputy Secretary-General, Márta Fülöp; Regional representatives—Central and South Africa, Therèse Tchombé; East Asia, Junko Tanaka-Mitsumi; Europe, David Sam; Insular Pacific, Ron Fischer; North America/USA, Veronica Benet-Martinez. He furthermore announces that the EC decided to fill the second Regional Representative position for Europe, vacant due to the election of Márta Fülöp, current Regional Representative for Europe, as Deputy Secretary-General, with the runner-up of this year’s Regional Representative election for Europe, Kostas Mylonas. Tania Esmeralda Rocha-Sanchez (Central America, and the Caribbean), Charles Harb (North Africa & Middle East), Kim Noels (North America/Canada), Claudio Torres (South America), Ramesh C. Mishra (South Asia), and Augustinus Supratiknya (Southeast Asia) continue their terms of office as Regional Representatives. (See New EC article, this issue.)

(7) Any other business

President James Georgas thanks all out-going EC members, among them current Past-President Shalom Schwartz, and Secretary-General Klaus Boehnke for their services on the EC of IACCP.
Best and Smith Named Honorary Fellows at Bremen Congress

Peter B. Smith, Emeritus Professor, University of Sussex, United Kingdom

This worthy recipient of an Honorary Fellowship from the IACCP began his cross-cultural journey after he had already established a reputation as an acute observer and analyst of group processes. A fellowship from the Canon Foundation took our recipient to Osaka where innovative work on the leadership of groups was then being done in Japan under the guidance of the late Jyuji Misumi. There, he initiated a series of four-culture comparisons of leadership.

He quickly mastered the exacting requirements of cross-cultural methodology, and with his innate sense of responsibility and fair play with others, began establishing a network of colleagues from other cultures with whom he has continued to publish. This multi-cultural work has included studies of how the performance and maintenance functions of leadership are enacted, how organizational events are managed, how values drive these processes, especially conformity, and how culturally socialized tendencies to acquiesce may be confounding our disciplinary attempts to map the world using self-report measures of psychological processes. He is the first author of the standard text in cross-cultural social psychology, now into its third edition, a text that has introduced the field to many students of psychology.

His range of knowledge and his personal contacts in the field, combined with his organizational skills and interpersonal diplomacy, made him an obvious choice to appoint as the fourth editor of the *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, a duty he performed with efficiency and good judgment from 1996 to 2001. During his watch, the journal gained in prestige because of the quality of the reviews it provided authors combined with his efficient processing of manuscripts.

In 2002, he was elected president of the International Association for Cross-Cultural Psychology in recognition of his two decades of intellectual contributions and dedicated service to our field. In that role, he worked efficiently.
backstage to manage the growing affairs of the Association and was the public face of our organization, representing us with dignity and good humor to our Chinese hosts at the Xi’an conference in 2004 and at the conferences of allied associations.

In acknowledgment of his wide-ranging and stellar contributions to our discipline and to our organization, the International Association for Cross-Cultural Psychology hereby confers its Honorary Fellowship upon Peter B. Smith.

Deborah L. Best, Professor,
Wake Forest University, USA

For more than three decades, Deborah L. Best has been a highly respected member of the family of cross-cultural psychologists and a significant contributor to the discipline of psychology. She has published consistently in important journals and has written many book chapters, often in collaboration with a network of scholars that she stimulated to impressive productivity and imbued with congenial relations. Perhaps her most frequently-cited publications are three co-authored books on sex stereotypes, gender, and self from a cross-cultural perspective.

She has had a meteoric career at Wake Forest, beginning with her B.A. in Psychology and her M.A. in General Experimental Psychology. She left for a short time while completing a Ph.D. in Developmental Psychology at the University of North Carolina in 1981. Her rapid rise in the academic ranks at Wake Forest led to being named the William L. Poteat Professor of Psychology. She served as chair of Psychology from 1994 to 2002 and subsequently as Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, a position she has held since 2004. Despite her demanding administrative activities, she continues to be active in the Department of Psychology. Debbie has also received numerous teaching and research awards. Throughout her career, she has maintained her primary interest of cross-cultural psychology, particularly in the area of developmental psychology. She has also developed a secondary interest in cognitive psychology.

Debbie has made extraordinary contributions to cross-cultural psychology, particularly to the International Association for Cross-Cultural Psychology in which she has held numerous roles with distinction. She has been a consulting editor of the Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology and, since 1996, an associate editor. For ten years, from 1988-1997, she was Treasurer of IACCP. She then served as President-Elect (1998-2000), President (2000-2002) and Past-President (2002-2004). In filling these and other roles, she has always exhibited impressive dedication, a gentle and reasoned voice, an easy and infectious laugh, and a pleasant demeanor that reflects the warm hospitality for which the southern United States is famous. The scope and depth of her commitment to cross-cultural psychology has clearly earned Deborah L. Best the title of Honorary Fellow, the highest award given by IACCP, which her fellow members proudly and enthusiastically bestow upon her.
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New Books, Films and Journals

A list of books published since 1990 by IACCP members can be found on the IACCP web site (www.iaccp.org) in a searchable database.


This is the second volume of a two volumes series on cultural and gender issues. The book consists of 16 chapters written primarily by Polish authors. The authors illustrate the colorful variety and high quality of work done in the crossroad of gender and culture in Poland. Together with the previous volume this book is a must and a valuable learning material for those who are interested in cultural and gender issues both for personal and professional reasons.


Critically reviews the literature on modernisation and contemporary relationships, challenging simplistic conclusions about the ‘end of intimacy’ and the inevitable decline of personal commitment. Contends that adaptation to rapid change is moderated by individual, social class and cultural variations, with consequently differing impacts on everyday relations.


A comprehensive textbook covering cross-cultural and cultural psychology topics and methods that is highly readable. - Editor


Published as a volume in the series "Advances in Cultural Psychology: Constructing Human Development", Ernest E. Boesch is a pioneer in cultural psychology and founder of the so-called Saarbrücken School of Cultural Psychology. Part I consists of four chapters that trace Boesch's "journey of discovery" in which he gradually constructed his unique Symbolic Action Theory and contributed in many other ways to the literature in cultural psychology. Part II features a sampling of 11 of his most penetrating and interesting writings on a variety of topics of enduring interest. The main intent of the book is to explain to all scholars who study the interface between psychology and culture the nature and scope of Boesch's life and contributions to a field in which he has been involved for more than half a century.
In 24 chapters the contributors discuss the cultural context of accurate assessment and appropriate interventions in counseling, highlighting work with groups including African Americans, Asian Americans, Hispanics, American Indians, Arabs and Muslims, refugees, victims of disasters, individuals experiencing the consequences of drug and alcohol abuse, problems and issues involving self and culture, counseling involving gender issues, gerontological counseling, health issues, spirituality counseling, family counseling involving various ethnic groups, and international students. Ethics, competence, considerations of universality and cultural relativism, and research perspectives are also covered.

Covers psychological, developmental, social, and methodological research on how cultural information is socially transmitted from one generation to the next within families. An evolutionary perspective is elaborated in the first part of the book; the second takes a cross-cultural perspective by presenting international research on development and intergenerational relations in the family; the third provides intracultural analyses of mechanisms and methodological aspects of cultural transmission.

Specialists address theoretical, methodological, and empirical multilevel models as they relate to the analysis of individual and cultural data. Divided into four parts, the book opens with the basic conceptual and theoretical issues in multilevel research, including the fallacies of such research. Part II describes the methodological aspects of multilevel research, including data-analytic and structural equation modeling techniques. Applications and models from various research areas including control, values, organizational behavior, social beliefs, well-being, personality, response styles, school performance, family, and acculturation, are explored in Part III. Part III also deals with validity issues in aggregation models. The book concludes with an overview of the kinds of questions addressed in multilevel models and highlights the theoretical and methodological issues yet to be explored.

Member Books on iaccp.org
Recent books published by IACCP members are featured on the IACCP web site. If your book is not currently displayed, please contact the IACCP webmaster.
Michael Bond Farewell Bash

Friends, colleagues, students, and staff gathered on December 6, 2008 to celebrate Michael Bond’s departure from the Chinese University of Hong Kong. Organized by students and colleagues, the event featured live testimonials and a Powerpoint show of new and ancient photos with special wishes from friends worldwide attesting to Michael’s impact on themselves and the field. A photo album of the event can be seen at http://picasaweb.google.com/sowanwong/ProfBondsFarewell. Michael is now at the Hong Kong Polytechnic University.

Cecilia Cheng  Former student, now at the University of Hong Kong. On screen: “bufen niwo”: “You and I are one.” In frame: yubuzhuo, buchengqi”: “One cannot become a useful citizen without being educated” (Book of Rites).

Jim Georgas Wins Ursula Gielen Award

_Families across Cultures: A 30-nation psychological study._ Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (2006) by James Georgas, John Berry, Fons van de Vijver, Cigdem Kagitcibasi, & Ype Poortinga, was the recipient of the 2007 Ursula Gielen Global Psychology Book Award of the International Psychology Division 52 of the American Psychological Association. The award was presented at the APA convention in Boston, 2008. (Jim is flanked by Renée Goodstein, chair of the Ursula Gielen Global Psychology Book Award Committee and Uwe Gielen.)
Planned Scientific Activities of the IACCP

2-6 August, 2009
Africa Regional Conference of IACCP
University of Buea, Cameroon

Organizers:
Therese M. Tchombe & Bame Nsamenang
http://cameroon2009.iaccp.org

7-10 July, 2010
XX International Congress of the IACCP
Melbourne, Australia

Organizers:
Amanda Gordon and Yoshi Kashima
Co-sponsored by the Australian Psychological Society

24-27 June, 2011
IACCP Regional Conference
Istanbul, Turkey

Organizers:
Zeynep Aycan and Cigdem Kagitcibasi

This conference will precede the European Federation of Psychologists’ Association conference (June 28-July 1, 2011)

Tentative dates: July 17-21, 2012
XXI International Congress of IACCP
Stellenbosch, South Africa

Organizers:
Deon Meiring and Leone Jackson
The Congress will be organized in conjunction with IUPsyS International Congress of Psychology in Cape Town.

2-6 August, 2009
Africa Regional Conference of IACCP
University of Buea, Cameroon

7-10 July, 2010
XX International Congress of the IACCP
Melbourne, Australia

24-27 June, 2011
IACCP Regional Conference
Istanbul, Turkey

30 October - 1 November, 2009
Southeast European Regional Conference of Psychology (SEERCP2009)
Sofia, Bulgaria
Southeastern Europe Looking Ahead: Paradigms, Schools, Needs and Achievements of Psychology in the SEE Region

Sponsors:
International Association of Applied Psychology (IAAP)
International Union of Psychological Science (IUPsyS)
European Federation of Psychologists’ Associations (EFPA)
International Association for Cross-Cultural Psychology (IACCP)
European Health Psychology Society (EHPs)

Contact:
www.rcp2009.wordpress.com

December 11-14, 2009
Asian Association for Social Psychology
IIT Delhi, India

Contact:
Purnima Singh
psingh@hss.iitd.ac.in
Janak Pandey
janakpandey@usa.net
http://asiansocialpsych.org

Other Conferences of Interest

August 15-19, 2009
International Academy for Intercultural Research
Honolulu, Hawaii, USA

Contact:
Dharm Bhawuk bhawuk@hawaii.edu

25-27 September, 2009
International Conference on Becoming a European: Cultural Adaptation and Culture Learning of Erasmus Program Exchange Students
Warsaw, Poland

Sponsors:
Warsaw School of Social Sciences and Humanities
Foundation for the Development of Educational System
International Association for Cross-Cultural Psychology

Contact:
Pawel Boski boskip@psychpan.waw.pl
http://www.erasmusconference2009.swps.pl

A useful compilation of international conferences can be found on the International Union of Psychological Science (IUPsyS) web site:
www.iupsys.org
## Large Associations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Association</th>
<th>Website</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>International Congress of Psychology (IUPsyS)</strong></td>
<td><a href="http://www.iupsys.org">www.iupsys.org</a></td>
<td>2012: Capetown, South Africa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>International Congress of Applied Psychology (IAAP)</strong></td>
<td><a href="http://www.iaappsy.org">www.iaappsy.org</a></td>
<td>2010: July 11-16, Melbourne, Australia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>American Psychological Association</strong></td>
<td><a href="http://www.apa.org">www.apa.org</a></td>
<td>2010: August 12-15, San Diego, CA, USA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Association for Psychological Science</strong></td>
<td><a href="http://www.psychologicalescience.org">www.psychologicalescience.org</a></td>
<td>2010: May 27-30, Boston, MA, USA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2011: May 26-29, Washington, DC, USA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interamerican Congress of Psychology (SIP)</strong></td>
<td><a href="http://www.sipsych.org">www.sipsych.org</a></td>
<td>(Sociedad interamericana de psicologia, SIP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>European Federation of Psychologists’ Associations (EFPA)</strong></td>
<td><a href="http://www.efpa.eu">www.efpa.eu</a></td>
<td>European Congress of Psychology (ECP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2011: July 4-8, Istanbul, Turkey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Executive Council 2006-2008

## Officers of the IACCP 2008-2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>Heidi Keller</td>
<td>Culture and Development Faculty of Human Sciences University of Osnabrück Artilleriestrasse 34 49076 Osnabrück Germany Tel: +49 (541) 969 3557 Fax: +49 (541) 969 3576 <a href="mailto:hkeller@uos.de">hkeller@uos.de</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past-President</td>
<td>James Georgas</td>
<td>Department of Psychology University of Athens 11 Herodou Attikou St. Athens 10674 Greece Tel: +30 (210) 7241 194 <a href="mailto:dgeorgas@psych.uoa.gr">dgeorgas@psych.uoa.gr</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President-Elect</td>
<td>Kwok Leung</td>
<td>Dept. of Management City University of Hong Kong Tat Chee Ave., Kowloon Hong Kong SAR, China Tel: +852 27889592 Fax: +852 27889146 <a href="mailto:dkleung@cityu.edu.hk">dkleung@cityu.edu.hk</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary-General</td>
<td>William Gabrenya</td>
<td>School of Psychology Florida Institute of Technology 150 W. University Blvd. Melbourne, FL 32901 USA Tel: +1 (321) 674-8104 Fax: +1 (321) 674-7105 <a href="mailto:gabrenya@fit.edu">gabrenya@fit.edu</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Secretary-General</td>
<td>Márta Fülöp</td>
<td>Institute for Psychology Hungarian Academy of Sciences Victor Hugo utca 18-22 Hungary Tel: +36 (1) 279-6088 Fax: +36 (1) 239-67-21 <a href="mailto:fmarta@mtapi.hu">fmarta@mtapi.hu</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>Sharon Glazer</td>
<td>Department of Psychology San Jose State University 1 Washington Square San Jose, CA 95192-0120 USA Tel: +1 (408) 924-5639 Fax: +1 (408) 924-5605 <a href="mailto:sharon.glazer@sjsu.edu">sharon.glazer@sjsu.edu</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair, Communication and Publications Committee</td>
<td>John Adamopoulos</td>
<td>Dept. of Psychology Grand Valley State University Allendale, MI 49001 USA Tel: +1 (616) 331 2388 Fax: +1 (616) 331 2480</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## IACCP Regional Representatives 2008-2010

### Central and South Africa
- **Thérèse Thombè**
  - Center for Educational Research in Child and Family
  - P.O. Box 901, Limbe, Cameroon
  - Tel.: +237-3333-2160
  - thombe@sandaf.ac.cm

### East Asia
- **Junko Tanaka-Matsumi**
  - Dept. of Integrated Psychological Science Kwansei Gakuin University 1-155 Ichibancho, Uegahara Nishinomiya-City, Hyogo 662-8501 Japan
  - Tel.: +81 (798) 54-6060 Fax: +81 (798) 52-7353 jmatsumi@kwansei.ac.jp

### Europe
- **Kostas Mylonas**
  - Department of Psychology University of Athens 157 84 Athens Greece
  - Tel.: +30 (210) 727-7584 Fax: +30 (210) 727-7534 kmylonas@psych.uoa.gr

### Insular Pacific
- **Ron Fischer**
  - School of Psychology Victoria University of Wellington PO Box 600 Wellington New Zealand
  - Tel: +64 (4) 463-6548 Fax: +64 (4) 463-5402 ronald.fischer@vuw.ac.nz

### Mexico, Central America, and the Caribbean
- **Tania Esmeralda Rocha-Sanchez**
  - Nat’l Autonomous Univ. of Mexico Sanchez Colin 55 Col. Providencia Delgr. Azcapotzalco CP 02440 Entre Mariscal Romel Y Emilio Portes Gil Mexico D.F. Mexico
  - Tel.: +52 (55) 56 22 23 26 Fax: +52 (55) 56 22 23 26 tania_rocha@correo.unam.mx

### North Africa and Middle East
- **Charles Harb**
  - Social and Beh. Sciences Dept. American University of Beirut P.O. Box 11-0236/SBS Dept. Beirut, 1107 2020 Lebanon
  - Tel.: +961 (1) 350000 ext 4371 charles.harb@aub.edu.lb

### North America
- **Veronica Benet-Martinez**
  - Department of Psychology Olmsted 1418 University of California Riverside, CA 92521 USA
  - Tel.: +1 (951) 827-7776 veronbm@ucr.edu

### South America
- **Cláudio Torres**
  - SQS 108 Block K Apt. 604 Brasilia, DF 70347-110 Brazil
  - Tel.: +55 (61) 307-2625 x223 Fax: +55 (61) 244-1178 claudpsius@aol.com

### Southeast Asia
- **Augustinus Supratiknya**
  - Sanata Dharma University Candi Gebang Permai, Blok GG-7 Condong Catur Sleman 55283 Indonesia
  - Tel.: +62 (027) 4-883037 Fax: +62 (027) 4-562383 supratiknya@yahoo.co.uk
The International Association for Cross-Cultural Psychology (IACCP) was founded in 1972 and has a membership of over 700 persons in more than 70 countries. The aims of the Association are to facilitate communication among persons interested in all areas of the intersection of culture and psychology. IACCP holds international congresses every two years and regional conferences in most other years. The next congress will be in Australia in 2010. We are associated with several publications, including the bimonthly *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, the newsletter-magazine-journal *Cross-Cultural Psychology Bulletin*, and conference proceedings. Membership fees are based on annual gross income.

Inquiries concerning membership and correspondence concerning publications and all address changes should be directed to the Treasurer (see inside back cover).

**IACCP Fees and Subscriptions**

Membership fees are based on income and include the *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* (JCCP) and the *Cross-Cultural Psychology Bulletin* (CCPB). Membership forms are available on the IACCP website.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Annual Dues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than US$ 10,000</td>
<td>US $20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between $10,001 and $30,000</td>
<td>$45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between $30,001 and $65,000</td>
<td>$65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than $65,000</td>
<td>$85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsor a member in a developing nation</td>
<td>$40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

JCCP institutional subscriptions: Please see www.sagepub.com

**World Wide Web**

News and information about IACCP can be found on the IACCP Website at www.iaccp.org