Bulletin of the Faculty of Education,
Nagoya University (Educational Psychology)
1985, Vol. 32, 97－103.

原　　著

Internationalizing the Study of Social Development

Alan FOGEL[1)]

In the past few years, social developmentalists from the United States have become acquainted with the important work of Japanese developmental studies. Recent reviews, published, in the 1983-1984 annual report of Hokkaido University's Research and Clinical Center for Child Development by Dr. Urie Bronfenbrenner of Cornell University, Dr. Michael Lewis of Rutgers Medical School-UMDNJ, and Dr. Joseph Campos of the University of Denver have given an excellent description of the current work of Japanese social developmentalists, especially in the area of infant development. I will not repeat their observations.

I was fortunate to spend nearly one year in Japan, as a Fulbright Senior Research Scholar. I was able to meet a wide range of Japanese professionals involved with children and families (developmentalists, psychotherapists, educators, sociologists, and anthropologists), I worked closely with Dr. Hideo Kojima, Masatoshi Kawai and their colleagues in the Department of Educationl Psychology at Nagoya University, I studied the Japanese language at the Nagoya University Language Center, I visited pre-shools, day care centers, elementary and junior high schools, I spent time with Japanese families, and I travelled widely in Japan.

My professional interest in Japan began in 1972. As a graduate student at the University of Chicago, I read the now classic report of Caudill and Weinstein (1969) and was intrigued by the differences in the mother-infant interaction between the two nations. I had just returned from three years of service as a Peace Corps volunteer in Bogota, Colombia: an experience that compelled me to change my career from physics to education and psychology.

I came to Japan, therefore, with a deep interest in the nature of culture and how it affects the child, family and school. I, like Drs. Bonfenbrenner, Lewis, and Campos, was impressed with the breadth and scope of developmental research in Japan.

In spite of the strength of the research enterprise in Japan, neither I nor my American colleagues had heard much about it, prior to arriving in Japan. In addition, I was surprised to find that the majority of Japanese researchers were relying extensively on Western theories and methods.

This is due partly to the fact that American developmental scholars have not been interested in work done in other countries, partly to the relatively recent history of psychological reasearch in Japan, and partly to the relatively small number of active developmental reseachers in Japan, compared to the United States.

---

* This paper is based, in part, on work done in 1983 and 1984, when the author was a Fulbright Senior Research Scholar in Japan. The author gratefully acknowledges the support of the Japan-United States Educational Commission, the Department of Educational Psychology, Nagoya, Japan, Dr. Hideo Kojima, and Masatoshi Kawai. I would also like to thank my hosts in other cities: Dr. Kazuo Miyake and Shing-jen Chen (Sapporo), Dr. Yorio Kosawa, Dr. Michiko Takahashi and Dr. Osamu Suda (Tokyo), and Dr. Yorio Kosawa and Dr. Kunio Wakai (Kobe). The ideas in this paper were further developed and formalized during a graduate seminar taught by the author at Purdue University after returning from Japan. The contributions of the students —Sueko Toda, David Duerden, and Colet McKnigt— were greatly appreciated. Requests for reprints may be addressed to the author: Dr. Alan Fogel, Department of Child Development and Family Studies, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN 47907, USA.

1) Department of Child Development and Family Studies, Purdue University.

In this paper I would like to analyze the state of Japanese developmental research from an international perspective. I will suggest that Westerners must open their scholarly doors to embrace Japanese work, and that the Japanese must strive to find what is unique about their approach to understanding children and families.

Cultural isolationism of United States developmental science

Cross-cultural psychology has sustained some serious challenges, as seen in a 1984 issue of *American Psychologist* devoted to the value and method of cross-cultural psychology. The main point of the papers in this volume is that Western psychology has been an isolationist science. We have ignored empirical evidence from other cultures that might enhance our Western theories, and we have ignored the *theoretical* concepts that have been introduced by psychologists from other countries.

Writing in that issue of the *American Psychologist*, Sexton and Misiak (1984) say that "as American psychology acquired a dominant position in world psychology, it ceased to keep up with psychological advances in other countries and became increasingly isolated ..." resulting in "...ignorance of some important developments in other countries that could have enriched and fertilized American psychology at an earlier stage and would have opened new vistas, theoretical and practical" (pp. 1026-1027).

One exception to this generalization is the case of Soviet psychology. Although Russia is part of Europe, the Soviet system has created a unique cultural and political entity. Through the efforts of Western translators of Soviet psychology (Cole, 1984), the work of Pavlov, Luria, and Vygotsky has had a major influence on Western developmentalists. The integration of Soviet and Western ideas serves as a model for how the international exchange of indigenous national theories leads to a better understanding of human development.

In most cases, however, we are far from this ideal of international sharing. There is evidence that Western psychology has been perceived as an instrument of Western imperialism by psychologists in the Arab near east (Prothro &Melikian, 1955; as quoted in Russell, 1984), and in the People's Republic of China, which forcibly purged scholars espousing Western psychology during the Cultural Revolution in 1966, and only now is conceptualizing its own national psychology in the service of the country's needs (Ching, 1984).

The paper by Ching on modern Chinese psychology, published in the *International Journal of Psychology*, joins with other papers in the same journal, including those of Lagmay (1984) of the Philippines, and Azuma (1984) of Japan, as well as earlier papers in *Psychologia* including Sharma (1981) from India, Ho (1982) from Hong Kong, and Diaz-Guererro (1977) from Mexico, publishing in the *American Psychologist*. Each of these papers calls for the development of national psychologies, independent of Western psychological concepts, and they propose a set of concepts indigenous to their own culture having no explicit counterpart in Western culture.

Western psychologists can use the unique psychological principles of other nations with great profit in the area of human social development and behavior. Unlike cognitive and perceptual development, which focuses primarily on universal structural aspects of perceiving and thinking, social behavior is the learning of roles and functions that are tied inextricably to the fabric of social relationships within a culture. Not only does the language mediating those relationships differ across cultures, but the roles, expectations and results may differ.

There are human universals of social behavior and development, for example, in the expression of basic emotions, the development of attachment bonds, and the requirement of a system of rules to regulate human communication in order to meet man's basic needs. The complexity of human social behavior and emotional experience is so vast, however, that a given culture can categorize explicitly only a small part of it, and a given individual within a culture can only learn a subset of the rules and roles available to members of the culture (Rohner, 1984).

The effect of context on behavior

Social developmentalists should discover which of the many possible encodings of human social experience are possessed by any individual or goup of individuals sharing a similar set of cultural beliefs. We may be able to illuminate a wider range of human functioning by piecing together, on an international

scale, the multiplicity of encodings —beliefs, values and concepts— derived from different cultural groupings.

One approach to the study of the relationship between social behavior and cognition taken by a number of developmentalists in the United States is the "social systems" or "social network" perspective (Bronfenbrenner, 1979; Lewis & Brooks-Gunn, 1979). This perspective offers an ecologically valid approach to the study of human behavior, observing individuals within the contexts of the family, school or peer group.

In constrast to social systems view, the Vygotskian constructivist approach pushes the developmentalist to a more anthropological perspective on the conceptualization of human behavior; by viewing cognitions as active processes that define the meaning by which the individual interprets and makes use of the context (Rogoff, et al., 1984). If context, such as family composition or the number of students in a school classroom, is simply treated as an independent variable, a set of objective constraints, we cannot do justice to the fact that different individuals will view those same objective aspects of context in different ways. If we fail to study how differences in cultural cognitions interact with differences in objectively defined contexts, we restrict our ability to understand the complexity of human behavior and development (Cole, Gay, Glick, & Sharp, 1971; Greenfield, 1966; Rogoff, et al., 1984).

Current research on human social development can be criticized for focusing on context at the expense of culture. We tend to study the effects of parents on children, the effects of schooling on development, or the role of the peer group on social behavior. We have forgotten that each of these contexts may serve different functions in different cultures.

Moral education is a good example. Some societies view the family as the primary setting for moral education, others look to the school, the peer group or religious institution. Within the United States there are differences in opinion on the proper setting for moral education. Public controversies over sex education, abortion, prayer in schools, and pornography are examples of these differences.

The premise of this paper is that individuals in all societies share a basic set of human goals and functions. What differs are the cultural cognitions that mediate between those goals and the environmental context, including the social institutions. By looking across cultures we investigate the culture-context interface, and thus avoid the confounding that arises when context is treated as an independent variable within a single cultural group.

I believe that social scientists who have studied social development as it occurs in at least two different societies, are best suited to discovering and explaining the culture-context linkages of society in relation to childrearing and socialization. We should include cultural differences in socialization as a part of our graduate and post-graduate training programs.

In the West we have failed to enrich our knowledge of other cultures, and thereby expand knowledge of our own. In other cultures, Western dominance has meant a lack of attention to the uniqueness of the processes of socialization found there, both by developmentalists native to the culture and by Westerners attempting to comprehend that culture.

Asian concepts of social development and behavior

Asian social developmentalists and social psychologists have begun to realize that concepts imported from Western countries are not adequate for explaining psychological phenomena in their own countries. This change of perspective in the Asian nations can be expected on the basis of cultural assimilation.

New ideas often become accepted from a "donor culture" to a "recipient culture," but their use in the recipient culture may be different from the function of the same idea in the donor culture (Valsiner, 1983). According to Azuma (1984), psychological concepts introduced from the West into Japan went through an introductory period of recognition, followed by modelling of the Western method. Later, some Japanese psychologists responded with the development of indigenous constructs. The final stage of cultural assimilation, not yet completed, is the integration of both Western and Japanese concepts, preserving aspects of both systems of thought.

Japan has a long history of borrowing, at times even directly copying, ideas and tools from the West, but maintaining a completely Japanese culture. The current assimilation of Western ideas is similar to the absorp-

tion of religious, educational and calligraphic systems from China over 1,000 years ago (Morsbach, 1980). In a similar manner, Kojima (in press) has tried to explain how modern Japan has maintained its traditional systems of childrearing and family relationships in spite of an influx of Western ideas and materials.

One of the most well-known writers of Japan's psychological indigenization period was Takeo Doi (1973). Widely read in Japan, and translated into English, his *Anatomy of Dependence* is a highly successful effort to explain a complex set of concepts that regulate interpersonal relationships among Japanese people.

Morsbach (1980) describes Doi's key concept, *amae*, as an active desire to be passively dependent upon someone. *Amae* is a self-indulgent wish for dependency, and it can be seen in people of all ages. Parents feel that children should learn *amae* feelings toward the parent, that is, to be able to indulge in total dependence on the parent when necessary.

Amae is related to a number of other social concepts (Doi, 1973), such as *on*. *On* expresses gratitude one received from benevolent others in the past. Because he or she who received *on* is expected to feel obligation to repay the gratitude, it can also be translated as obligation. Within the family, *on* expresses the obligation children should have to their parents.

Utaug la loob is a Philippine term that means a debt inside oneself, and is usually translated as a debt of gratitude. *Utaug la loob* regulates interpersonal behavior so strongly, that to refuse to show your gratitude becomes a serious matter (Ho, 1982). The character for the Japanese word *on* is the same in Chinese, and has the same meaning in Chinese. Furthemore, the Chinese concept of *sajiao* (used for women and children) and *laugi* (used for men) is nearly identical to Japanese *amae*. *Sajiao/ laugi* is an affectionnate response from an intimate person by whom one can presume to be loved (Ho, 1982). It is this presumption of love or affection from another that is the core of the *amae* concept.

Similar concepts can be found in India, for example *dharma*, meaning right action or duty (Sharma, 1981). As Neki (1975) notes, in the West, life is based on a centrifugal (outward moving) principle. The West's ideal of mental health is to be able to change the self to fit in with the environment. India holds a centripetal (center seeking) philosophy of life. Mental health is achieved by seeking an intrapsychic harmony within the self, independent of the demands of the environment.

Thus, the Eastern person distinguishes between that which must be done because of social obligations, and that which is part of one's own true and personal beliefs, and can maintain that distinction even when the two parts of the self seem to conflict. The Eastern person's apparent failure to reconcile these two parts of the self may be seen by Westerners as hypocritical. The Western goal is to be "true to oneself," and to have open and honest communications with others, even if the content of the communication may be upsetting to others. To do otherwise would be considered deceitful.

Befu (in press) describes the differences between Western and Japanese cultures as that between "individualism", including self-reliance, independence, individual responsibility and freedom, and "interpersonalism" including the concepts of dependency (*amae*) and obligation based on mutual trust.

Befu assumes that even though the concepts of personhood and interpersonal relationships differ between Japan and the United States, certain similarities exist. Even though Americans do not make an explicit recognition of it, they have both immediate and lasting interpersonal obligations and dependencies. Children in the United States, however, are socialized at an early age to ignore those dependencies and made to feel responsible for their own decisions and status in life .

In the *Anatomy of Dependence*, Doi raises similar issues. With regard to the sense of obligation, the Japanese accept their duties to others from whom they have received some benefit. Americans, on the other hand, find it difficult to receive assistance or gifts or to allow themselves to become dependent upon others. The feeling of obligation incurred when receiving a gift conflicts with the American's sense of self-reliance, and leads to feelings of shame when being a receiver or being dependent on others.

Doi's point is that receiving something (at least something outside the normal, culturally expected pattern of gift giving) brings with it a sense of personal inadequacy and perhaps a fleeting sense of shame in all humans. Asian peoples have encoded this sense of inadequacy into a linguistic and cultural concept; they deal with the strong feelings of shame and dependency by formulating explicit and binding rules that insure the

receiver will eventually unburden himself of the debt. Knowing that he must repay the obligation can free the individual's psyche in the short-term.

Americans do not have such an explicitly defined cultural concept. The American has difficulty in being receptive to unsolicited and unexpected gifts, and to open expressions of caring. This may be explained by the presence of a universal human emotion for which there are no culturally recognized coping strategies. Conversely, Japanese people become uncomfortable when isolated from their reference group, or asked to be independent decision makers.

Questions arising from an international developmental science

Thus, the same interpersonal situation, that of giving and receiving, has fundamentally different meanings and patterns of response in Eastern and Western societies. Furthermore, this brief analysis suggests that both Japanese and Americans can learn a great deal about themselves and the nature of their social relationships and how they develop, by grasping fully the concepts used to regulate social behavior in other cultures.

This raises a number of questions that may be asked, once we become aware of these different social meanings.

How do the differences in meaning arise? This is the basic developmental question. Rather than using cross-cultural comparisons to look for universal stages of development, or trying to test developmental theories cross-culturally, we can focus on the particulars of the socialization process that lead to differences in cultural meaning systems. We may find similar socialization processes, or quite different processes between cultures. In any case, increasing our knowledge of the specific link between socialization practice and socialization outcome will lead to better understanding of the process of social development.

My own work on the mother-infant interaction seems particularly suited to answering such a question (Fogel, 1982a; 1982b). Observations of mothers responding to their babies can reveal the way in which cultural cognitions and belief systems are put into practice and transmitted to young children.

With Hideo Kojima and Masatoshi Kawai, we videotaped about 50 mothers engaging in face-to-face play with their three-month-old infants in Nagoya's Meito-ku Hoken-jo. We are in the process of comparing these data with similar videotapes made in the United States.

Our study differs from that of Caudill and Weinstein and the recent replications of that reseach in several important ways. First of all, Caudill's work was done in the home, while ours is in a controlled laboratory situation. Second, Caudill used live observers and rather global coding categories. We are using videotapes and doing a micro-analysis of the behavioral exchanges between mother and infant.

Even though our work cannot be said to represent the mother's usual style in the home, we will be able to study in more detail than has been done in the past the ways in which the mothers respond to specific aspects of the baby's behavior. Responses to particular emotions of the infant—expressions of distress or enjoyment— or to particular interpersonal situations should differ between the cultures. The translation into action of the mother's beliefs about the nature of the child and about the child's potential for communication should emerge from the data.

We have already found, for example, that mothers from both cultures vocalize about the same amount of time to their babies. While North American mothers rely primarily on words and sentences, however, Japanese mothers communicate mostly with sounds that have no linguistic meaning. This Japanese emphasis on non-verbal communication may reflect the mother's culturally-based cognitions about the use and value of words vs. gestures in intimate relationships.

We predict that maternal contingent responses to specific aspects of infant behavior will differ between the two cultures. This will eventually lead to the social construction of culturally-based meaning systems in the infants. Extension of this research strategy to older infants and children will reveal specific socialization sequences, such as giving and receiving, that can be linked theoretically to more general cultural concepts as *amae.*

What is the nature of the historical and social process within a particular society that has led to the explicit cultural conceptualization of particular aspects of individual development and interpersonal relations? Conversely, what

accounts for the lack of such conceptualization in other societies? The psychology of individuals and groups is too complex for any single culture to have recognized all aspects of social life explicitly. The fact that we do not have a culturally defined mechanism for dealing with a particular feeling, does not do away with the importance of that feeling in determining our affairs. International sharing of concepts regulating interpersonal and individual behavior may lead to a deepening awareness of aspects of our functioning that have gone unrecognized by our culture, and by our culturally derived psychologies. Hideo Kojima's historical analysis of childrearing belief systems will be a valuable contribution to our knowledge in this area.

What differences are there in psychological effect between experiencing those feeling and concepts defined by the culture, compared to those feelings and concepts that are not defined? We might expect higher levels of lasting negative emotion, and perhaps some psychopathology, to be based on the experience of powerful emotions for which the individual has no clearly defined coping mechanism. The developmental issue becomes important here also: does psychopathology have its genesis within the individual or within the socially and historically derived cultural concepts used for self understanding and emotional coping?

Conclusions

By encouraging the creation of national developmental sciences, at the temporary expense of the traditional Western models, we open the doors to a variety of new concepts about social behavior and development. The integration of these concepts across nations by developmentalists who are trained with an international and interdisciplinary perspective, can result in fundamental changes in our understanding of human development.

By attendance at international meetings, developmentalists have the opportunity to learn the points of view of those from other nations (Sexton & Misiak, 1984). In addition, the growth of internationally oriented publications devoted to developmental study is an essential avenue of communication (Russell, 1984).

These publications should expand the scope of articles to include explicit discussions of national theories of development (more than simply a summary of work done in a particular country), and attempts at international integration and hypothesis generation. At the outset, such articles may be largely speculative, but valuable to the growth of field.

In addition, Japanese scholars should make an effort to publish their contributions in mainstream English language journals. Even though Japanese scholars publish extensive discussions and debates over the interpretation and validity of concepts like *amae*, this work is not known outside Japan. Japanese scholars must take the time to summarize and describe this valuable work for Western audiences.

A carefully reasoned attempt at an indigenous developmental perspective requires a considerably broad scope of knowledge about one's own and also another's culture. It requires personal experience with other cultures. There is a great need for providing developmentalists with the time and funds for undertaking such an internationally broad-based training program. Finally, it suggests that some kind of cross-linguistic and cross-cultural experience be a required part of the training for advanced degrees, not only in anthropology, but in all the social and developmental sciences.

REFERENCES

Azuma, H. 1984 Psychology in a non-Western country. *International Journal of Psychology*, **19**, 45-55.

Befu, H. in press Social and cultural background for child development in Japan and the United States. In H.W. Stevenson, H. Azuma & K. Hakuta (Eds.) *Child development and education in Japan.* San Francisco: Freeman.

Bronfenbrenner, U. 1979 *The ecology of human development.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Caudill, W., & Weinstein, H. 1969 Maternal care and infant behavior in Japan and America. *Psychiatry*, **32**, 12–43.

Ching, C. 1984 Psychology and the four modernizations in China. *International Journal of Psychology*, **19**, 57-64.

Cole, M. 1984 The world beyond our borders: What might our students need to know about it? *American*

Psychologist, **39**, 998-1005.

Cole, M., Gay, J., Glick, J.A., & Sharp, D.W. 1971 *The cultural context of learning and thinking.* New York: Basic Books.

Diaz-Guerrero, R. 1977 A Mexican psychology. *American Psychologist*, **32**, 934-944.

Doi, T. 1973 *The anatomy of dependence* (J. Bester, trans.). Tokyo: Kodansha International.

Fogel, A. 1982a Early adult-infant interaction: Expectable sequences of behavior. *Journal of Pediatric Psychology*, **7**, 1-22.

Fogel, A. 1982b Affect dynamics in early infancy: Affective tolerance. In T. Field & A. Fogel (Eds.), *Emotion and early interaction.* Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Greenfield, P.M. 1966 On culture and conservation. In J.S. Bruner, R.R. Olver, & P.M. Greenfield (Eds.) *Studies in cognitive growth.* New York: Wiley.

Ho, D. Y. F. 1982 Asian concepts in behavioral science. *Psychologia*, **25**, 228-235.

Kojima, H. in press Child-reaing concepts as belief-value system of the society and the individual. In H.W. Stevenson, H. Azuma & K. Hakuta (Eds.) *Child development and education in Japan.* San Francisco: Freeman.

Lagmay, A. 1984 Western psychology in the Philippines: Impact and response. *International Journal of Psychology*, **19**, 31-44.

Lewis, M., & Brooks-Gunn, J. 1979 *Social cognition and the acquistion of self.* New York: Plenum.

Morsbach, H. 1980 Major psychological factors influencing Japanese interpersonal relations. In N. Warren (Ed.), *Studies in cross-cultural psychology, Vol.* 2. (pp. 317-342). London: Academic Press.

Neki, J.S. 1975 Sahaja: An Indian ideal of mental health. *Psychiatry*, **38**, 1-10.

Prothro, E.T., & Melikian, L. 1955 Psychology in the Arab Near East. *Psychological Bulletin*, **52**, 303-310.

Rogoff, B., Gauvain, M., & Ellis, S. 1984 Development viewed in its cultural context. In M.H. Bornstein & M. Lamb (Eds.), *Developmental psychology. An advanced textbook.* (pp.553-571). Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Rohner, R.P. 1984 Toward a conception of culture for cross-cultural psychology. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, **15**, 111-138.

Russell, R.W. 1984 Psychology in its world context. *American Psychologist*, **39**, 1017-1025.

Sexton, V.S., & Misiak, H. 1984 American psychologists and psychology abroad. *American Psychologist*, **39**, 1026-1031.

Sharma, S. 1981 Key concepts of social psychology in India. *Psychologia*, **24**, 105-114.

Valsiner, J. 1983 A developing child in a developing culture: A relative synthesis. Paper presented at the 26th annual meeting of the African Studies Association, Boston.

要　　約

日本における社会的発達に関する研究の現状を国際的な視野から検討するのが，この論文の主目的である。アメリカの発達研究は，文化的に孤立した視点でなされてきたが，他の文化の下で発展してきた理論的概念や心理学の原理を活用することによって，大きな利益を受けることが期待できる。社会的発達と社会的行動についてのアジアの概念のいくつかを取り上げて，同一の社会的状況が，社会により根本的に違った意味を持つことが示された。このような意味のシステムを生じさせる社会化の過程，その歴史的・社会的背景とその心理的影響が論じられた。

社会的発達と社会的行動に関する新しい多様な概念に目を開き，その統合を図ることによって，人間発達に関する新しい理解がもたらされるであろう。そのために，大学院水準での教育プログラムに，異文化での訓練を含ませる必要がある。西欧の学界が数多く行われている日本の発達研究の成果を受け入れるとともに，日本の研究者が英文雑誌に論文を発表する努力をし，さらに，子どもと家族を理解する日本のアプローチのどこに独自性があるのかを明らかにする努力を怠ってはならない。

（1985年8月3日　受稿）