

Grand Valley State University

ScholarWorks@GVSU

Papers from the International Association for
Cross-Cultural Psychology Conferences

IACCP

2004

Robber's Cave Revisited: Lessons for Cross-Cultural Psychology

Deborah L. Best

Wake Forest University

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



Part of the [Psychology Commons](#)

ScholarWorks Citation

Best, D. L. (2004). Robbers' cave revisited: Lessons for cross-cultural psychology. In B. N. Setiadi, A. Supratiknya, W. J. Lonner, & Y. H. Poortinga (Eds.), *Ongoing themes in psychology and culture: Proceedings from the 16th International Congress of the International Association for Cross-Cultural Psychology*. https://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/iaccp_papers/274/

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the IACCP at ScholarWorks@GVSU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Papers from the International Association for Cross-Cultural Psychology Conferences by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@GVSU. For more information, please contact scholarworks@gvsu.edu.

ROBBER'S CAVE REVISITED: LESSONS FOR CROSS-CULTURAL PSYCHOLOGY

Deborah L. Best

Wake Forest University

Winston-Salem, U.S.A.

Cross-Cultural Psychology and World Events

The global economy and technological revolutions in communication have changed the world, bringing us closer together but also further apart as fear, frustration, hatred, and prejudice have grown from terrorism and tragedy. Two recent tragedies remind us of the seriousness of the problems we face and suggest that as cross-cultural psychologists we may be able to help mitigate or prevent such atrocities from recurring.

Rwanda

April 15, 1994, in the village of Nyarubuye, Rwanda, Pacifique Mutimura, a nine-year-old Tutsi boy spent a day hiding under a pile of dead bodies trying to escape the machetes that had killed his family. His friend described the scene by saying, "The soldiers came by helicopter and gathered all of us in a church. They were screaming. They asked us our ethnic group. Then they began to kill us. Busloads of people came with machetes. They killed my family with machetes. They thought I was dead and left me." They told us we were "*inyenzi*" (insects; Lorch, 1994). Mutilated arms and severed limbs floated down the Kagera River. According to the United Nations, at least 500,000 men, women, and children were killed, many in the Catholic churches where they had gathered to hide (United Nations, 1994).

World Trade Center

On September 11, 2001, at 8:46 am, American Airlines Flight 11 crashed into the North Tower of the World Trade Center, shredding steel columns, wallboard, filing cabinets and computer-loaded desks. Across the top 19 floors there were 1,344 people, many of them alive, stunned, unhurt, and calling for help. None of them would survive. (Dwyer, Lipton,

Flynn, Glanz, & Fessenden, 2002). Sixteen minutes later, at 9:02 am, United Airlines Flight 175 smashed into the South Tower of the World Trade Center. There were 602 people above the 77th floor. None of them survived. People fell and jumped from windows to escape the inferno inside. At 9:59 am, the South Tower collapsed, and at 10:28 am, the North Tower collapsed. In the 102 minutes of horror, 2,823 died in the World Trade Center including hundreds of firefighters and rescue personnel who were helping to evacuate the buildings. In Washington, 189 died as American Flight 77 crashed into the Pentagon. In Pennsylvania, 44 passengers and crew died on hijacked United Flight 93. A total of 3,056 lives were lost to the 19 hijackers. These horrific acts of terrorism in Rwanda and in the U.S.A. were tragedies for our world.

Effects of Terrorism

During the past century mass hatred, terrorism, and genocide have reached overwhelming proportions in Bangladesh, Bosnia, Burundi, Cambodia, Germany, Indonesia, Israel, Nigeria, Rwanda, Russia, Turkey, and elsewhere, and in the United States in the century before. Terrorists whose hate knows no bounds have wreaked havoc on innocent civilians around the globe and have introduced nightmarish technologies of destruction. Large portions of nations or cultural groups have participated in mass murder, terrorism, and other atrocities against unarmed civilians targeted simply because of their race, nationality, ethnicity, religion, or ideology (Kressel, 1996).

One does not have to travel far from home to encounter terrorists. Simply boarding a plane at the local airport, taking the bus to work, or shopping at a crowded food market can lead to horror. Terrorists have profoundly altered the way people around the world go about their daily lives and have challenged our understanding of the world and of mankind. "How can human beings be so inhumane, evil to other human beings?" "What would cause someone to hate so much?" "What experiences would cause someone to take the path of terrorism?" "How can we diffuse the hate, prejudice, stereotyping, and bigotry that have led to such terrorist acts, and bring about peace and understanding?"

Social Relevance of Cross-Cultural Research

Addressing these questions as social scientists requires examination of what we know about human behavior, how it develops, and how it

can be changed. The accumulated years of psychological research may help to make sense of terrorist events and to find ways to prevent such horrible acts from recurring. Indeed, cross-cultural psychologists should be at the forefront of the efforts to understand and prevent terrorism. The many questions for which there are no readily available answers should provide direction for future research that is relevant to one of the most serious concerns of the day.

Twenty-six years ago, in his IACCP Presidential Address, Harry Triandis (1977) called for IACCP to identify important global issues and to launch large-scale scientific research efforts to seek solutions to significant human problems in the world. A number of the IACCP Presidents who followed Triandis have echoed similar concerns. Recent world events make it clear that cross-cultural psychology is positioned to address significant human problems dealing with cultures in contact and with global change.

How Does Hate Manifest Itself in Behavior?

Evil people have always existed – Hitler, Stalin, Pol Pot — and perhaps many of these extreme individuals would be diagnosed with psychological disorders by our clinical colleagues. However, one of the more striking characteristics of terrorists is their apparent normality (Crenshaw, 1981). They do not show notable psychopathology (Post, 1985), so calling them “crazy” does not adequately describe their actions. Nevertheless, one should not assume that mass murderers are simply normal people who regretfully carry out their orders. Amongst terrorist ranks are more passive individuals who are not overly committed or driven by hatred, and who follow orders with some regret, and more active perpetrators who are driven by a fanatical sense of purpose, and readily participate in the atrocities with little guilt (Kressel, 1996).

Terrorists and Terrorist Organizations

Research has shown that demographically terrorists are mostly male (although more females are getting into the act), young (most are in their 20s and 30s with their leadership being older), and primarily middle or professional class with more working-class members in separatist groups. Perhaps surprising is that many have at least some university education

(Atran, 2003; McCauley & Segal, 1987). Evidence suggests that in general, education leads to greater tolerance and support for democracy, and less authoritarianism and racism (Kressel, 1996). However, this is the form of education that encourages critical thinking in science, math, literature, and the arts, rather than simply the rote memorization of religious texts, as, for example, in Taliban schools.

Many terrorists are idealistic and join a succession of groups and causes with pacifist goals (Crenshaw, 1985). Post (1984) and others (McCauley & Segal, 1987) have noted the similarity between cult and terrorist organizations' recruitment and group interactions. The commitment to terrorism may develop gradually as individuals come to see that as the only means to effect social or political change. New recruits gradually move from peripheral activities, such as courier or driver, to more central activities that support the group's violent purpose, such as planting bombs and hijacking planes (Clark, 1983; Hutchison, 1978). Division of labor is common in terrorist organizations so specialization and variation in the extremity of actions is possible (Crenshaw, 1985; McCauley & Segal, 1987).

Within terrorist organizations, intergroup conflict is not uncommon and external violence restores cohesion between competing factions (Laquer, 1977; Zawodny, 1983). An individual's survival depends upon the solidarity of the group and there are strong pressures to conform because members need protection from the outside world. There are powerful incentives to remain in the group (McCauley & Segal, 1987) – material rewards, emotional support (e.g., family substitutes), cognitive reinforcements (e.g., sense of mission and self-righteousness), and social rewards (e.g., status within the group). Terrorists' ultimate objectives (e.g., the grievance the group claims to redress, the ideology it avows) may become secondary to their proximate objectives (e.g., the well-being of the group, public attention). Media coverage fuels terrorists' sense of power (Wardlaw, 1982) and often becomes the end in itself. A quote from a West German terrorist noted, "It is through the press that our cause is maintained in the just manner" (Schmid & de Graff, 1982).

Obedience to Authority

Both situational and personal factors have been explored as explanations for mass atrocities. Asch's conformity studies (1951), Milgram's

obedience studies (Blass, 1992; Milgram, 1963; Milgram, 1974), and similar research by social psychologists are the foundation for one explanation. The obedience explanation contends that obedience to authority is widespread, and it cuts across gender, nationality, culture, educational level, religious ideology, and personality. Obedience depends on the relationship with the authority figure. Because people consider the authority figure to be legitimate, they relinquish personal responsibility for their actions. People obey evil commands not because they lack character or appropriate morality, nor are they aggressive, but they obey because they are overwhelmed by the situation. In spite of reporting severe stress, obedience is quite high when participants are instructed to exert a more modern form of violence, indirect psychological violence, rather than direct physical violence (Meeus & Raaijmakers, 1995).

The obedience explanation is consistent with the Watsonian viewpoint that humankind is quite malleable (Watson, 1930). For instance, based on interviews with former Greek military police (ESA) torturers and reviews of their testimony given at their trials in Athens, Gibson and Haritos-Fatouros (1986) concluded that using progressive desensitization torturing could be taught like other skills.

Although there are some parallels between Milgram's laboratory studies and acts of terrorism in Rwanda, New York, or even Nazi Germany, there are important differences. Many of the terrorists regarded their activities as morally justifiable in terms of their cultural or religious beliefs. Unlike Milgram's participants, terrorists know that death will result from their actions, and they often act with incredible cruelty fueled by years of hatred for their victims and by effective propaganda. What we know from Milgram's studies is that group pressures are often sufficient to suppress inclinations to question or disobey authority.

We find similar failures to intervene in Zimbardo's famous prison guard study (Haney, Banks, & Zimbardo, 1995, Zimbardo, 1972) in which 21 Stanford students selected on the basis of their psychological stability and maturity were randomly assigned to be either prisoners or guards. Over the course of six days, those students quickly assumed their assigned roles with about 1/3 of the guards becoming tyrannical, about 1/3 being "tough but fair" and the final third being good, friendly guards. What is important to note is that the good guards and the dutiful guards never made an effort to interfere with the commands of the aggressive

guards. Although Zimbardo's laboratory study contributes to our understanding of how brutality and cruelty can develop, it obviously differs from the brutalization process in real world torture situations.

Personality Factors

Not everyone succumbs to pressures to obey harmful orders. Looking back at Milgram's and Zimbardo's studies, note that a third of the participants in each experiment failed to conform to group pressure or defied the experimenter by refusing to administer more shocks. In Milgram's study some were highly agitated, some protested verbally, and others simply got up from the chair and walked out of the laboratory. What was it in their personality, their religious beliefs, education, or other previous experiences that led these individuals to disobey? How did they differ from participants who behaved cruelly?

Attempts to understand what predisposes a person to hate and kill have led to studies of fascist and authoritarian personalities (Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswick, Levinson, & Sanford, 1950), dogmatism (Rokeach, 1960), right-wing authoritarianism (Altemeyer, 1981), and social dominance orientation (Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth, & Malle, 1994). Unfortunately, very little research has examined the role of such personality factors in crimes of obedience or other types of human destructiveness (Kressel, 1996). Indeed, studies have told us little about how such authoritarian factors may vary across time or cultural groups, or whether these factors play a role in terrorism.

Part of the process of becoming a terrorist involves developing an identity that involves faith in someone or something outside the self, such as a religious movement or leader (Kressel, 1996). Young men faced with Erikson's "identity vs. role confusion" conflict may resolve their identity issues by submerging themselves into the group which gives them a place to be accepted (Laqueur, 1987). As they struggle with their identity, potential terrorists overinterpret their situations in terms of their own egocentric perspectives, assuming others' behaviors as intentions to hurt or suppress their values and interests (Beck, 1999).

Cultural Factors

Moghaddam (2004) proposes that terrorist groups are more likely to develop when cultural preconditions exist that support such groups. He

notes that perhaps the most important of these preconditions is isolation of the group from the broader society. Isolation serves as a "structural" catalyst, maintaining secrecy and strengthening ethnocentric notions among group members that "we are right and they are wrong." Isolation enhances group conformity and cohesion, reduces rebellion, and solidifies leadership.

The second most important precondition which serves as a "psychological" catalyst for the evolution of terrorism is the perception by group members that society needs radical changes. Along with this belief is the conviction that the existing system does not permit reasonable ways for achieving social change and that an ideal society is an end that justifies any means necessary. For many terrorist groups, particularly those who seek an ideal society with a religious foundation, the ultimate goal is often considered to be inevitable even though the group must play a role in bringing society back on the right path.

Although these two preconditions have central importance, other preconditions, such as a categorical world-view (e.g., good vs. evil), and an inflated view of self, come together to increase the probability that terrorist acts will be carried out. Although these preconditions do not make it inevitable that terrorism will occur, they increase the probability of this outcome. Unlike common criminals, terrorists believe that fairness and justice are on their side and it is their role to bring about change in their societies.

How Does Hate Develop?

"Conflict between groups is like a sturdy three-legged stool. It is sturdy because two legs are universal ineradicable psychological processes, ethnocentrism and stereotyping, and the third is a state of society, unfair distribution of resources, which has always existed everywhere." *Roger Brown, 1986 (p. 533).*

While Hovland and Sears (1940) classic study showed a relationship between economic conditions and prejudiced-related violence, most psychologists would agree that prejudice is learned. The social learning view suggests that children develop negative attitudes toward various social groups because they hear such views expressed by parents, teachers, friends, and mass media, and they are rewarded for adopting these nega-

tive views. Children readily learn social-cultural norms and they imitate those who are important in their social worlds. Bigots are made, not born.

Ethnocentrism and In-Group/Out-Group Bias

In 1906, sociologist William Sumner introduced the term *ethnocentrism* to describe "...the view of things in which one's own group is the center of everything, and all others are scaled and rated with reference to it....Each group nourishes its own pride and vanity, boasts itself superior...and looks with contempt on outsiders" (p. 13). Triandis (1994) has identified four generalizations about this universal cognitive process of ethnocentrism:

1. What goes on in our own culture is seen as "natural" and "correct" and what happens in other cultures is considered "unnatural" and "incorrect."
2. We perceive in-group customs as universally valid.
3. We unquestionably think that in-group norms, roles, and values are correct.
4. We believe that it is natural to help and cooperate with members of our in-group, to favor our in-group, to feel proud of our in-group, and to be distrustful of or even hostile toward out-groups. The more similar an out-group is to the in-group, the less likely there will be hostility between them (Brewer & Campbell, 1976).

Both social identity theory (Tajfel, 1981) and social dominance theory (Pratto, et al., 1994) suggest that an individual's identity and behavior derive from his/her group membership. Tajfel (1981) suggests that group membership provides one with a sense of self (e.g., who one is) as well as with an awareness of how one should behave toward in-group and out-group members. Sidanius and Pratto (Pratto, et al., 1994) maintain that high status groups identify strongly with their group and endorse beliefs that support their dominance.

Minimal group paradigm studies (Tajfel, Billig, Bundy, & Flament, 1971) have shown that simply being randomly assigned to be a member of a group is enough to change behavior to favor the in-group and to be biased against the out-group. Minimal group studies have been conducted in individualistic countries (e.g., meta-analysis of studies from U.K., U.S.A., Germany, Netherlands, Ireland, Switzerland, by Mullen, Brown, &

Smith, 1992; Australia, by Hogg & Sunderland, 1991) and more collectivistic cultures (e.g., Japan, by Kakimoto, 1992; New Zealand children of Polynesian, European, Samoan, and Maori background, by Wetherell, 1982), and findings have generally been replicated with some cultural differences.

Stereotypes

Stereotypes reflect one's beliefs about the characteristics and behavior of persons who are members of a particular group, such as women, older adults, Americans, or the working class. Stereotyped beliefs are sometimes found at early ages, such as John Williams' and my research with children in 25 countries which found consistent gender stereotypes as early as five years of age (Williams & Best, 1990). Other stereotypes, such as national stereotypes, seem to develop at later ages and may be related to different kinds of characteristics (Linssen & Hagendoorn, 1994; Peabody, 1985). Most researchers consider stereotyped beliefs to be a result of cultural messages.

Generally, group members have more positive views of their own group than of other groups. However, group members do not have to have personal contact with the members of another group in order to form stereotyped beliefs about them. When large differences exist between an in-group and out-group in their views of each other, there may be serious consequences for social relationships and intergroup harmony (Smith & Bond, 1999). Stereotypes can guide behaviors toward out-group members, and the illusion of out-group homogeneity (Linville, Fischer, & Salovey, 1989) — the belief that "they're all the same" but in-group members are different from one another — make it easy to treat all out-group members in similar fashion.

Prejudice and Discrimination

While stereotypes represent beliefs about members of a group, prejudice constitutes the attitudes, usually negative, toward those group members (Baron & Byrne, 2000). As a cognitive schema, prejudice provides a framework for processing information such that prejudice-consistent information is remembered more accurately than inconsistent information (Fiske & Neuberg, 1990). Hence, prejudice tends to increase in strength over time and serves to affirm one's self-worth (Higgins, 1996).

Closed-minded people, even those who are not deeply prejudiced, seem susceptible to a variety of rigid, potentially destructive ideologies (Kressel, 1996). Cultural factors, such as public/group acceptance of aggression, religious attitudes such as the notion of a "just war," nationalism, and patriotism are powerful forces that encourage individuals willingly to aggress toward members of the out-group (Hinde, 1997). In contrast, laws, social pressures, fear of retaliation, morals, and cultural norms serve to deter people from openly putting their prejudiced views into practice, but subtle forms of discrimination are still found throughout the world.

Children Who Live in Danger

As a developmental psychologist, I am concerned about the consequences of terrorism on children. Both the research literature and clinical observations suggest that children caught in war and exposed to other forms of chronic danger adapt in ways that produce developmental impairment, physical damage, and emotional trauma, and they are mis-socialized to a model of fear, violence, and hatred (Garbarino, Kostelny, & Dubrow, 1991). Simply witnessing violence can itself be traumatic. However, there are stories of children's resilience in overcoming the challenges of war. One example of such short-term positive outcomes can be seen in Anna Freud's reports of children who survived World War II. However, follow-up studies of those children revealed significant evidence of chronic and profound problems despite receiving compensatory care (Freud & Burlingham, 1943).

Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD)

Children who are forced to cope with chronic danger may adapt in dysfunctional ways. This may frequently take the form of post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), a psychopathological reaction to stress that has been found in numerous cultures. Even years after exposure to extreme violence has ended, children may develop psychological disturbances. For example, four years after they left the country, half of the Cambodian children who experienced the devastation of the Pol Pot regime in 1974-1979, had developed PTSD (Kinzie, Sack, Angell, Manson, & Rath, 1986).

Role of Parents

In such stressful situations, both children's and parents' behaviors change. Parents' coping with chronic danger may become more restrictive and punitive in an effort to protect their children, but often such efforts lead to heightened aggression in their children. When parents are not pushed beyond their stress-absorption capacity, children maintain reservoirs of resilience (Garbarino, et al., 1991). However, when parents become demoralized and do not have access to basic necessities, such as food, shelter, and medical care (Garbarino, 1988), infant mortality rates skyrocket (e.g., as high as 500 per 1,000 births in a Brazilian village; Scheper-Hughes, 1987), as do rates of child abandonment and exploitation. Even strong parental support cannot erase the horror of severe trauma (Aptekar & Stöcklin, 1997).

Studies of children in difficult situations have shown their resilience and increased our understanding of different family structures, but a number of questions remain. For example, one group yet to be studied are the more than 10,000 Sudanese children that Aptekar and Stöcklin (1997) report have lived without adult parenting for several years, moving from Sudan, to Ethiopia, and to Kenya. These children perhaps could teach us about families of "peers" and the consequences of living without parental support. Certainly William Golding's novel, *Lord of the Flies*, does not suggest very positive outcomes in such circumstances. Unfortunately, there are other groups of children, such as those Colin MacMillin is studying who were abducted, enslaved, and abused by the Lord's Resistance Army in Sudan who could benefit from our research expertise.

Moral Development

When children live in constant danger, moral development may be compromised. Those who seem to fare best during conflict are extremists who do not struggle with the moral ambiguities of the situation (Pines, 1989). However, ideology is a paradoxical resource. It bolsters adults, making them better able to care for their children, but it may also prolong conflict by increasing the challenges that parents and children must face. As psychologists we must find ways to help children who live with chronic danger to make sense of their experiences and increase their resilience without breeding fanaticism and intransigence (Garbarino, et al., 1991).

How to Decrease Hate and In-Group/Out-Group Bias?

Although a number of psychological studies have examined ways to decrease prejudice and stereotypes in both children (e.g., Best, Smith, Graves, & Williams, 1975) and adults (e.g., Wright, Aron, McLaughlin-Volpe, & Ropp, 1997) few have attempted to decrease both hostility and negative behaviors directed toward an out-group. Because prejudiced attitudes do not necessarily predict how a person will behave (LaPiere, 1934; Wicker, 1971), it is important to examine studies which have addressed both.

Robber's Cave Experiment

One study that addressed both was conducted in the summer of 1954, by Muzafer and Carolyn Sherif and their colleagues (Sherif, Harvey, White, Hood, & Sherif, 1954; Sherif & Sherif, 1956). Their 1954 experiment on group relations followed the plan of their 1949 and 1953 experiments but with the crucial focus of *reducing* intergroup friction and conflict. The experiment was carried out with three stages. The last stage, reducing intergroup conflict, was the crucial one that was a new step beyond the prior two studies. It is also the aspect of the study that makes it remarkable even today.

Participants were twenty-two previously unacquainted boys around 11 years of age who came from middle-class homes. All were of above average IQ, all were healthy and socially well-adjusted, and none were from broken homes. Hence, they were socioeconomically, religiously, and ethnically homogeneous. The study took place in Robber's Cave State Park, about 150 miles southeast of Oklahoma City, OK, U.S.A.

The participants were divided into two groups prior to the experiment with the groups matched on as many characteristics as possible. The two groups of boys were taken to the park in separate buses and at different times. Until the last days of Stage I, the two groups carried out in-group activities unaware of each other's presence at the camp.

Stage I: Formation of in-groups. Over the course of this first stage, the groups stabilized as they dealt with a series of problem situations (e.g., taking canoes to the swimming place, preparing a meal) that led to a division of labor and status. By the end of the first week, each group had adopted a name, "Rattlers" and "Eagles," each had a bunk-

house, hide-out, and swimming place of its own, and the boys put the names of their group on flags and t-shirts.

Stage II: Production of intergroup friction. The formation of negative intergroup attitudes and stereotypes was planned (e.g., tug-of-war contest) in order to examine ways to reduce them. A series of competitive events and reciprocally frustrating situations was devised with prizes awarded to the group with the higher score at the end of the tournament. Interestingly, when the groups learned of the presence of the other group at the end of the first stage, each group expressed the desire to compete with the other group which led to a flag-burning incident and retaliation, derogatory name calling, and physical encounters. Within six days, the intergroup conflict resulted in unfavorable stereotypes and attitudes toward the out-group, increased in-group solidarity, and changed strategies for dealing with intergroup conflict. Data indicated that friendship patterns were consistent with group membership and ratings of in-group members were more favorable ($M = 97\%$) than for out-group members ($M = 44\%$).

Stage III: Reduction of intergroup conflict and stereotypes. By the end of Stage II, each group saw the other as the "villain" and saw themselves as "aligned with the angels," providing justification for unfavorable stereotypes toward the out-group. Various methods for reducing intergroup friction were considered and rejected (e.g., disseminating favorable information about the out-group; emphasizing individual achievement which would result in group splitting; leader resolution of conflict; bringing groups together against a third, common enemy). Two methods were chosen: first, increasing social contacts between members of the groups, and second, interaction between groups to achieve superordinate goals.

Increasing social contacts with little obvious staff supervision took place in pleasant situations such as eating together, watching a movie together, and shooting firecrackers together. Unfortunately, these situations did not result in positive social interactions or reduced intergroup friction but were used as opportunities for name-calling and conflict (e.g., food fights). Thus, contact by itself, even in a pleasant context, did not reduce intergroup tensions.

Interaction between groups toward superordinate goals was introduced by presenting challenging problems for both groups which neces-

sitated intergroup interaction. Goals were chosen that could not be ignored nor achieved by either group alone – hence, *superordinate* goals. Because it was assumed that friction, unfavorable stereotypes, and social distance could not be overcome in one encounter, a series of superordinate goal situations were developed to reduce group tensions. The situations required different planning and action, but all had urgent goals. Interdependence between the groups was required.

The first urgent situation was a disruption in the water supply necessitating that boys from each group trace the problem and unstop the blocked pipe. When the task was completed, members from both groups were visibly pleased with their accomplishment. However, an hour later at dinner, there was an exchange of invectives between the groups.

The second problem that arose was renting a much-desired movie from a local theater. The camp administrator put up half the money to secure the film, but the boys had to provide the remaining funds. The groups agreed on the amount each boy would contribute, and both groups chose the film. However, when the film was shown, they sat in their groups on opposite sides of the isle.

The third and most striking episode took place at a camp-out at an out-of-the-way place far from the main camp and far from main roads. The groups went separately but both expressed the desire to camp without the other group. The groups arrived in the morning and went swimming. When they returned to the picnic area at lunch, a staff member announced that he was leaving to buy food some miles away. The only means of transportation, a truck, would not start. With considerable effort, the boys used a rope to pull the truck around so it could be pushed to start, which it did. When the truck returned, the boys prepared the meal together. Other meals and further truck pulling were accomplished with boys from the two groups intermingling.

In the closing hours of the camp, on their own initiative the two groups decided to entertain each other with skits and songs at a campfire, and they asked to leave the camp together in one bus. The two groups parted as friends. While friendship choices were still largely for in-group members, at the end of Stage III there was a substantial increase in choice of out-group members as friends and a reduction in rejection of out-group members as disliked ($M = 85\%$ to 31%). There was also a sharp decrease in name-calling and in-group adulation. The increased simila-

ity in ratings of in-group and out-group resulted from the significant increases in favorable ratings of the out-group.

Intergroup Relations

The problem of intergroup relations is reflected in the attitudes, stereotypes, and behaviors of one group toward another, collectively or individually. A member of a group internalizes the acceptable social distances and relationships with out-group members, and if the individual varies from the group norm, he/she is treated as a deviant by his/her in-group. If the functional relationships between groups are positive, favorable attitudes toward out-group members develop. However, if the relationships are negative, then negative attitudes and stereotypes form, leading to greater social distance. Personal and sociocultural factors work together to modify the interactive process between groups and individuals.

Robber's Cave in Other Cultures

Critics have suggested that the Sherifs' study could not be applied to real world social conflicts, but there have been replications with boys' camps in Lebanon (Diab, 1970), the United Kingdom (Tyerman & Spencer, 1983), and in the Soviet Union (Andreeva, 1984). The short-term nature of the groups established in camp studies does not address long-term intergroup conflicts. Nonetheless, the studies do suggest some principles regarding how such conflicts evolve and how they can be reduced. Replications of the Sherifs' studies have shown the importance of *established cultural norms* that provided a background for group interactions. In Tyerman and Spencer's (1983) study with a boy scout troop at summer camp, they were not able to increase intergroup hostility. The well-established scouts' social norm of cooperation was largely unaffected by the manipulations.

When individuals interact with one another as a group in pursuit of common goals, norms emerge that regulate group activity and individual social behaviors. Groups with contact in competitive or frustrating situations develop negative attitudes and stereotypes of each other. However, when antagonistic groups interact in the pursuit of superordinate goals, intergroup conflict and negative stereotypes decrease. Both intergroup friction and cooperation have significant consequences for group rela-

tionships both between and within groups. For intergroup friction to be reduced, in-group and intergroup attitudes must be consistent with each other.

Direct and Indirect Contact

The contact hypothesis (Allport, 1954) suggests that interaction between members of different groups can reduce prejudice and hostility between group members. Contact can lead to recognition of similarities between group members, can provide information inconsistent with stereotypes, and can help counter the illusion of out-group homogeneity (Baron & Byrne, 2000). Contact can promote tolerance and acceptance but only under certain conditions, such as equal status among groups and common goals (Baron & Byrne, 2000). Indeed, in a recent meta-analysis of 500 studies, Pettigrew and Tropp (2000) found that in all but the most hostile and threatening situations, contact is all that is needed. Stereotypes do not necessarily change, but one grows to like members of the other group anyway. Furthermore, direct contact between persons from different groups is not necessary. Simply knowing that persons in one's own group have close friendships with persons from the other group is enough to reduce prejudice (Wright et al., 1997).

Socially-Relevant Research Questions for Cross-Cultural Psychology

In the same vein as IACCP Presidents before me, I challenge you as scientists to address the socially-relevant problems and serious concerns that face our world today. Culture and its institutions are primary determinants of responses to life conditions. Culture provides shared values and goals, images of the world, and processes, such as child rearing and education. Because culture plays a critically important role in group hostilities and violence, there are some questions that I believe we should address:

1. ***Context of terrorism***. What are the consequences for children and adults who live in cultures where they experience daily terrorist threats and activities? What are the outcomes of living in such an anxious context?

2. **Moral imperatives**. What is the role of culturally-prescribed moral imperatives, such as religious and nationalistic assertions, that are used to justify hostilities between groups? Ideologies often contribute to hatred and mistrust between groups and help to maintain longstanding rivalries, some lasting for centuries.
3. **Obedience**. What are the cultural differences in obedience, acceptance of hate propaganda, and the influence of the media that will expand our understanding of how terrorism develops and how to decrease it?
4. **Decrease hostility**. How can hostility between different cultural groups be decreased, not simply in laboratory studies? What sorts of contact, if any, work when group hostilities are strong and well-established? How can a world of caring and connectedness be created?
5. **Developmental pathway**. What is the developmental pathway an individual follows in becoming a terrorist? What life experiences promote terrorist behavior, and what are the cognitive, emotional, and motivational aspects of terrorism for an individual? In contrast, what experiences strengthen the altruistic, benevolent aspects of behavior?

There are certainly many other questions that cross-cultural psychologists are well-suited to examine and that are important to address. On a more positive note, I will close with a true story of cross-cultural concern and understanding.

Gift of the Masai, the World Cares

Kimeli Naiyomah, a Masai villager, came to the United States after a journalist wrote about how villagers raised \$5,000 to help him realize his dream of becoming a doctor. Administrators in an American university saw the story and offered him a full scholarship and now he is a premed student at Stanford. In June, 2002 during a visit home, Naiyomah told his Masai countrymen, an isolated nomadic people in Kenya who shun modern technology, about the terrorist events of September 11, 2001. They were so saddened by the attack on the nation that had shown Naiyomah such kindness that they arranged to present a gift to the United States to express their solidarity. The Masai gave the people of the United States

14 cows, a sacred and significant gift – one of the greatest treasures that a person can own. Among the Masai, cows are used for currency, clothing, food, and they are believed to have supernatural abilities – “The cow is almost the center of life for us,” Naiyomah told a reporter (Pitts, 2002). What an amazing gift.

References

- Adorno, T. W., Frenkel-Brunswik, E., Levinson, D. J., & Sanford, N. (1950). *The authoritarian personality*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Cambridge: Addison-Wesley.
- Altemeyer, B. (1981). *Right-wing authoritarianism*. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press.
- Atran, S. (2003). Genesis of suicide terrorism. *Science*, 299, 1534-1539.
- Andreeva, G. (1984). Cognitive processes in developing groups. In L. H. Strickland (Ed.), *Directions in Soviet social psychology* (pp. 67-82). New York: Springer.
- Aptekar, L., & Stöcklin, D. (1997). Children in particularly difficult circumstances. In J. W. Berry, P. R. Dasen, & T. S. Saraswathi (Eds.), *Handbook of cross-cultural psychology: Vol. 2. Basic processes and human development* (2nd ed., pp. 377-412). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Asch, S. (1951). Effects of group pressure on the modification and distortion of judgments. In H. Guetzkow (Ed.), *Groups, leadership and men* (pp. 177-190). Pittsburgh, PA: Carnegie.
- Baron, R. A., & Byrne, D. (2000). *Social psychology* (9th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Beck, A. T. (1999). *Prisoners of hate: The cognitive basis of anger, hostility, and violence*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Best, D. L., Smith, S. C., Graves, D. J., & Williams, J. E. (1975). The modification of racial bias in preschool children. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 20, 193-205.
- Blass, T. (1992). The social psychology of Stanley Milgram. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 25, pp. 277-329). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

- Brewer, M. B., & Campbell, D. T. (1976). *Ethnocentrism and intergroup attitudes: East African evidence*. New York: Wiley.
- Brown, R. (1986). *Social psychology* (2nd ed.). New York: Free Press.
- Clark, R. P. (1983). Patterns in the lives of ETA members. *Terrorism: An International Journal*, 6, 423-454.
- Crenshaw, M. (1981). The causes of terrorism. *Comparative Politics*, 13, 379-399.
- Crenshaw, M. (1985). An organizational approach to the analysis of political terrorism. *Orbis*, 29, 465-489.
- Diab, L. N. (1970). A study of intragroup and intergroup relations among experimentally produced small groups. *Genetic Psychology Monograph*, 82, 49-82.
- Dwyer, J., Lipton, E., Flynn, K., Glanz, J., & Fessenden, F. (2002, May 26). Fighting to live as the towers died. *New York Times*, pp 1-23, late national edition.
- Fiske, S. T., & Neuberg, S. L. (1990). A continuum of impression formation, from category-based to individuating processes: Influence of information and motivation on attention and interpretation. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 23, pp. 1-74). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Freud, A., & Burlingham, D. (1943). *War and children*. New York: Ernest Willard.
- Garbarino, J. (1988). *The future as if it really mattered*. Longmont, CO: Bookmakers Guild.
- Garbarino, J., Kostelny, K., & Dubrow, N. (1991). What children can tell us about living in danger. *American Psychologist*, 46, 376-383.
- Gibson, J. T., & Haritos-Fatouros, M. (1986, November). The education of a torturer. *Psychology Today*, 20(11), 50-52, 56-58.
- Haney, C., Banks, C., & Zimbardo, P. (1995). A study of prisoners and guards in a simulated prison. In E. Aronson (Ed.), *Readings about the social animal* (7th ed., pp. 52-67). New York: W. H. Freeman.
- Higgins, E. T. (1996). Emotional experiences: The pains and pleasures of distinct regulatory systems. In D. Kavanaugh, B. Zimmerberg,

- & S. Fein (Eds.), *Emotion: Interdisciplinary perspectives* (pp. 203-241). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Hinde, R. (1997). Is war a consequence of human aggression? In S. Feshbach & J. Zagrodzka (Eds.), *Aggression: Biological, developmental, and social perspectives* (pp. 177-183). New York: Plenum.
- Hogg, M. A., & Sunderland, J. (1991). Self-esteem and intergroup discrimination in minimal group paradigm. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 30, 51-62.
- Hovland, C. L., & Sears, R. R. (1940). Minor studies in aggression: VI. Correlation of lynchings with economic indices. *Journal of Psychology*, 9, 301-310.
- Hutchison, M. C. (1978). *Revolutionary terrorism: The FLN in Algeria, 1954-1962*. Stanford, CA: Hoover Institute Press.
- Kakimoto, T. (1992). *Cognitive distraction and the effect of social categorisation*. Paper presented at the 25th International Congress of Psychology, Brussels.
- Kinzie, J.D., Sack, W., Angell, R., Manson, S., & Rath, B. (1986). The psychiatric effects of massive trauma on Cambodian children. *Journal of American Academy of Child Psychiatry*, 25, 370-376.
- Kressel, N. J. (1996). *Mass hate: The global rise of genocide and terror*. New York: Plenum.
- LaPiere, R. T. (1934). Attitudes and actions. *Social Forces*, 13, 230-237.
- Laqueur, W. (1987). *The age of terrorism*. Boston: Little, Brown.
- Linssen, H., & Hagendoorn, L. (1994). Social and geographic factors in the explanation of the content of European nationality stereotypes. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 33, 165-182.
- Linville, P. W., Fischer, G. W., & Salovey, P. (1989). Perceived distributions of the characteristics of in-group and out-group members: Empirical evidence and a computer simulation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57, 165-188.
- Lorch, D. (1994, September 16) Children's drawings tell horror of Rwanda in colors of crayons. *New York Times*, p. A1, late edition.

- McCauley, C. R., & Segal, M. E. (1987). Social psychology of terrorist groups. In C. Hendrick (Ed.), *Group processes and intergroup relations* (Vol. 9, pp. 231-256). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Meeus, W. H. J., & Raaijmakers, Q. A. W. (1995). Obedience in modern society: The Utrecht Studies. *Journal of Social Issues*, 51, 155-175.
- Milgram, S. (1963). Behavioral study of obedience. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 67, 371-378.
- Milgram, S. (1974). *Obedience to authority: An experimental view*. New York: Harper-Colophon.
- Moghaddam, F. M. (2004). Cultural preconditions for potential terrorist groups: Terrorism and societal change. In F. M. Moghaddam & A. J. Marsella, (Eds.), *Understanding terrorism: Psychological roots, consequences, and interventions* (pp. 103-117). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Mullen, B., Brown, R. J., & Smith, C. (1992). In-group bias as a function of salience, relevance and status: An integration. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 22, 103-122.
- Peabody, D. (1985). *National characteristics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pettigrew, T. F., & Troop, L. R. (2000). Does intergroup contact reduce prejudice? Recent meta-analytic findings. In S. Oskamp (Ed.), *Reducing prejudice and discrimination* (pp. 93-114). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Pines, R. (1989, January). *Why do Israelis burn out — The role of the intifada*. Paper presented at the International Conference on Psychological Stress and Adjustment, Tel Aviv, Israel.
- Pitts, L. (2002, June 6). In solidarity: Gift of the Masai shows that the world cares. *Miami Herald*, p. 1E.
- Post, J. M. (1984). Notes on a psychodynamic theory of terrorist behavior. *Terrorism: An International Journal*, 7, 241-256.
- Post, J. M. (1985). Hostilité, conformité, fraternité: The group dynamics of terrorist behavior. *International Journal of Group Psychotherapy*, 36, 211-224.

- Pratto, F., Sidanius, J., Stallworth, L. M., & Malle, B. F. (1994). Social dominance orientation: A personality variable predicting social and political attitudes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67, 741-763.
- Rokeach, M. (1960). *The open and close mind: Investigations into the nature of belief systems and personality systems*. New York: Basic Books.
- Scheper-Hughes, N. (1987). Culture, scarcity, and maternal thinking: Mother love and child death in northeastern Brazil. In N. Scheper-Hughes (Ed.), *Child survival* (pp. 187-210). Boston: Reidel.
- Schmid, A. P., & Graff, J. (1982). *Violence as communication*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Sherif, M., Harvey, O. J., White, B. J., Hood, W. R., & Sherif, C. W. (1954). *Experimental study of positive and negative intergroup attitudes between experimentally produced groups. Robber's Cave Study*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Sherif, M. & Sherif, C. W. (1956). *An outline of social psychology* (Rev.ed.). New York: Harper & Brothers.
- Smith, P. B., & Bond, M. H. (1999). *Social psychology across cultures*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Sumner, W. G. (1906/1940). *Folkways*. Boston: Ginn.
- Tajfel, H. (1981). *Human groups and social categories*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tajfel, H., Billig, M., Bundy, R. P., & Flament, C. (1971). Social categorisation and intergroup behaviour. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 1, 149-178.
- Triandis, H. C. (1977). Presidential Address: Impediments to the progress of cross-cultural psychology. In Y.H. Poortinga (Ed.), *Basic problems in cross-cultural psychology. Selected papers from the Third International Congress of the International Association for Cross-Cultural Psychology* (pp. 3-11). Lisse, Netherlands: Swets & Zeitlinger.
- Triandis, H. C. (1994). *Culture and social behavior*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

- Tyerman, A., & Spencer, C. (1983). A critical test of the Sherifs' Robber's Cave experiments: Intergroup competition and cooperation between groups of well-acquainted individuals. *Small Group Behavior*, 14, 515-531.
- United Nations. (1994). *Final report of the Commission of Experts Submitted Pursuant to Security Council Resolution 935*. Geneva: United Nations.
- Wardlaw, G. (1982). *Political terrorism: Theory, tactics and counter-measures*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Watson, J. B. (1930). *Behaviorism* (2nd ed.). New York: W. W. Norton.
- Wetherell, M. (1982). Cross-cultural studies of minimal groups: Implications for the social identity theory of intergroup relations. In H. Tajfel (Ed.), *Social identity and intergroup relations* (pp. 207-240). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wicker, A. (1971). Attitudes vs. action: The relationship between verbal and overt behavior responses to attitude objects. *Journal of Social Issues*, 25, 41-78.
- Williams, J. E., & Best, D. L. (1990). *Measuring sex stereotypes: A multi-nation study*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Wright, S. C., Aron, A., McLaughlin-Volpe, T., & Ropp, S. A. (1997). The extended contact effect: Knowledge of cross-group friendships and prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 73, 73-90.
- Zawodny, J. K. (1983). Infrastructures of terrorist organizations. In L. Z. Freeman & Y. Alexander (Eds.), *Perspectives on terrorism* (pp. 61-70). Wilmington, DE: Scholarly Resources.
- Zimbardo, P. G. (1972, April). Pathology of imprisonment. *Society*, 9, 55-60.