ONLINE READINGS IN PSYCHOLOGY AND CULTURE
International Association for Cross-Cultural Psychology

Volume 5 *Social Psychology and Culture*
Issue 3 *Social Motives and Behavior in Cultural Context*

Article 1

1-2015

Social Motives and Their Development in Cultural Context

Hans-Joachim Kornadt
University of the Saarland, Saarbrücken, Germany, h.kornadt@mx.uni-saarland.de

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/orpc

Recommended Citation
Kornadt, H. (2015). Social Motives and Their Development in Cultural Context. *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture, 5*(3). https://doi.org/10.9707/2307-0919.1048

This Online Readings in Psychology and Culture Article is brought to you for free and open access (provided uses are educational in nature)by IACCP and ScholarWorks@GVSU. Copyright © 2015 International Association for Cross-Cultural Psychology. All Rights Reserved. ISBN 978-0-9845627-0-1

Social Motives and Their Development in Cultural Context

Abstract

This paper deals with differences in social motives between cultures and with respect to their development. First, social motives are described as complex functional systems. Then aggressiveness and achievement motivation are dealt with as examples. Assumptions about biological factors are discussed and cultural differences are reported. Based on cross-cultural research, variations in early mother-child relations and in cultural norms and values are discussed as main sources of individual and cultural differences.

Creative Commons License

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License.

This article is available in Online Readings in Psychology and Culture: https://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/orpc/vol5/iss3/1

INTRODUCTION

A precise definition of "social motives" is elusive. At minimum, motives, or motivated acts, are somehow socially relevant. Hunger, thirst, or sexuality have an immediate physiological basis and a specific neurophysiological motivating mechanism. They have certainly evolved phylogenetically. This leads to specific forms of action to "satisfy" the physiological "needs". These actions or goals can partially be socially or culturally shaped; observable for example, in special food preferences or aversions based on cultural beliefs and customs: milk or cheese are in some cultures (e.g., Japan and China) mostly intolerable or disliked; in others cultures dogs (e.g., Northern China), insects or maggots (e.g. Capricorn larvae, Asmat; Kenntner & Kremnitz, 1984) are accepted to satisfy hunger or even preferred as delicacies, while rejected as disgusting in other (e.g., Western) cultures.

Social motives are unlike physiological based motives from the outset because they are directed at social outcomes without a specific physiological source. Social motives also have a neurophysiological substrate, but this is not directly related to homeostatic conditions and certainly much more based on experiences. Examples include affiliation, aggression, power, altruism, achievement, and approval, among others. These motives have basic characteristics in common in the way they are associated with specific goal-directed behavior. They form a specific system, a culture-related connection of emotion and cognition. These systems are normally latent, but they become activated by specific situations and motivate actions adapted to the situation.

Two social motives in cultural context will be discussed here as examples: the aggression motive, which is less often studied (Kornadt, 1992), though certainly not unimportant in cultural context, and the achievement motive, the "classical" field for motivation research since the publication by McClelland, Atkinson, Clark, and Lowell (1953). Both motives represent also the research focus of the author over the last 40 and more years.

According to motivation theory, (Atkinson, 1958; Heckhausen, 1967, 1991; Kornadt, 1982a, 1984, 2002, 2011; McClelland, 1985, 1961; McClelland, et al., 1953) motives are complex functional systems. They comprise emotional responses and cognitive processes. The details of the specific components are characteristic for each motive. It is also specific how such a functional system is activated and developed during childhood – each with its cultural and individual variations (see Hofer, 2010, for an overview).

Generally, a distinction is made between *explicit* and *implicit* social motives (McClelland, Koestner, & Weinberger, 1989; Schultheis & Brunstein, 2010). The term "implicit motive" refers to unconscious motives, which normally cannot be recognized by introspection. The term "explicit motives" refers to self-observed and self–attributed goals and attitudes. Both represent independent systems of motivation, (McClelland et al., 1989) and the measurement of these motives is very different: "explicit motives" are studied through self-attribution and self-description mostly by using questionnaires. "Implicit

motives" are measured by indirect expression. For example, the subjects are asked to create narratives evoked by presented cues in projective methods.

The two methods differ in reactivity of participants: answers in questionnaires can be consciously manipulated, while there is less control of answer behavior in projective measures.

Measurement and Motive-Content Scoring Techniques

The implicit motives are usually measured by a special assessment technique known as the Thematic Apperception Test (TAT) (Atkinson, 1958; McClelland et al., 1953), or its modification as Picture Story Exercise (PSE, Schultheis & Brunstein, 2010). The TAT is one of the most popular projective tests ever developed. Ambiguous photos and pictures relevant for one or more motives are presented, and the participant is asked to tell a story referring to the content. The ambiguous picture allows for a projection of the subject's needs into the story. This means that the picture or photo-cue triggers motive-related cognitions and emotions. This projection would be hindered if the stimulus pull/content of a picture is uniform, i.e., all subjects tell similar content. Pictures differ in their appropriateness depending on this criterion (Pang & Schultheiss, 2005). McClelland developed a content-related scoring system (McClelland et al., 1953). TAT methods have been further adapted to various motives and cultures, using more sophisticated and systematic scoring systems (e. g. Heckhausen, 1963 for hope of success and fear of failure; Kornadt, 1982b for aggression and aggression inhibition; Hofer & Chasiotis, 2011; see Pang, 2010a, for an overview).

Further scenario techniques have been developed and often used in cross-cultural investigations (Kornadt 2002, 2011; Kornadt & Tachibana, 1999; Trommsdorff, Cole, & Heikamp, 2012). Here, typical motive and culture-relevant everyday scenes are depicted. They can be understood as motive-related or neutral. The participant is asked to remember and report a similar situation and report his/her own reactions and behavior.

These and similar (projective) techniques require intensive work for cross-cultural studies. First, the construction of a coding manual not only requires to take into account the details of theoretically motive-relevant indicators but also an intensive intimate knowledge of the culture-specific values and forms of expression of the specific motive. Second, an intensive training of coders from the participating cultures is required in order to guarantee that they follow the manual rules.

For assessing explicit motives in cross-cultural comparisons, questionnaires have also been used. However, these fixed-format self-report measures are especially critical in cross-cultural investigations as it is (very) difficult to adapt them to culture-specific contents (details are explained in Kornadt, 2011).

Certainly, all methods to be used in cross-cultural studies, questionnaires as well as projective techniques, have their flaws. However, projective techniques as described here (i.e., not formalized "tests") can easier be adapted to a specific culture, although being more expensive and more difficult to construct and administer. If such cultural adaptations

are carefully done and in exchange with informants of each cultural group, such projective tests are less likely to show construct and method bias compared to standardized tests developed in one culture (see also van de Vijver, 2009).

The Aggression Motive

Aggressive behavior is motivated, unlike as seen by social learning theory (Bandura, 1977). Motivated acts are normally seen as aggressive when they intend to hurt or destroy something or somebody. This *hostile aggression* has to be differentiated from *instrumental aggression* (Kornadt, 1992; Olweus, 1972; Rule, 1974). An example of instrumental aggression is when a person intends to outperform another person or to win in a competitive sport without intending to hurt the person. The focus of the present article is on hostile aggression, which is based on an (implicit) aggression motive. Sometimes distinctions are made between *relational* and *physical aggression*. However, the underlying motivational processes are the same, only the content of goals and behavior are different.

Global Cultural Differences in Aggressiveness

Starting from this preliminary understanding, we may realize that cultures differ with respect to aggressiveness. For example, indicators used to distinguish between "aggressive" and "non-aggressive" cultures include the frequency of war-like conflicts, rates of violent crimes, malevolent sorcery, general hostility, or perhaps even headhunting, or cannibalism. According to early reports by missionaries and travelers, and especially from studies by anthropologists and psychologists, for example, the Kwoma, Apache, Comanche, Rajiup, Eipo and Janamali belong to a more aggressive group of cultures, whereas the Hopi, !Ko-Bushman, Semai and Hutterites are described as low or non-aggressive (see overview in Kornadt, Eckensberger, & Emminghaus, 1980). In these studies, cultures are seen globally as an entity, leaving aside intra-cultural differences. Contrasted groups are often selected by using the Human Relations Area Files (HRAF).

Aggression - Drive or Instinct?

How can differences in aggressiveness between cultures and/or between individuals be explained? In the past, some answers had been given from a biological perspective. The first scientist to promote this line of reasoning was Sigmund Freud (1938). He postulated sexuality (Eros) in its broader meaning as the general driving force to live. He later also postulated a "death-drive" (Thanatos) as its antagonistic force and therefore a source of aggression. These drives are viewed as biologically rooted motivational forces. Another view was presented by William McDougall (1908) who assumed a number of "instincts" and among these an "aggression instinct." Perhaps the most famous perspective was the aggression theory of Konrad Lorenz (1966). He postulated a kind of biological-driven aggression energy that is continuously produced and accumulates if not released by some

aggressive act. However, this assumption has never been confirmed by empirical research.

We know that aggressiveness has a biological component. However, differences between cultures cannot be attributed exclusively to biology, except we would argue that cultures differ in their biological basis. This was assumed in early "race theories." However, there is no empirical evidence to support "race" assumptions. The function of biological factors in motivation is much more differentiated, and besides biological factors, other components play a crucial role for the development and behavioral function of motives like aggression.

Beside biological components, there are three relevant areas that help explain aggression differences between cultures as well as among individuals:

a) Cultural context: socio-cultural factors like values, religious beliefs
b) Function of motives
c) Development of motives embedded in cultural context

A Component Model of Aggression

Biological Components of Aggression

Even if no single and simple cause like drive or instinct can be assumed as a source of motives, biological factors play a role as components in a complex motivational system, but only partially and in various and complicated ways as components of a motive system.

In the last several decades, many studies have shown that genetic factors play a role in aggression. The comparison of monozygotic and dizygotic twins is informative. Rhee and Waldman (2002) found in a meta-analysis of several twin and adoption studies that a large portion of the variance in aggression is explained by genetic factors. However, there is no simple influence of genes or other biological factors on behavior (Kornadt, 2002). The biochemical expression of genes during the prenatal development of the brain as well as their later influence on behavior underlies the complicated epigenetic gene-environment interactions. For example, hormonal factors such as cortisol of the embryo and/or mother, gonadal hormones of the mother, or external substances like alcohol or drugs are influential. Later, various psychological processes on the part of the mother and/or child can become influential. Besides, it has to be understood that there is no single "aggression gene." Other genetic factors, e.g., relevant for temperament (e.g., extraversion) play a role. Only one specific genetic-based factor is well documented: the influence of the male hormone testosterone. There is a universally strong increase of aggressiveness in male adolescents during puberty. This correlates with a steep increase of testosterone at the beginning of puberty and a slow decrease with the gradual decline of puberty, whereby a great variance in age exists (Olweus, 1986) (for details of the physiological and neural processes see Hall, Stanton, & Schultheiss, 2010).

Cultural context

Cultures differ in many aspects. One difference is based on their ecological and socio-economic conditions. For example, the living conditions of hunters and gatherers are different from those of herdsmen and farmers. Accordingly, people in pastoral cultures were frequently described as more aggressive than people from farming cultures. In their famous Six Cultures Study, Whiting and Whiting (1979) showed that the family and household structure provide influential socialization conditions. Children in cultures with patrilineal extended families and polygynous mother-child-households were more aggressive as compared to children in cultures with nuclear families and close relationship of mother and father, where children were more pro-social.

According to the findings of Hofstede (2001), cultures vary along several dimensions: e.g., power distance, individualism vs. collectivism, and masculinity vs. femininity (see also Hofstede, 2011). Although they are rather rough generalizations and typologies, some of these dimensions are widely used, especially individualism vs. collectivism, a cultural dimension which has been often used to describe typical differences between (East-) Asian and Western cultures. Some of these dimensions are related to factors that are relevant to the development of the aggression (and the achievement) motive.

Other influential cross-cultural studies are based on the universal value theory by Schwartz (2004). Values (based on bipolar dimensions) are seen as forming a motivational circle. Evidence for the circular structure of values is strong (Schwartz, 2012). Values can be seen as individual ideals that universally shape individual and social behavior. According to Schwartz‘s value theory, corresponding universal dimensions are to be distinguished: “conservation vs. openness to change” and “self-enhancement vs. self-transcendence.” Bond et al. (2004) used a different approach by investigating social axioms as basic cultural concepts in more than 40 cultures around the world. However, Oyserman, Coon, and Kemmelmeier (2002) argue, that besides individualism/collectivism, cultures may differ in many other dimensions, and - most of all – those dimension may “be confounded with numerous other individual differences” (p. 8). One question for further study is whether cultural differences in basic values and axioms are related to social motives and respective social behavior (Trommsdorff, in press-a). In the following, I will discuss the role of further cultural factors in the development of the aggression motive.

Social Roles, Values, and Religion

Diverse culturally sanctioned social roles, a culture’s values and its dominant religious beliefs are found as relevant for aggressiveness (see Feshbach, 1992). Some examples will illustrate these factors. Further fundamental differences among cultures referring to the self-construal, self-views, and world views were described by Markus and Kitayama (1991) as well as Rothbaum and Wang (2010) (see also Rothbaum, Wang, & Cohen, 2012; Trommsdorff, 2012b). Self-and world-views, in which the word is seen as changeable and the self as stable/invariable tend to favor aggressive reactions/tendencies. Self- and world-

views, in which the world is seen as stable, the self however as malleable, promote compliance and discourage aggression.

Social Roles. The role of fathers can vary across and within cultures in relation to masculinity and dominance vs. femininity. Male assertiveness and power manifested in public, especially in the family, and regarding child-rearing can be a model for aggressive self-enhancement and aggressive assertiveness. This is often the case in Western, individualistic cultures. It is clearly the case in some Turkish and Arabic cultures. In these, it is mostly connected with a tendency of aggressiveness of their sons, as e.g., shown by Pfeiffer (2012) with Turkish adolescents in Germany. The dominant behavior of fathers, however, can also hinder boys in the development of self-confidence, and therefore induce shyness and low aggressiveness. Likewise, the role of mothers differs across cultures. This is most important for the motive development. Cross-cultural studies will be described in a later section.

Values. Cultures often vary in their predominant values. For the expression and development of aggression, it is especially relevant how generally accepted and promoted values of aggressiveness vs. politeness and considerateness in social behavior are. Inside many East Asian cultures — Japan, Thailand, Java, and Bali — aggressive behavior is strictly disapproved, while politeness, empathy, and consideration are highly valued and desired. This characterizes all social interactions. These values go back to a long Confucian-Buddhist tradition. Compared to Western cultures with similar industrialization and modernization, very low incidence of violence and interpersonal aggression are reported for Japan (Kornadt, 2011; Kornadt & Tachibana, 1999; Landau, 1984). In Java (Magnis-Suseno, 1997), harmony—partly based on religious mysticism—is the predominant rule and value, and characterizes social interactions, even in the case of conflicting interests. Hostile conflicts or aggression are strictly disapproved. Similarly, for the Toraja people on Sulavesi Island (Indonesia), the general rule is to “stay cool.” Feelings of frustration are avoided, while fate is seen as unchangeable and having its origin in the spirits and ancestors (Hollan & Wellenkamp, 1993). In some (sub)cultures however, aggression is justified or even required, e.g., if one’s honor is insulted. That is the case in some southern parts of the USA, if one’s masculine honor is insulted (van Osch, Breugelmans, Zeelenberg, & Bölük, 2013). However, family honor is more important in some Mediterranean cultures. Family honor explains the relatively high rate of homicides within the European Union and honor killings (van Osch, Breugelmans, Zeelenberg, & Bölük, 2013). In Germany, several cases are known, as a young female was killed by her brother, because she behaved like a young German female in the German culture, thereby violating the honor of the traditional Turkish family.

Religion, including beliefs, values and norms, can also significantly account for cultural differences in aggressiveness (Kornadt, 2012, Trommsdorff, in press a). Here, at least two main differences are mentioned. In cultures where Hinduism or Buddhism is most common, a strict norm is related to the teaching of reincarnation: never cause any harm to any creature. Therefore, aggression between men is considered immoral (for Hinduism, see Mishra, 2012). A typical culture might be the traditional Bali. On the other hand, in the monotheistic cultures, “there is only one God,” and each religion claims an

own God to be the only and true God. Here, people are encouraged or even asked to defend their specific belief in their own God, and even to prosecute "nonbelievers" (Assmann, 2003). In medieval times in Europe, Christian heretics were prosecuted and killed (e.g., the Catharist/Albigensian movement). Presently, this tendency seems especially relevant in some Islamic cultures. Here, spreading the Islamic faith even with aggressive means has increased: In Malaysia, Christians are now prohibited to call God "Allah," as they have done in centuries, since in their Arabic or Malay language there is no other word for God. In Sudan recently, a Muslim woman has been sentenced to death for marrying a Christian man and converting to Christianity. Supported by socio-political factors, the Jihadistic Salafiya has developed, where suicide-bombers are encouraged to kill unbelievers and consequently are admired as martyrs. And recently, members of the "Islamic State" in Syria, who are Sunnites, have killed numerous Shiites as followers of the "wrong Islam," and even decapitated Christians.

Social Motives as Functional Systems

In order to understand the effects of these socio-cultural factors in motivation and in the development of motives, one has to understand the function of motives more in detail. Regarding the aggression motive, the famous Yale Group postulated the "frustration-aggression" theory: Each aggression is preceded by a frustration, but not every frustration leads to an aggression (Berkowitz 1989; Miller, 1941). Modern psychological research on motivation has shown that a motive is not a homogenous single phenomenon, instinct, or trait. The fundamental work of McClelland (1985), McClelland et al. (1953), Atkinson (1958), and Heckhausen (1967, 1991) showed that motives are complex systems which are characterized by several components which interact in systematic ways (Anderson & Bushman, 2002; Fabes & Eisenberg, 1992; Kornadt, 1982a, 1984, 2011). Components of social motives are cognitively structured social goals (Eccles & Wigfield, 2002). In aggression, the basic goal is to eliminate sources of frustration forcibly.

The psychological process to attain this goal is activated by specific emotions, e.g., anger. Anger is activated by frustrating experiences ("frustration"). Such a situation is the object of an immediate cognitive evaluation: is the frustrating situation based on malevolent intentions of other persons or accidental? Through emotion regulation (Trommsdorff & Cole, 2011), the anger emotion will become either deactivated or aggravated (Fabes & Eisenberg, 1992). This gives rise to stored "scripts" (Huesmann, 1988), which are learned cognitive schemata and patterns of action, related to the respective emotion and goals. In case of aggression, these goals and actions may be to retaliate, to restore self-esteem or reputation, to hurt the enemy, or generally, to remove or destroy the source of frustration (Anderson & Bushman, 2002; Fabes & Eisenberg, 1992; Kornadt, 1982a, 2011). Following goal attainment, the whole system becomes deactivated as demonstrated experimentally (Kornadt, 1982a; Zumkley, 1984). Similar to the concept of fear of failure in the achievement motive, the concept of aggression inhibition has to be taken into account in the explanation of the development of aggression. Fear of aggression, activated by anger and related to aggressive scripts and intentions, is

assumed to inhibit aggressive actions (Kornadt, 1982a). Observations have shown related empirical phenomena and some developmental conditions for the development of aggression inhibition (Park Shin, 2003). The elements and processes discussed above are essentially the same in other social motives. However, social motives differ in the activating situation, the emotion and the content of related interpretations, goals, and actions. It becomes clear that no simple biological condition can be assumed for such a complicated system. Motives develop in a longer period of maturation and development, influenced by socio-cultural conditions. Here, childrearing experiences are of special importance for further development.

Sociocultural Developmental Conditions for Motive Development

It has been empirically supported that in "aggressive" cultures, e.g., the Mundugumor (Mead, 1935), socialization conditions are rather harsh and related to punishment and rejection. Painful and "aggressive" initiation rites are typical in aggressive cultures. Lambert (1992) showed that parents from cultures believing in malevolent and punishing gods or spirits use harsh and painful socialization techniques. This behavior conforms to the ideal of the strong, dominant, harsh, assertive, and unyielding male and insensitive warrior. If the child's unwanted behavior is aggressively punished, anger and aggressive reactions are evoked in the child. These lead to more aggressive punishment, furthering angry emotions and malevolent intention attribution in the child. Consequently, aggressive goals are set based on the belief to live in a hostile world.

In contrast, in cultures where "non-aggressive" values prevail, e.g., the Semai, children are treated with empathy and understanding; they learn quite early to control anger, to tolerate frustrations, and expect negative consequences of own aggression (Dentan, 1968). In the Minangkabau, a successful Indonesian ethnic (matriarchal) group, as well in many Polynesian cultures (Martini & Kirkpatrick, 1992), parents use shame to teach proper behavior. The child will be in a loving, not rejecting, way laughed at, and the behavior will be ridiculed if he/she behaves naughtily or angrily. Children are never scolded or even punished, and they never experience rejection nor even anger, nor aggression. Instead, they feel ashamed, develop a need for approval, and grow up as a non-aggressive person in a non-aggressive culture. These child-rearing practices follow the cultural ideal that a mature adult practices self-control, is relaxed and non-aggressive, and values social harmony.

Mother–Child Interaction

For a motive to develop, the mother-child interaction is most influential. It has also been intensively studied cross-culturally (e.g., Roopnarine & Carter, 1992; for aggression, e.g., Patterson, 1982). Especially, differences in child care between Japan and the U.S. have stimulated early comparative studies (e.g., Caudill & Weinstein, 1969). Differences in maternal vocalization and behavior were reported repeatedly, discovering characteristic cultural differences between Japan and the U.S. (Conroy, Hess, Azuma, & Kashiwagi, 1980; Messinger & Freedman, 1992). Differences between Japan and Western cultures

are of special interest; they reveal fundamental differences in the relation between individuals and the (social) world (Rothbaum, Weisz, Pott, Miyake, & Morelli, 2000; Trommsdorff & Rothbaum, 2008). Trommsdorff and her colleagues carried out various cross-cultural studies, showing many differences in child rearing, mother-child interactions, and emotional reactions of children (Friedlmeier 2011; Friedlmeier & Trommsdorff, 1998; Trommsdorff, 2006, 2012a, 2012b; Trommsdorff & Friedlmeier, 1993; Trommsdorff, Friedlmeier, & Mayer, 2007).

Furthermore, a cross-cultural longitudinal study could demonstrate that differences in the early mother-child relation are basic conditions for culture-specific differences in aggression (Kornadt, 2002, 2011; Kornadt & Tachibana, 1999). Here, aggression and its developmental conditions in two European (Switzerland and Germany) and three East Asian cultures (Japan, Bali and Batak from Indonesia) were studied. The sample consisted of adolescents, mothers, and their children. Especially, the Japanese and Balinese adolescents and children showed a significantly lower aggressiveness as compared to the European samples. This is in accordance with the respective cultural values and social rules in these countries. A special condition for the development of low aggression was the very close mother-child relation, which is also a part of the Japanese and Balinese cultural tradition. The mothers know how to establish a certain kind of “one-ness” between themselves and their children (Azuma, 1984). Thereby, the children experience intense security, and only little frustration and anger. Restrictions or rules are not experienced as hostile interference with the child’s interests, but rather as an indicator of parental benevolent intentions. Problems are rather experienced as shared by mother and child and are expected to be solved jointly, in cooperation with the mother. Tendencies of the child to pursue his or her own interests against the interests of the mother (or, more generally, later against other persons, eventually including violent acts) can therefore hardly develop. Consequently, typical conditions for the development of aggression do not occur in Balinese and (traditional) Japanese socialization.

This is different when the mother pursues her own interests, and does not avoid frustrating her child’s interests. This is often the case in Western cultures. Here the mother’s own (legitimate) interests are often contrasted with those of the child, even explicitly. The Western mother does not intend to create “one-ness.” A distance or even an occasional discrepancy between mother and child’s interest is understood as normal. It is sometimes frankly expressed, valued, or even emphasized when the child expresses his grief, wishes, or even his own will. Also, scolding and punishing, and sometimes even physically beating the child, is not impossible or completely unusual. Thus, separateness and differences between mother and child become obvious and are rather underlined. The Japanese sense of community thus does not develop while it is more probable that the tendency to perceive the world as indifferent or unfriendly will be established. This induces the goal to become independent and to pursue one‘s own interests, even recklessly, if necessary. This is in line with a basic Western tendency to see the relation between an individual person and the world as characterized by separateness (Rothbaum & Trommsdorff, 2007; Rothbaum et al., 2000; Rothbaum et al., 2012).

A remarkable result of our longitudinal study is that differences in early mother-child interaction resulted in corresponding differences in (low or high) aggression of the adolescent children nine years later when comparing East Asian and European mother-child pairs. Early childrearing thus has long-term effects on the development of aggressiveness (Kornadt, 2002, 2011, Kornadt & Tachibana, 1999). However, not only child-rearing experiences are influential; social experiences according to values and customs of the culture during development are also important.

In the Japanese and Balinese culture, aggressive behavior is negatively sanctioned and seen as immature and antisocial. Aggressive behavior is hardly successful, rather harmful in social interactions. Thus, the child grows up without opportunities to observe aggressive models or without becoming a victim of aggression. Accordingly, the child hardly has the opportunity to observe aggressive models or to experience other conditions necessary to develop aggression. However, social change in Japan is related to an increasing "Westernization," which affects traditional mother-child relations.

In Western, individualistic cultures, aggressive behavior is also unwanted and often sanctioned, while competition and mild antagonistic behavior is not unusual and rather taken for granted. Contrasted with East Asian cultures, children from Western social contexts therefore have various opportunities to observe and learn "normal" aggressive behavior. This corresponds to the ideal of the independent, assertive, and successful personality.

The Achievement Motive

The achievement motive is defined as the motive to be successful, to perform well, to be capable, to "maintain or to improve the standard of excellence" (McClelland et al., 1953). "Achievement-motivated people are interested in doing something for its own sake, for intrinsic satisfaction of 'doing better'" (Pang, 2010b, p. 42). The motive has two components: the general hope of success in trying to reach a certain goal and fear of failure, which often leads to the avoidance of achievement-related situations and tasks in order to avoid the negative effects of failure on one's self-esteem (Atkinson, 1958). These components are seen as antagonistic. However, sometimes awareness of the probability of failing might also motivate one to exert more intensive and careful effort.

Differences between cultures in the achievement motive have been reported regarding diligence and the relevance of effort (Eccles & Wigfield, 2002; Holloway, 1988). However, these differences have been less reliably documented than results on aggressiveness. Also, intra-cultural differences over time have to be taken into account. To this end, McClelland (1961) studied the correlation of indicators of the achievement motive to economic growth and decline in different cultures. According to his results, the associations were significant. When the achievement motive was high, the productivity in the culture (e. g., number of patents) was also high some time later (McClelland, 1961). Fifty years later, Engeser, Rheinberg, and Möller (2009) found a corresponding relationship. TAT-like analysis of the contents of schoolbooks in two German Federal

States showed a significant difference in achievement motive, which corresponded to large differences in school achievement (in tests) between these two Federal States. No relationship with affiliation or other motive scores (in the schoolbooks) were found.

Based on the above mentioned broad definition, the achievement motive has mostly been measured by the Thematic Apperception Test (TAT). McClelland et al. (1953) developed a systematic and relatively objective scoring system. This allowed for systematic investigations. In many investigations and experimental studies, the relationship between (high) achievement motive and (high) performance in diverse achievement tasks has been demonstrated. Using this technique cross-culturally, the (implicit) achievement motive was often found to be higher in Western society than in other parts of the world. This was even the case with Asian cultures of comparable industrialization. For example, Australian students were higher in achievement motive than Chinese students from Hong Kong. Turkish-speaking Turkish students from a Turkish University had lower achievement motivation than English-speaking students from the same university.

Culture-Specific Achievement Concepts

In the meantime, research has gone on, the pictures have changed, and our knowledge has been improved. To date, more and more studies have shown that East Asian individuals are higher in achievement motivation than Western people, especially than European-Americans. This corresponds to higher achievement in school (Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, 2001) of Asian (Japan, Korea, China) students in comparison to European and, especially, American students. Also, the TAT achievement scores of Chinese high school students were higher than those of comparable British students. In particular, the achievement motivation scores of Japanese and Chinese were higher than those of the European Americans. This was even true for the second generation of Asian immigrants who have been raised in the U.S. (Chen & Stevenson, 1995; Stevenson, 1998; Tsui, 1998).

Further careful analyses have revealed that some of the former data were misleading. The original broad definition of “achievement” and “success” was understood as achievement in the Western sense, namely including competitive situations. This concept was basic in the interpretation and evaluation of the TAT stories. Those situations activate the competition-oriented achievement motive in Western students, most of who perform better than students from other cultures. However, individuals especially in East Asian cultures are accustomed and motivated to work in and for the benefit of their group and their family (Trommsdorff, in press a, b). They rather reject direct competition and tend to avoid standing out individually.

Taking this basic difference into account, the cross-cultural TAT data were then analyzed in the context of culture-specific values and norms. This resulted in the conclusion that the original broad and generalized theoretical definition of achievement cannot be narrowly conceptualized simply in the Western sense of entrepreneurship and competitive academic achievement. In other cultures, the concept of success or

achievement tends to focus on the achievement of a group, or rather the contribution to one‘s group (especially in favor of the family).

The theoretically generalized term “achievement” should therefore be conceptualized in culture-specific terms. Cultures differ in the activity, works, and norms which are relevant and valued in specific settings (Holloway, 1988; Kornadt, 2007, p. 325f., 2011). Excellence and achievement can therefore refer to various domains, for example, to social competence, verbal fluency, or to performance in sports. In certain (sub)cultures, it can also refer to achievement in hunting, sailing, fishing or even maybe in social influence, persuasion, or cheating. This corresponds highly to the ecological and economic circumstances and their demands. A similar tendency was mentioned earlier with respect to aggressiveness. Additionally, the religious background is also important. In cultures with a Confucian, Hindu, Buddhist tradition, or in so-called “collectivistic” cultures (Hofstede, 2001), most people tend to dislike individuals who try to be better than their friends. They are met with disapproval as braggarts or show-offs. In contrast, all kinds of family-, group-, or community-oriented achievement are highly esteemed. “Achievement” has therefore to be defined and understood in culture-specific ways.

Components of the Achievement Motive

As already mentioned for the aggression motive, motivated acts also depend on other factors. For example, the subjective interpretation of the situation and the generalized goals and scripts have to be considered. Individual and culture-specific differences have to be taken into consideration. For the achievement motive, at least three components are paramount. One is the *willingness or readiness for effort* (“Anstrengungsbereitschaft”, effort expenditure) (Heckhausen, 1989); *attitudes*, (Xin, Cindy, & Jing, 2013; Zhu & Leung, 2011) and *effortful control* as part of self-regulation (Trommsdorff, in press a).

Heine (2001) demonstrated significant differences between American and Japanese students in an experimental setting. After experiencing success or failure, the students had the opportunity to continue working on similar tasks. The American students continued to work on the tasks only after success, not after failure. The Japanese reacted in opposite ways: they continued working and even worked harder after experiencing failure. These results may indicate differences in self-concept and the relation between the self and the world. It seems typical for individuals from East Asian cultures to intensify one‘s effort and to strive for self-improvement, especially after failure.

Accordingly, the *self-concept* should be taken into account as a further culturally shaped component of the achievement motive. Causal attribution (Heckhausen, 1991) as part of the expectancy-x-value theory consists of the tendency to attribute success and failure to one‘s inherent and stable talent. Success and failure are then seen as more or less given (fate), where effort cannot change much. This tendency is more or less common in Western cultures (Rothbaum & Wang, 2010). When success and failure are primarily understood as dependent on fixed traits, there is less incentive for effort to improve achievement. In East Asian cultures, a basic belief of the malleable personality that always strives for improvement of the self is more common. Permanent effort to improve oneself is

a basic attitude in Japan, e.g., especially after failure in school examinations (Zhu & Leung, 2011). This belief is embedded into a broader and basic idea about the relation of person and world; here, basic differences exist between Eastern and Western cultures (see Rothbaum et al., 2012; Rothbaum & Trommsdorff, 2007; Trommsdorff, 2012a, in press-a, for further details). Finally, the distinction between hope of success and fear of failure has to be taken more into account. Pang (2010 b) has done a careful analysis, studying different scoring systems, based on PSE results. However this distinction seems seldom used in cross-cultural studies.

Motive Development and Childrearing

The socio-cultural conditions mentioned above are especially relevant in the process of developing the achievement motive. Here, as for aggressiveness, the early mother-child relation is the first important influencing factor. Children who are securely attached to their caring and sensitive mothers feel supported to explore the environment and to test their growing abilities.

In this way, a kind of “mastery motive” can be seen as universal. How far the achievement motive will develop depends on what kind of opportunities, incentives, and encouragement (or discouragement) is provided. From studies by McClelland et al. (1953) we know the importance of early “independence training.” “Early” has to be understood in relation to the developmental age of the child. According to cross-cultural studies, this stage seems to be reached at about eight years of age, though individual and cultural differences need to be taken into account. These have to be seen in relation to cultural values, rules, and the age and kind of independence training. Too early training can induce anxiety about failing. Moreover, the positive value of achievement plays a role (Hayashi & Habu, 1962; Rosen & D‘Andrade, 1959). Boys with high achievement motive had warm and encouraging parents, while authoritarian and dominant fathers had boys with low achievement motive. Bradburn (1963) found the same with dominant fathers in Turkey. Exactly which part(s) of the domain-specific achievement motive will develop depends on a society’s prevailing social values and norms.

Summary

We have selected two important social motives, aggression and achievement, and have demonstrated some universalities, cultural specificities, and the processes of their development. One of the challenges of cross-cultural research is to specify how these motives are activated and develop in diverse cultures. Research has shown the often neglected fact that social motives must be understood in the culture-specific ways and in their respective domain-specificity. Furthermore, this research should and can successfully be extended in several directions: in the field of aggression and achievement, detailed research should be done in different groups, e.g., male/female (not differentiated in this article) and especially for the achievement motive. Another neglected field is the development of motives, its process, the interaction of biological and social conditions, and

their cultural variations. Furthermore, studies should be extended to other motives, e.g., affiliation, power, approval, sexuality. Finally, cross-cultural studies should include comparisons of multicultural contexts and their selection should be theoretically based. Cross-cultural studies will thereby contribute to a better understanding of social motives as part of human behavior in general and as part of each individual's personality (Kornadt, 1990).

References

Anderson, C. A., & Bushman, B. J. (2002). Human aggression. *Annual Review of Psychology, 53*(1), 27-51. http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.53.100901.135231

Assman, J. (2003). *Die Mosaische Unterscheidung oder der Preis des Monotheismus*. (Moses´ distinction and the price of monotheism). München, Germany: Carl Hanser.

Atkinson, J. W. (1958). *Motives in fantasy, action, and society: A method of assessment and study*. New York, NY: Van Nostrand.

Azuma, H. (1984). Secondary control as a heterogeneous category. *American Psychologist, 39*(9), 970-971. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.39.9.970

Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory.* New York, NY: General Learning Press

Berkowitz, L. (1989). Frustration-aggression hypothesis: Examination and reformulation. *Psychological Bulletin*, *106*(1), 59-73. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.106.1.59

Bond, M. H., Leung, K., Au, A., Tong, K.-K., Carrasquel, S. R. D., Murakami, F., et al. (2004). Culture-level dimensions of social axioms and their correlates across 41 cultures. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 35*(5), 548-570. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0022022104268388

Bradburn, N. M. (1963). The cultural context of personality theory. In J. M. Wepman & R. W. Heine (Eds.), *Concepts of personality* (pp. 333-360). Chicago, IL: Aldine. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/11175-012

Caudill, W., & Weinstein, H. (1969). Maternal care and infant behavior in Japan and America. *Psychiatry: Journal for the Study of Interpersonal Processes, 32*(1), 12-43.

Chen, C., & Stevenson, H. W. (1995). Motivation and mathematics achievement: A comparative study of Asian-American, Caucasian-American, and East Asian high school students. *Child Development, 66*(4), 1215-1234. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/1131808

Conroy, M., Hess, R. D., Azuma, H., & Kashiwagi, K. (1980). Maternal strategies for regulating children's behavior: Japanese and American families. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *11*(2), 153-172. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0022022180112002

Dentan, R. K. (1968). *The Semai: A nonviolent people of Malaya*. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Eccles, J. S., & Wigfield, A. (2002). Motivational beliefs, values, and goals. *Annual Review of Psychology, 53*(1), 109-132. http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.53.100901.135153

Engeser, S., Rheinberg, F. & Möller, M. (2009). Achievement motive imagery in German schoolbooks: A pilot study testing McClelland's hypothesis. *Journal of Research in Personality, 43*(1), 110-113. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2008.12.001

Fabes, R., & Eisenberg, N. (1992). Young children´s emotional arousal and anger/aggressive behaviors. In A. Fraczek, & H. Zumkley (Eds.*), Socialization and aggression* (pp.85-101). Berlin, Germany: Springer.

Feshbach, S. (1992). Human aggressivity and war. In A. Fraczek, & H., Zumkley (Eds), *Socialization and aggression* (pp. 203-215). Berlin, Germany: Springer.

Freud, S. (1938). *The basic writings of Sigmund Freud*. New York, NY: Random.

Friedlmeier, W. (2011). Emotionale Entwicklung im kulturellen Kontext. (Emotional development in cultural context). In B. Mayer & H.-J. Kornadt (Eds.), *Psychologie – Kultur- Gesellschaft* (pp. 128-138). Wiesbaden, Germany: VS.

Friedlmeier, W., & Trommsdorff, G. (1998). Japanese and German mother-child interactions in early childhood. In G. Trommsdorff, W. Friedlmeier & H.-J. Kornadt (Eds.), *Japan in transition. Sociological and psychological aspects* (pp. 217-230). Lengerich, Germany: Pabst Science.

Hall, J. L., Stanton, S. J., & Schultheiss, O. C. (2010). Biopsychological and neural processes of implicit motivation. In O. C. Schultheiss & J. C. Brunstein (Eds.), *Implicit motives* (pp. 279-307). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Hayashi, T., & Habu, K. (1962). A research on achievement motive: An experimental test of the 'thought sampling' method by using Japanese students. *Japanese Psychological Research*, *4*(1), 30-42. Retrieved from http://www.psych.or.jp/english/publications. html

Heckhausen, H. (1963). *Hoffnung und Furcht in der Leistungsmotivation*. (Hope and fear in achievement motivation). Meisenheim/Glan, Gemany: Hain.

Heckhausen, H. (1967). *The anatomy of achievement motivation*. New York, NY: Academic Press.

Heckhausen, H. (1989). *Motivation und Handeln* (Motivation and action). (2nd ed.). Berlin, Germany: Springer.

Heckhausen, H. (1991). *Motivation and action*. Berlin, Germany: Springer.

Heine, S. J. (2001). Self as cultural product: An examination of East Asian and North American selves. *Journal of Personality, 69*(6), 881-906. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1467-6494.696168

Hofer, J. (2010). Research on implicit motives across cultures. In Schultheiss, O. C. & Brunstein, J. C. (Eds.), *Implicit Motives* (pp. 433-467). Oxford, England: Oxford University Press. http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195335156.003.0015

Hofer, J., & Chasiotis, A. (2011). Implicit motives across cultures. *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture*, *4*(1). http://dx.doi.org/10.9707/2307-0919.1097

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

Hofstede, G. (2011). Dimensionalizing cultures: The Hofstede model in context. *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture*, *2*(1). http://dx.doi.org/10.9707/2307-0919.1014

Hollan, D., & Wellenkamp, J., C. (1993). *Contentment and suffering: Culture and experience in Toraja.* New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

Holloway, S. D. (1988). Concept of ability and effort in Japan and the United States. *Review of Educational Research*, *58*(3), 237-345. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/1170258

Huesmann, L. R. (1988). An information processing model for the development of aggression. *Aggressive Behavior, 14*(1), 13-24. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/1098-2337(1988)14:1%3C13::AID-AB2480140104%3E3.0.CO;2-J

Kenntner, G., & Kremnitz, W. A. (1984). *Neuginea: Expedition in die Steinzeit* (New Guinea: Expedition into the Stoneage). Frieding-Andechs, Germany: Ambro Laccus.

Kornadt, H.-J. (1982a). *Aggressionsmotiv und Aggressionshemmung* (Aggression motive and aggression inhibition) (Vol. 1). Bern, Switzerland: Huber.

Kornadt, H.-J. (1982b) *Aggressionsmotiv und Aggressionshemmung* (Aggressions motive and aggression inhibition) (Vol. 2) *Aggressions-TAT und andere aggressionsrevante Verfahren* (Aggression TAT and other aggression relevant methods). Bern, Switzerland: Huber.

Kornadt, H.-J. (1984). Motivation theory of aggression and its relation to social psychological approaches. In A. Mummendey (Ed.), *Social psychology of aggression: From individual behavior to social interaction* (pp. 21-31). Berlin, Germany: Springer.

Kornadt, H.-J. (1990). Why motives can be better understood if seen as parts of the personality. In G. L. V. Heck, S. E. Hampson, J. Reykowski & J. Zakrzewski (Eds.), *Personality psychology in Europe: Vol. 3. Foundations, models, and inquiries* (pp. 81-100). Lisse, The Netherlands: Swets & Zeitlinger.

Kornadt, H.-J. (1992). Trends und Lage der gegenwärtige Aggressionsforschung. (Trends and situation of the present research on aggression. In H.-J. Kornadt (Ed.), *Aggression und Frustration als psychologisches Problem* (Aggression and frustration as problem in psychology) (Vol. 2, pp. 513-580). Darmstadt, Germany: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Kornadt, H.-J. (2002). Biology, culture and childrearing: The development of social motives. In H. Keller, Y. H. Poortinga & A. Schölmerich (Eds.), *Between culture and biology: Perspectives on ontogenetic development* (pp. 191-211). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Kornadt, H.-J. (2011). *Aggression: Die Rolle der Erziehung in Europa und Ostasien. (The function of child-rearing in Europe and East-Asia).* Wiesbaden, Germany: VS Verlag.

Kornadt, H.-J. (2012) Psychological functions of religion in youth – A historical and cultural perspective. In G.Trommsdorff & X.Chen (Eds.), *Values, religion and culture in adolescent development* (pp. 46-65). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Kornadt, H.-J., Eckensberger, L. H., & Emminghaus, W. B. (1980). Cross-cultural research on motivation and its contribution to a general theory of motivation. In H. C. Triandis & W. J. Lonner (Eds.), *Handbook of cross-cultural psychology: Vol. 3. Basic processes* (pp. 223-321). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Kornadt, H.-J., & Tachibana, Y. (1999). Early child-rearing and social motives after nine years: A cross-cultural longitudinal study. In W. J. Lonner, D. L. Dinnel, D. K. Forgays & S. A. Hayes (Eds.), *Merging past, present, and future in cross-cultural psychology: Selected papers from the 14th International Congress of the International Association for Cross-Cultural Psychology* (pp. 429-441). Lisse, The Netherlands: Swets & Zeitlinger.

Lambert, W. W. (1992). Cultural background to aggression: Correlates and consequences of benevolent and malevolent gods and spirits. In A. Fraczek & H. Zumkley (Eds.), *Socialization and aggression* (pp. 217-230). Berlin, Germany: Springer.

Landau, S. F. (1984). Trends in violence and aggression: A cross-cultural analysis. *International Journal of Comparative Sociology, 25*, 133-158. http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/156854284X00115

Lorenz, K. (1966). *On aggression*. New York, NY: Harcourt.

Magnis-Suseno, F. (1997). *Javanese ethics and world view. The Javanese idea of the good life*. Jakarta, Indonesia: Gramedia Pustaka Utama.

Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review, 98*(2), 224-253. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.98.2.224

Martini, M., & Kirkpatrick, J. (1992). Parenting in Polynesia: A view from the Marquesas. In J. L. Roopnarine & D. B. Carter (Eds.), *Parent-child socialization in diverse cultures* (Vol. 5, pp. 199-222). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

McClelland, D. C. (1985). *Human motivation*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

McClelland, D. C. (1961). *The achieving society*. Princeton, NJ: Van Nostrand.

McClelland, D. C., Atkinson, J. W., Clark, R. A., & Lowell, E. L. (1953). *The achievement motive.* New York, NY: Appleton Century Crofts.

McClelland, D. C., Koestner, R., & Weinberger, J. (1989). How do self-attributed and implicit motives differ? *Psychological Review*, *96*(4), 690-702. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.96.4.690

McDougall, W. (1908). *Introduction to social psychology.* London, England: Methuen.

Mead, M. (1935). *Sex and temperament in three primitive societies*. New York, NY: Harper Collins.

Messinger, D. & Freedman, D. G. (1992). Autonomy and interdependence in Japanese and American mother–toddler dyads. *Early Development and Parenting*, *1*(1), 33-38. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/edp.2430010108

Miller, N. E. (1941). I. The frustration-aggression hypothesis. *Psychological Review*, *48*(4), 337-342. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/h0055861

Mishra, R. C. (2012). Hindu religious values and their influence on youths in India. In G. Trommsdorff & X. Chen (Eds.), *Values, religion, and culture in adolescent development* (pp. 424-442). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Olweus, D. (1972). Personality and aggression. In J. K. Cole and D. D. Jensen (Eds.), *Nebraska symposium on motivation* (pp. 261-321). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Olweus, D. (1986). Aggression and hormones: Behavioral relationship with testosterone and adrenaline. In D. Olweus, J. Block, & M. Radtke-Yarrow (Eds.), *Development of antisocial and prosocial behavior: Research, theories, and issues* (pp. 51-72). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) (2010). *PISA 2009 Results: What students know and can do: Students performance in reading, mathematics, and science* (Vol. 1). PISA: OECD. http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264091450-en

Oyserman, D., Coon, H. M., & Kemmelmeier, M. (2002). Cultural psychology, a new look: Reply to Bond (2002), Fiske (2002), Kitayama (2002), and Miller (2002). *Psychological Bulletin*, *128*(1), 110-117. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.128.1.110

Pang, J. S. (2010a). Content coding methods in implicit motive assessment: Standards of measurements and best practices for the picture story exercise. In O. C. Schultheiss & J. C. Brunstein (Eds.), *Implicit motives* (pp. 119-150). Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Pang, J. S. (2010b). The achievement motive: A review of theory and assessment of achievement, hope of success, and fear of failure. In O. C. Schultheiss & J. C. Brunstein (Eds.), *Implicit motives* (pp. 30-70). Oxford, NY: Oxford University Press.

Pang, J. S., & Schultheiss, O. C. (2005). Assessing implicit motives in U.S. college students: effect of picture type and position, gender and ethnicity, and cross-cultural comparisons. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, *85*, 280–294

Park Shin, H. K. (2003). *Aggressionshemmung und ihre innere Struktur. Eine kulturvergleichende Untersuchung an deutschen und koreanischen Kindern*. (Aggression inhibition and its internal structure. A cross-cultural study with German and Korean children). Seoul, Korea: Digital Network.

Patterson, G. R. (1982). *Coercive family process*. Eugene, OR: Castalia.

Pfeiffer, C. (2012). Junge Muslime und Gewalt. (Young Muslims and violence) In M. Hallensleben, M. Abou-Taam, J. Emig, C. Pfeiffer, N. Foroutan & C. Nischler-Leibl (Eds.), *Radikalisierungsmechanismen und Deradikalisierungsstrategien bei der Bekämpfung des islamistischen Terrorismus im europäischen Vergleich* (Mechanism for radicalization and strategies to de-radicalize for fighting the Islamic terrorism in European comparison) (pp. 63-76). Hilden, Germany: Deutsche Polizeiliteratur.

Rhee, S., & Waldman, I. D. (2002). Genetic and environmental influences on antisocial behavior: A meta-analysis of twin and adoption studies. *Psychological Bulletin*, *128*(3), 490-529. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.128.3.490

Roopnarine, J. L., & Carter, D. B. (Eds.). (1992). *Parent-child socialization in diverse cultures*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Rosen, B. C., & D'Andrade, R. (1959). The psychosocial origins of achievement motivation. *Sociometry*, *22*(3), 185-218. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2785664

Rothbaum, F. & Trommsdorff, G. (2007). Do roots and wings complement or oppose one another? The socialization of relatedness and autonomy in cultural context. In J. E. Grusec & P. Hastings (Eds.), *The handbook of socialization* (pp. 461-489). New York, NY: The Guilford Press.

Rothbaum, F., & Wang, Y. Z. (2010). Fostering the child's malleable views of the self and the world: Caregiving practices in East Asian and European-American communities. In B. Mayer & H.-J. Kornadt (Eds.), *Psychologie - Kultur - Gesellschaft* (pp. 101-120). Wiesbaden, Germany: VS Verlag.

Rothbaum, F., Wang, Z. Y., & Cohen, D. (2012). Cultural differences in self-awareness and spirituality in adolescence: Pathways to self-transcendence. In G. Trommsdorff & X. Chen (Eds.), *Values, religion, and culture in adolescent development* (pp. 66-95). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Rothbaum, F., Weisz, J., Pott, M., Miyake, K., & Morelli, G. (2000). Attachment and culture: Security in the United States and Japan. *American Psychologist, 55*(10), 1093-1104. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.10.1093

Rule, B. G. (1974). The hostile and instrumental functions of human aggression. In J. DeWitt & W. W. Hartup (Eds.), *Determinants and origins of aggressive behavior* (pp. 125-145). The Hague, The Netherlands: Mouton.

Schultheis, O. C., & Brunstein, J. C. (Eds). (2010). *Implicit motives*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Schwartz, S. H., (2004). Mapping and interpreting cultural differences around the world. In H. Vinken, J. Soeters, & P. Ester (Eds.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 25, pp. 1-65). New York, NY: Academic Press.

Schwartz, S., H. (2012). Values and religion in adolescent development: Cross national and comparative evidence. In G. Trommsdorff, and X. Chen (Eds.), *Values, religion and culture in adolescent development* (pp. 97-122). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Stevenson, H. P. (1998). A study of three cultures: Germany, Japan, and the United States - An overview of the TIMSS case study project. *The Phi Delta Kappan*, *79*(7), 524-529. Retrieved from http://pdkintl.org/publications/kappan/

Trommsdorff, G. (2006). Parent-child relations over the life span. A cross-cultural perspective. In K. H. Rubin & O. B. Chung (Eds.), *Parenting beliefs, behaviors, and parent-child relations. A cross-cultural perspective* (pp. 143-183). New York, NY: Psychology Press.

Trommsdorff, G. (2012a). Development of 'agentic' regulation in cultural context: The role of self and world views. *Child Development Perspectives, 6*(1), 19-26. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1750-8606.2011.00224.x

Trommsdorff, G. (2012b). Cultural perspectives on values and religion in adolescent development: A conceptual overview and synthesis. In G. Trommsdorff & X. Chen (Eds.), *Values, religion, and culture in adolescent development* (pp. 3-45). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Trommsdorff, G. (in press-a). Cultural roots of values, and moral and religious purposes in adolescent development. In L. A. Jensen (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of human culture and development.* New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Trommsdorff, G. (in press-b). Socialization of self-regulation for achievement in cultural context: A developmental-psychological perspective on the Asian miracle. In U. Kim

& Y.-S. Park (Eds.), *Asia's educational miracle: Psychological, social, and cultural perspectives*. New York, NY: Springer.

Trommsdorff, G., & Cole, P. M. (2011). Emotion, self-regulation, and social behavior in cultural contexts. In X. Chen & K. H. Rubin (Eds.), *Socio-emotional development in cultural context* (pp. 131-163). New York, NY: The Guilford Press.

Trommsdorff, G., Cole, P. M., & Heikamp, T. (2012). Cultural variations in mother's intuitive theories: A preliminary report on interviewing mothers from five nations about their socialization of children's emotion. *Global Studies of Childhood, 2*(2), 158-159. http://dx.doi.org/10.2304/gsch.2012.2.2.158

Trommsdorff, G., & Friedlmeier, W. (1993). Control and responsiveness in Japanese and German mother-child interactions. *Early Development and Parenting, 2*(1), 65-78. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/edp.2430020109

Trommsdorff, G., Friedlmeier, W., & Mayer, B. (2007). Sympathy, distress, and prosocial behavior of preschool children in four cultures. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 31*(3), 284-293. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0165025407076441

Trommsdorff, G., & Rothbaum, F. (2008). Development of emotion regulation in cultural context. In S. Ismer, S. Jung, S. Kronast, C. v. Scheve & M. Vandekerckhove (Eds.), *Regulating emotions: Social necessity and biological inheritance* (pp. 85-120). New York, NY: Blackwell.

Tsui, C.-F. C. (1998). Attributions and achievement motivation: Cultural differences among American, Chinese-American, and Chinese (in Taiwan) college students. *Dissertation Abstracts International Section A: Humanities & Social Sciences, 59*, 85.

Van Osch, Y., Breugelmans, S. M., Zeelenberg, M., & Bölük, P. (2013). A different kind of honor culture: Family honor and aggression in Turks. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations* 16(3), 334-344. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1368430212467475

van de Vijver, F. J. (2009). Types of comparative studies in cross-cultural psychology. *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture, 2*(2). http://dx.doi.org/10.9707/2307-0919.1017

Whiting, B., B., & Whiting, J., W., M. (1979). *Children of six cultures: A psycho-cultural analysis.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Xin, M., Cindy, J., & Jing, Y. (2013).Exploring reasons for the East Asian success in PISA. In Meyer, H.-D. & Benavot, A. (Eds.), *PISA, power, and policy: The emergence of global educational governance.* Oxford, England: Symposium Books.

Zhu, Y. & Leung, F. K. S. (2011). Motivation and achievement: Is there an East Asian model? *International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education*, *9*(5), 1189-1212. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10763-010-9255-y

Zumkley, H. (1984). Individual differences and aggressive interactions. In A. Mummendey (Ed.*), Social psychology of aggression* (33-49). Berlin, Germany: Springer.

Suggested Readings

Anderson, C. A., & Bushman, B. J. (2002). Human aggression. *Annual Review of Psychology. 53*, 27-51. http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.53.100901.135231

Atkinson, J. W. (Ed.). (1958). *Motives in fantasy, action, and society: A method of assessment and study*. New York, NY: Van Nostrand.

Fraczek, A., & Zumkley, H. (Eds.). (1992). *Socialization and aggression*. Berlin, Germany: Springer.

Heckhausen, H. (1991). *Motivation and action*. Berlin, Germany: Springer.

Kornadt, H.-J. (2002). Biology, culture and childrearing: The development of social motives. In H. Keller, Y. H. Poortinga, & A. Schölmerich (Eds.), *Between culture and biology: Perspectives on ontogenetic development* (pp. 191-211). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Kornadt, H.-J. (2007). Motivation im kulturellen Kontext (Motivation in the context of culture). In G. Trommsdorff, & H.-J. Kornadt (Eds.), *Erleben und Handeln im kulturellen Kontext.* (Experience and action in the context of culture). *Kulturvergleichende Psychologie* (cross-cultural psychology) (Vol. 2., pp. 283-376). Göttingen, Germany: Hogrefe.

Schultheis, O. C., & Brunstein, J. C. (Eds) (2010). *Implicit motives*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Trommsdorff, G., & Cole, P. M. (2011). Emotion, self-regulation and social behaviour in cultural contexts. In X. Chen & K. H. Rubin (Eds.), *Socio-emotional development in cultural context*, (pp. 131-163). New York, NY: The Guilford Press.

About the author

Hans-Joachim Kornadt is Professor Emeritus of Educational Psychology at the University of Saarbrücken, Germany. He was vice-director of the Institute for Research in Developing Countries, Saarbrücken from 1968 to 1984 (Director: Boesch), and co-director with Lutz Eckensberger from 1984 to 1986. He was a member of the German National Science Advisory Council, President of the German Psychological Association and of the Japanese-German Society for Social Sciences. He was chairman of both the Scientific Councils of the Max Planck Institute for Psychological Research, Munich, and of the German Institute for Japan Studies, Tokyo. Research areas are pro- and anti-social motives and socialization in cross-cultural perspective and psychological aspects of changes in universities and higher education. He conducted field research in East Africa as well as since 1975 in East and South East Asia holding several guest-professorships in Japan and Indonesia. He published numerous publications on motivation, socialization, and personality development in different cultures, aggression, and education. Email: h.kornadt@mx.uni-saarland.de.

Questions for Discussion

1. How do implicit and explicit motives differ?
2. Who are pioneers in motivation research?
3. Why are TAT-like methods better suited to measure implicit motives than questionnaires?
4. How important are genetic conditions in the development of aggression?
5. How are cultural values relevant in the development of achievement motive?
6. How can religion be relevant for the development of aggression?
7. In which way is child rearing important in the development of social motives?
8. What is the function of anger in motivated aggression?
9. How important is the social context for achievement motive?