15 Carriers: The Individual in Society and Society in the Individual

> She's become a lot more poised and confident since she started ballet. Both my husband and I noticed it. Of course it's good exercise, but besides that we want her to be elegant. We don't like a lot of the new trends in education; all this political correctness has gone too far. Of course, women have to have equal rights, go as far as they can in education. I have a law degree, but at the same time I think women should have grace, be elegant, be feminine. There are some things worth keeping. A lot of traditions are wonderful, and we want to keep them. Modern dance and jazz and all that is fine, I like some of it, but it doesn't give a woman poise and elegance the way ballet does. Even if my daughter never practices ballet again after this year, for the rest of her life when she walks across a room, anyone with an eye for these things will recognize her poise.

While interviewing the parents of young girls attending ballet classes, such as the mother quoted above, it became clear to me and my student collaborators that many such parents think of ballet as much more than dance and a lot more than just exercise. For many, ballet serves as a powerful carrier, sustaining key values associated with gender roles. Ballet, they assume, can help girls gain the poise needed to be "ladylike"—to sit, stand, walk, talk, and generally behave in a feminine manner. Ballet is part of a tradition that many of them strive to maintain.

The same themes of tradition and continuity can be found in the literature designed to teach children about ballet. In an authoritative book for young readers, the ballet dancer Anton Dolin declares, "I deplore the changing of the great classics, whether by the young who know no better or by the older who certainly should. Who would dare change a note of a Beethoven or Tchaikovsky symphony or change the colour or figures of a Goya or Raphael masterpiece?" (quoted in Gregory, p. 7). In a more recent book for *The Young Dancer*, the ballerina Darcey Bussell stresses the same theme of tradition in

advice to the newest generation of children in ballet classes: "You need to feel and understand the tradition of ballet. Try to learn and appreciate it for yourself and feel that you are part of it. Your dancing will grow and develop in feeling if you know about other arts, too, such as music and painting" (p.7). Such instruction books stress tradition, grace, poise, discipline, proper dress, and proper communications, such as how to bow or curtsy at the end of a class.

Moreover, the decision to send a young child to ballet class is intended, sometimes explicitly, to influence more than just the life of that particular child. By training their children in ballet, some parents see themselves as sustaining a larger tradition, one that runs counter to some more recent trends, such as those associated with popular culture (rap music and so on) and sometimes also with political correctness in education. This, then, is an example of individuals intentionally making decisions in their everyday lives in a way that aims to influence some aspects of the larger society that are of high value to them personally.

Far from behaving like helpless pawns, individuals often intentionally make choices in their everyday lives with the goal of impacting the larger society around them. The exploration of carriers enables us to better unravel how even seemingly "trivial" choices, such as deciding between ballet and modern dance classes for a child, are sometimes made with very important and large-scale issues in mind. A number of parents we interviewed argued that if sufficiently large enough numbers of parents chose ballet and the values associated with ballet, they would be able to influence the climate of educational institutions thus change the culture of schools. All this is attempted through first training a child in ballet; in other words, using ballet as a gateway for the child to enter into society and, after entering, to influence society.

The vast majority of individuals exert whatever power they can by sustaining or rejecting existing carriers, such as ballet, through choices in their everyday lives, but they do not enjoy the power to construct new carriers *and* to make them widely effective. However, a very small elite do enjoy such power; examples are routinely reported in the media. This morning I came across the following example reported in a story appearing on the front page of my daily newspaper:

> About two years ago, newspaper, magazine and television news stories began popping up across the country about a little-known malady called social anxiety disorder. Psychiatrists and patient advocates appeared on television shows and in articles explaining that the debilitating form of bashfulness was extremely widespread and easily treatable. The stories and appearances were part of a campaign, coordinated by a New York public relations agency, that included pitches to

> newspapers, radio and TV, satellite and Internet communications, and testimonials from advocates and doctors who said social anxiety was America's third most common mental disorder with more than 10 million sufferers.
> —*Washington Post*, July 16, 2001, p.1

According to this report, the advertising campaign was so successful that media accounts of social anxiety increased from just 50 stories in 1997 and 1998 to more than 1 billion references in 1999. The vast majority of these stories informed the audience that "Paxil is the first and only FDA-approved medication for the treatment of social anxiety disorder." The public relations agency and the entire "educational campaign" were funded by the pharmaceutical company that manufactures the antidepressant Paxil.

The case of "social anxiety disorder" is one of many that illustrate the power of elites to construct effective new carriers. (For another example of such cases "hyped" in the mass media, see Mary Egan's article on so-called Syndrome X in *Forbes* magazine, listed in the Suggested Readings at the end of this chapter. We are asked to believe that one in four Americans has a mysterious and potentially fatal condition known as Syndrome X.) Through the newly created carrier "social anxiety disorder," millions of people have been persuaded to interpret their bashfulness as a "disorder," as something that is abnormal and must be *assessed through a medical model and treated through drug therapy*. Once again, the focus is on the search for causes within isolated individuals, with complete disregard for the context of their lives. This is particularly ironic in this case, because so-called social anxiety disorder has been manufactured by the context—it is purely a cultural construct, created for marketing purposes. Out of the millions of individuals influenced by this carrier, perhaps several hundred actually need medical help through drug therapy. For the rest, there is no need for drug therapy, profitable though it is for shareholders in pharmaceutical companies, because so-called social anxiety disorder is not a chemical problem with the brain but rather a carrier that sustains particular ways of interpreting the world.

The case of this newly manufactured carrier also illustrates the process of society entering the individual. Through the accumulated influence of psychiatrists, psychologists, and other "experts," as well as countless media talk shows and other outlets, the new carrier becomes widely known and easily available for appropriation by individuals. It "enters into" individuals by becoming part of their everyday knowledge about the world, by becoming something they, too, can talk about and act on. The "problem," social anxiety disorder, and the "solution," the drug, become part of the common sense of the culture.

Carriers, then, are numerous and pervasive in the lives of both elites and nonelites. In this final chapter, I want to explore the dynamic picture of human

behavior we arrive at through the concept of carriers. To begin, I examine the implications of carriers for how we go about examining the individual and society.

Implications of Carriers

Carriers act as transporters of meaning; they are containers into which people load values, beliefs, faith, and the like. The most important carriers are "out there" in public space, and they are shared by many, sometimes millions of, different people. Many such carriers span generations, helping to sustain ways of doing and thinking, sometimes over thousands of years. Well-known examples are carriers that support continuity in religious activities, such as the Christian cross.

Carriers are at once public and collective, private and individual. They are public and collective in the sense that they are present in public space and are collaboratively constructed through the contributions of many people over many generations. For example, in some countries a military uniform acts as a carrier of honor and patriotism, and this has been so for centuries. But carriers are at the same time private and individual in the sense that each individual has a personal representation of a military uniform in her or his mind, and some aspects of this representation may be unique. For example, while a military uniform generally is a carrier of honor and patriotism for Janet, she feels particular pride in being a female officer in the army. The uniform has a special meaning for her that is not shared by Wendy, who is a civilian.

The concept of carrier guides us to look to the larger, shared, collaboratively constructed social world for explanations of human behavior. Although representations of carriers exist inside private minds, carriers are effective through being "out there" in the external world. This has a number of important implications, as discussed below.

Beyond Reductionism

Reductionism, the tendency to analyze phenomena by focusing on smaller and smaller units, is a fundamental and pervasive shortcoming of contemporary research on human behavior. Reductionism has led to an almost complete neglect of the context and the larger world of meaning in which human behavior takes place. Researchers have turned inward to focus on isolated "mental mechanisms" or biological processes as explanations of how humans

behavior. This strong bias in favor of reductionism arises from the cultural characteristics of the dominant society in the world, the United States.

The ideology of self-help and individual responsibility, reflecting the pervasive individualism of U.S. culture, in large part explains the prominence of reductionist research strategies in the twenty-first century. The rise of research areas such as cognitive psychology, neuroscience, and sociobiology—and their influence on psychology, sociology, anthropology, economics, and political science—has a lot more to do with the cultural biases of the United States than with the scientific merit of such approaches. Cognitive psychology, neuroscience, and sociobiology keep the focus on smaller, nonsocial units, such as assumed cognitive processes, neurons, and genes; they are part of a reductionist tradition.

Of course, this is not to suggest that cognitive psychology, neuroscience, and sociobiology do not have valuable contributions to make to human knowledge. Rather, my claim is that the enormous and *disproportional* resources and attention allocated to these research areas—and their very great prominence in the contemporary world—arises from their perfect fit with the individualism of U.S. culture. It is not difficult to imagine that in a different world order—one headed by India or China, for example—the areas of research given greatest prominence would be different. In particular, the role of context and community might be taken more seriously, particularly in attempts to change behavior. Therapeutic techniques, for example, would focus more on changing relationships and the social context, rather than focusing almost exclusively on processes inside a person.

Thus, I am interpreting reductionism as a direct product of strong cultural biases in the United States, biases that depict behavior as causally determined by intraindividual characteristics, things inside persons. I am also pointing out that far from being unbiased and objective, research fields such as cognitive psychology, neuroscience, and sociobiology are the areas *most* influenced by this cultural bias.

Beyond Performance Capacity and the Causal Model

Perhaps the greatest mistake of students of human behavior since the mid-nineteenth century has been to try to copy the physical sciences, such as chemistry and physics. Of course, it is not difficult to see why students of human behavior took this path: They wanted to emulate the "real" sciences and thus to enjoy the high status of science rather than be branded "soft" and similar to the arts and humanities. They, too, wanted to be able to put forward "scientific facts" and to have their findings interpreted as objective.

One way to achieve this, it has been assumed, is to study the internal characteristics of isolated individuals under controlled conditions, just as a biochemist might isolate an enzyme and study its characteristics in laboratory conditions.

Undoubtedly, some concepts and ideas are transferable from the physical sciences to the study of human behavior; broadly, these are the ones most appropriate for studying performance capacity (as discussed in Chapter 1). But certain fundamental differences exist between studying human beings and studying nonhuman phenomena, and in traditional research no more than lip service is given to this fundamental difference. An obvious point is that students of human behavior share the same characteristics as the object of their study, one such characteristic being the tendency both to be influenced by and to contribute to the shaping of cultural surroundings. Human beings reflect on, and intentionally change, their own surroundings; and the surroundings in turn influence human behavior, a process Anthony Giddens terms "double structuration" and discusses with much insight. One of the most important features of the context is carriers, particularly their collaboratively constructed and collectively sustained nature.

I have introduced the concepts of performance capacity and performance style to clarify the domains in which it is, and is not, appropriate to transfer methods of study from the physical sciences to the study of human behavior. Performance capacity concerns human abilities that are determined by physical characteristics, such as how well a person can see or hear. Such capacities are causally determined by the physical characteristics of persons, just as the activities of an enzyme are determined by its physical properties. For example, when David is in an automobile accident and suffers an eye injury, the physical disability causes him to see less well.

But how David interprets what he sees—the meaning he ascribes to the world around him—is a matter of performance style, and this is not explained by the kind of causal relationship found in the physical sciences. For David, an activist in the growing anti-globalization movement, the World Bank serves as a carrier of pro-globalization values. A first issue is how well David can see the World Bank building as he stands across the street from it in Washington, D.C., but a second issue is the meanings this building carries for him. Through social interactions with numerous others in the anti-globalization movement, David has participated in the collaborative construction of the carrier "World Bank," and this carrier sustains values and meanings central to his life as a citizen of the world.

Thus, in order to emulate the physical sciences, students of human behavior have seen it as appropriate to treat all human behavior as capacities that can be measured on a low-high continuum. What is being measured is assumed to be dependent on characteristics internal to the individual. For example, per-

sonality is reduced to scores on a low–high continuum on each of five factors (Chapter 8), and intelligence is reduced to a score on a low–high continuum on an IQ scale (Chapter 9)— all on the assumption that factors internal to individuals determine such scores. But as Michael Cole and others have demonstrated, the results produced by such research are highly dependent on the nature of the research instruments being used. When Cole used traditional Western measures of intelligence, his non-Western test-takers scored very low. But when he assessed the same individuals using tests more appropriate for their cultures, they scored much higher. Studies by Fanny Cheung and others in China have shown that even if the standard personality-measurement procedures are used, results would look very different if Chinese rather than U.S. researchers dominated the field of personality assessment.

The concept of carriers highlights the importance of the collaboratively constructed world outside the individual: the shared culture into which individuals enter and which they help to shape. Another implication of carriers concerns continuities in culture and behavior, in both collective and individual life.

Toward Understanding Continuity

> Paris's Crillon Ball is a debutante dance with a fashion accent. Twenty-four young women, chosen from the international crème de la crème, are presented in haute couture gowns by renowned designers . . . the tenth edition included four princesses and the daughter of an English marquess. But all eyes were on American Lauren Bush, granddaughter of the first President Bush, niece of the present President Bush. . . . She was escorted by Prince Louis de Bourbon . . . direct descendent of the Bourbon kings of France.
>
> —*Town & Country*, April 2001, p. 41

> "Faster! Faster!" And they went so fast that at last they seemed to skim through the air, hardly touching the ground with their feet, till suddenly, just as Alice was getting quite exhausted, they stopped, and she found herself sitting on the ground, breathless and giddy.
>
> The Queen propped her up against a tree, and said kindly, "You may rest a little, now."
>
> Alice looked around her in great surprise. "Why, I do believe we've been under this tree the whole time! Everything's just as it was!"
>
> "Of course it is," said the Queen, "What would you have it?"
>
> "Well, in *our* country," said Alice, still panting a little, "you'd generally get to somewhere else— if you ran very fast for a long time as we've been doing."
>
> "A slow sort of country!" said the Queen. "Now, *here*, you see, it takes all the running you can do, to keep in the same place. If *you* want to get somewhere else, you must run at least twice as fast as that."
>
> —Lewis Carroll, *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*, pp. 209–210

An important contribution of carriers is in highlighting processes of continuity in human societies. The identification of continuity is of particular value in our era, when there is so much talk of the increasingly fast pace of life. The rapid speed of technological change and shifts in certain aspects of lifestyles such as changes in family structure and the decline of the traditional family, can lead to the impression that everything is changing and that modern societies have little in common with societies 50 or 100 or 1,000 years ago. Indeed, in twenty-first-century North America people often feel like Alice when she finds herself in a country where "it takes all the running you can do, to keep in the same place." Carriers such as "American exceptionalism," discussed in Chapter 4, underline this idea of the United States being a different kind of place, a society that changes rapidly and is not hindered by the inequalities and social-class markers characteristic of the Old World of Europe, with its (assumed) class system and inherited inequalities.

But through carriers we can gain a different perspective on continuity and change, one that allows us to identify processes through which people *intentionally* sustain certain activities, values, beliefs— and a way of life more generally—both in the United States and elsewhere. One example is the debutante ball, referred to above in the quotation from the magazine *Town & Country*. The debutante ball had its origins in England, where aristocratic families took up the tradition of presenting their daughters of marriageable age at the Court of St. James (the title given to the court of the kings and queens of England). After a young lady was presented at court and completed the ceremonial bow to the queen, she was considered as being officially "out" in society. The rest of the "season" consisted of balls given by different aristocratic families, in which marriageable young men and women would meet. The main purpose of the debutante ball, then, was to ensure that young men and women from "the right kind of" families married into other such families.

The debutante ball might have disappeared in England in the latter part of the nineteenth century, when the power and wealth of the landed gentry declined and that of the newly emerging manufacturing class increased. The entrepreneurs who made up the "new rich" could have set aside archaic traditions, such as having their daughters do the "St. James Bow" at court. However, rather than doing away with debutante balls, the new rich bought into them and made them even more extravagant.

Similarly, the people in the New World of North America, avowedly opposed to the elitism and the prejudices of Old World Europe, might have turned away from the debutante ball. But far from it! There were already early forms of the debutante ball in Philadelphia in the eighteenth century, and in the twenty-first century just about every major region of the United States has its own "deb season," and this is in addition to the national and international seasons. The new world order and the global economy have been very kind to the debutante ball.

The debutante ball is a carrier that sustains fundamentally important values associated with distinctions between the elite and the nonelite. The separateness and superiority of the elite is endorsed, in part by the exclusiveness of the event and in part by the highlighting of historical "aristocratic" links. For example, in the case of Paris's Crillon Ball, not only are the debutantes chosen from an international crème de la crème but genuine princesses and other aristocrats attend. Their escorts are similarly "superior," with several princes among them.

The theme of continuity becomes particularly intriguing in the case of the star couple at the ball, the debutante Lauren Bush and her escort Prince Louis de Bourbon. Prince Louis is legitimized by being a descendant of an elite American family, living members of which are the former President Bush and his son, the current President Bush. The debutante ball serves as a carrier in both New and Old Worlds, illuminating *normative distance*: the distance between the formal system and the informal system, what is formally presented as taking place and what actually takes place. There are many examples of this in daily life. For example, Americans experienced a dramatic reminder of normative distance in the 2000 presidential election. The crafting of the formal picture of what took place was dominated by the Republican party and led to the presidency of George Bush, while the informal picture of events was experienced and constructed very differently by the opposition, particularly by some African-American voters in Florida.

The continuity of normative distance is sustained through carriers, anchored as they are to everyday social practices. Because the informal normative system is mostly implicit and integrated tightly into the fabric of everyday social practices, it is extremely difficult to change by relying only on top-down solutions. For example, the disenfranchisement of some African-American voters in Florida in the 2000 presidential election is intimately connected with everyday social practices and relations between blacks and whites—the details of discriminatory practices ingrained in U.S. culture and social life—and will not be causally affected through top-down efforts alone. The persistence of such challenges is obvious not only in the "dirty" world of politics but also in academia, where numerous carriers sustain continuity of inequalities.

An example of such carriers is science, which continues to be anchored in everyday social practices that still work against some female academics in fields such as physics, mathematics, and chemistry (interestingly, there is growing concern that an anti-male bias is becoming institutionalized in some humanities and social science fields). A 2001 report in the journal *Science* reflects this state of affairs, which is perplexing if viewed from a traditional perspective that ignores the role of normative distance and the details of informal daily practices. Although 31 percent of the Ph.D. pool of chemists is now female, only 7 percent of full professors, 16 percent of associate professors, and 14 percent of

assistant professors in chemistry departments at nine top U.S. research universities are females. This is decades after antidiscrimination legislation changed the official context for hiring in academia. It is only through attending to the fine details of everyday practices, such as subtle communication cues and networking styles, that it becomes apparent how carriers such as science serve to uphold an informal normative system that perpetuates inequalities (as discussed in the case of gender relations in Chapter 6).

Future Directions

Further explorations of carriers must begin by dealing with a "straw man" criticism concerning the so-called group-mind fallacy, and it is to this that I turn next.

The Group-Mind Straw Man

I have criticized reductionism and the tendency to focus on assumed causal factors within individuals. As an alternative approach, I have drawn attention to carriers and the collaboratively constructed social world *outside* the individual. This orientation may lead some critics to accuse me of assuming that a "group mind" exists. As Gustav Jahoda has shown, this line of attack has been well known at least since Wilhelm Wundt (1832–1920) produced his 10-volume treatise on *Volkerpsychologie*, typically translated as "Folk Psychology," in the latter part of the nineteenth century.

Critics of the idea that more attention needs to be given to context and collective processes outside the individual often drag out the straw man of group mind, on the assumption that attention to collective processes (and concepts such as carriers) must necessarily assume a group mind. These critics then set about knocking down the straw man of group mind by using variations of the following argument: Thoughts exist only in individual minds, and actions are taken by individual persons. There is no such thing as a collective brain or a group mind. Even when a large group of individuals act in unison, and agree with one another in their thoughts, each mind is still a separate entity. Minds do not merge to make a collectivity. Thus the unit of analysis and the focus of study must remain the individual person.

The above analysis misses a major point made by Wundt in his monumental *Volkerpsychologie*, as well as by Lev Vygotsky and various modern cultural and discursive researchers, such as Jerome Bruner, Rom Harré, Michael Cole, and

Richard Shweder: It is not necessary to, and indeed one should not, assume a group mind, in order to give adequate attention to the collaboratively constructed social world of which the individual is a part. The focus on social life outside individuals highlights the features of the human world that stand apart from single persons, that do not depend on any particular individual for their existence. These features come to be appropriated by individuals and shared among groups of persons, but this in no way implies the existence of a group mind.

Individuals tend to appropriate carriers in conformity with others in their group. Thus most people adopt the national flag of their country as a carrier, but not everyone does so. Also, a carrier that is adopted today may be abandoned tomorrow. This underlines flexibility in the use made of carriers.

Flexibility in the Use of Carriers

> Here is something material, something I can see, feel and understand. This means victory. This *is* victory.
> —Abraham Lincoln, upon receiving a captured Confederate battle flag (quoted in the *Washington Post*, April 23, 2000, p. F1)

The Confederate flag, once hailed by President Lincoln as a tangible indication of victory, continues to play an important role as a carrier in the United States, as shown by the high visibility of the flag in and around numerous American homes, particularly in the South, and the continued controversies about the official role of the flag in a number of southern states. The Confederate flag reflects continuity and stability as central features of carriers. But carriers are adopted by individuals and groups to serve particular purposes; they are first and foremost functional, a means to an end rather than an end in themselves. In order to serve their purposes, carriers have also to be flexible, in the sense that they could be set aside and taken up again as the need arises.

Consider, for example, the case of the veil worn by women (by force or otherwise, as discussed in Chapter 6) in many Islamic countries. The veil is used as a carrier of the traditional female role. In the case of Islamic women living in Western countries, conflicts often arise between the veil and the requirements of working outside the home in a modern Western society. The following is a report in a local Maryland paper showing how such conflicts can be resolved:

> A Montgomery County firefighter who converted to Islam has reached a compromise with her bosses on wearing a head scarf required by her religion . . . [she] can wear the hijab while on the job as a paramedic. She has agreed to switch to a flame-retardant hood when she's pressed into firefighting duties.
> —Associated Press, July 13, 2001

In the above case, although the veil continues to be retained as an important carrier by the new convert to Islam, she sets it aside and takes it up again as the situation demands (unfortunately, women in some Islamic countries, such as Iran and Afghanistan, do not have a choice in this matter; they have to wear the veil at all times). In other cases, a carrier can decline in importance but still be used in a ceremonial sense. For example, consider the following case of a bride and groom, a cadet at the U.S. Naval Academy in Annapolis, Maryland:

> [The] groom removes his bride's garter, a traditional symbol of virginity. By publicly removing her garter, [the] groom employs a Civil-War ritual to claim his bride in front of other young men in his community —in this case, fellow cadets.
> — David Cohen, *The Circle of Life*, p. 160.

On the surface, it may appear that this modern bride and groom are engaged in a ritual with little meaning; after all, mainstream modern America is far removed from societies in which the virginity of the bride is prized and considered essential for marriage. Although virginity has lost its traditional role in modern Western societies, fidelity, loyalty, and honesty continue to be among the important characteristics prized in marriage partners. The ceremony of garter removal can still act as a carrier, but in a situation where there has been a reinterpretation of duties (as discussed in Chapter 3). The bride is no longer expected to be a virgin, but she is expected to be faithful to her husband. Thus her duty to be faithful has not changed, although how she should carry out this duty has changed.

The above cases reflect the functional aspect of carriers, which is primary. Carriers serve a purpose, and when they fail to do so they can be adapted or completely discarded. Consider, for example, bra burning as a carrier incorporated into the women's movement in the 1960s, or the Afro haircut that served as a carrier in the African-American movement in that era. Both of these have been abandoned, because they are no longer effective today.

The flexibility of carriers— the ability of people to abandon some carriers and take up others— shows that the cause sustained by the carrier, rather than the carrier itself, is the most important element. Collective movements have shown again and again that they will strive to maintain carriers that are effective and useful for their causes but will adopt new carriers when and if it serves their purpose to do so. The exploration of carriers highlights the fluid, dynamic, and evolving nature of the collaboratively constructed social world outside the individual. The study of carriers is part of a cultural turn in research.

Carriers and the Cultural Turn in Research on Human Behavior

Research on human behavior began to take a dramatic cultural turn in the last few decades of the twentieth century. This has largely been a result of the polit

ical influence of ethnic mobilization, involving the collective movement of African-Americans, Native Americans, and other minorities in North America. Other contributing factors have been increasing globalization and the growing populations of ethnic minorities in Western European countries (South Asians in England, North Africans in France, Turks in Germany, and so on). Ethnic-minority movements and increased contact between Westerners and non-Westerners have led to heightened awareness of cultural diversity both within nations and internationally as well as to a need for more research that takes culture into consideration.

A related dramatic shift has involved sharp criticisms of the traditional research methods employed to study human behavior. The major hallmarks of such traditional methods are (1) a focus on testing isolated individuals divorced from their cultural contexts and, (2) an exclusive reliance on quantitative methods. This line of criticism is associated with calls for more research using qualitative and mixed methods; that is, methods that combine a variety of quantitative and qualitative approaches. As Jaber Gubrium and James Holstein have pointed out, this movement has led to a new language of qualitative research methods; the entire discourse used to evaluate and conduct research is changing.

Another development has been the call for a more multidisciplinary approach to understanding the individual and society. Academics from many different disciplines have lamented the impact of rigid disciplinary boundaries and increasing specialization, as well as limitations of what I have discussed as *the specialized society*—social worlds characterized by increasing specialization and fragmentation. Greater efforts are being made to reach across specialty boundaries, as demonstrated by the rapid growth of multidisciplinary majors and minors on numerous university campuses. Perhaps as part of this same trend, a "holistic" liberal arts education is once again receiving strong support.

The exploration of carriers and the call for more attention to the relationship between individuals and the collaboratively constructed world outside individuals is in line with these three major developments: the cultural turn, more focus on qualitative and mixed methods, and a push toward multidisciplinary understanding. There is also a fourth trend, one that is not yet very explicit; it is indicated by the distinction I have drawn between performance capacity and performance style.

This fourth trend is toward a split between research that focuses on performance capacity (how well the human organism does on various tasks when tested in isolation) and research that focuses on performance style (the meaning various things have for people). For example, in the tradition of research on performance capacity, researchers address questions such as "How many bits of information can Jim remember after a week when tested under controlled laboratory conditions?" or "How has damage to part X of Jim's brain impacted on his ability to remember?" In the tradition of research on performance style,

researchers address such questions as "How do Jim and his friends collaboratively construct the events of last week?" or "What carriers are used by Jim to sustain the memories of last week?" This split between research on performance capacity and on performance style will influence the ongoing reorganization of research and academic disciplines over the next century, breaking old boundaries and highlighting multidisciplicary studies.

Suggested Readings

Associated Press. (2001, July 13). Compromise reached to allow Muslim firefighter to wear scarf. *Montgomery Journal*, p. A3.

Bussell, D. (1994). *The young dancer*. London: Dorling Kindersley.

Carroll, L. (1998). *The annotated Alice: Alice's adventures in wonderland; Through the looking glass*. New York: Random House. (Original work published 1871.)

Cheung, F. M., Leung, K., Zhang, J., Sun, H., Gan, Y., Song, W., & Xie, D. (2001). Indigenous Chinese personality constructs: Is the five-factor model complete? *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 32*, 407–433.

Cohen, D. (Ed.). (1991). *The circle of life: Rituals from the human family album*. New York: HarperCollins.

Cole, M. (1996). *Cultural psychology: A once and future science*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Igen, M. K. (2001, August 6). The unknown epidemic. *Forbes*, pp. 110–111.

Gregory, J. (1972). *Understanding ballet: The steps of dance from classroom to stage*. London: Octopus.

Gubrium, J. F., & Holstein, J. A. (1997). *The new language of qualitative method*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Jahoda, G. (1993). *Crossroads between culture and mind: Continuities and change in theories of human nature*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Lawler, A. (2001). College heads pledge to remove barriers. *Science, 291*, 806.

Moghaddam, F. M. (1997). *The specialized society: The plight of the individual in an age of individualism*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Vedantam, S. (2001, July 16). Drug ads hyping anxiety make some uneasy. *Washington Post*, pp. A1, A6.

Name Index

Adams, C., 165
Aguirre, B. E., 37
Alliance for Aging Research, 221
Alpert, N. M., 165
Alzheimer, A., 211
American Federation for Aging Research (AFAR), 221
Amnesty International, 49, 52
Anastasi, A., 126
Anderson, M. L., 68
Anderson, N. D., 165
Archer, J., 83
Argyle, M., 68
Arjomand, A. A., 37
Associated Press, 235
Austen, J., 102–103, 109

Baddeley, A., 165
Baldwin, W., 113, 126
Bales, K., 68
Barnes, M. L., 110
Baxter, N., 112, 126, 166, 180
Beegbley, L., 20, 68
Bem, D., 103
Bennett, P. H., 193
Benson, C., 126
Billig, M., 61
Binet, A., 139
Blake, R., 20
Blau, D. M., 180
Block, R. H., 109
Boothby, N. G., 83
Bradley, R. H., 181
Brettell, C. B., 97
Brewer, J. B., 19, 165
Bronson, M. B., 180
Bronte, C., 102
Brooks-Gunn, J., 181
Bruner, J., 231
Buckner, R. L., 165
Burt, C., Sir, 138
Bussell, D., 222, 235

Cambell, D., 143
Camposano, S., 165
Cannon, L., 65
Capel, A. K., 97
Cardon, L. R., 193
Carroll, J., 228, 235
Cascio, W. E., 165
Cawelti, J., 51, 52
Chaguan, N., 71, 72, 83
Chang, L., 84
Chase-Landsdale, P. L., 181
Cheung, F., 228, 235
Church, A. T., 126
Clover, G. H., 19
Cobb, J., 69
Coffee, M. C., 97
Cohen, D., 233, 235
Cole, M., 50, 144, 181, 228, 231, 235
Cole, S. R., 181
Cole, T. R., 181, 221
Cook, B. A., 97
Cook, P., 68
Costa, P. T., 126
Craik, F. I. M., 165
Crystal, D., 20
Curtis, R. L., 37

Dale, A. M., 165
Dall, J. L. C., 221
Daniels, N., 68
Darwin, C., 40, 130, 131, 1
Das, V., 83
Davies, K. E., 208
Deci, E. L., 209
De Munck, V. C., 110
Desmond, J. E., 19, 165
Devine, P., 65, 68
Dixon, R. A., 165
Dolan, B., 193
Dolin, A., 222
Druguns, J., 209
Dube, C. R., 145
Duke, L., 19
Duncan, G. J., 181

Eagly, A. H., 89, 97
Ebbinghaus, H., 153.
Edwards, D., 165
Egan, M., 224, 235
Ehrenreich, B., 68
Ehrlich, P. R., 72, 8
Einstein, A., 135
Elliot, G., 102
Engel, S., 150, 165
Engels, F., 69
Enserink, M., 208
Erikson, E., 167,
Ermani, M., 221

Espuña, J., 193
Eysenck, H., 115, 122

Fancher, R. E., 144
Farran, D. C., 181
Fath, H., 221
Fechner, G., 153
Felician, O., 165
Festinger, L., 103
Fiper, O., 37
Finkel, N., 52
Fisch, R., 20
Fitzgerald, E., 206, 208
Flynn, J., 141, 142, 144
Fortune, W. H., 53
Frank, R., 68
Freud, S., 75, 76, 83, 115, 118, 119, 122, 123, 157, 167, 168, 169
Fujimura-Fenselow, K., 97

Gabrieli, J. D., 19, 165
Galileo, 40
Galton, F., 134—135
Gan, Y., 235
Ganis, G., 165
Gardner, H., 131, 144
Giddens, A., 7, 20, 50, 68, 126
Glanzman, D. L., 209
Glendon, M. A., 52
Glover, G. H., 165
Goddard, H., 140
Goffman, E., 221
Golding, W., 41, 52
Goldstein, J. H., 83
Goleman, D., 144
Good, B., 208
Goodale, J. C., 52
Goodwin, F. K., 208
Gould, S. J., 144
Greenfield, P. M., 144
Gregor, T., 83, 84
Gregory, J., 222, 235
Grossman, D., 82, 83
Gubrium, J., 234, 235
Gura, T., 193

Haan, M. N., 144
Haas, J., 83
Haeri, S., 97
Hall, C., 193
Hall, J. R., 68
Handler, J. F., 69
Harré, R., 20, 221, 231
Harlow, H., 172
Hart, C. W., 52
Harvey, T., 145
Hashimoto, T., 110
Hatfield, E., 110
Heatherton, T. F., 126
Hodaya, R. J., 208
Held, D., 68
Hemingway, E., 102
Hendrick, C., 110
Hendrick, S. S., 110
Heraclitus, 6
Herrnstein, R., 130, 140, 144
Hetherington, M. E., 181
Hewitt, J. K., 193
Highsmith, P., 54, 69
Hobbes, T., 119
Hoffman, A., 231
Holsinger, P., 84
Holstein, J., 234, 235
Holtown, G., 97
Homer, 102
Hooks, B., 69
Horacio, F. Jr., 209
Huxley, A., 207

Ijima, C., 193
Illouz, E., 110
Ingram, R. E., 208
Ishiguro, K., 38, 52

Jablow, H. D., 208
Jaguar, W. J., 144
Jahoda, G., 231, 235
Jamison, K. R., 208
Jankowiak, W. R., 110
Janov, A., 110
Jensen, A., 140, 144
Jenilow, P., 37
Johnson, R. A., 110
Jorm, A. F., 231
Joyce, P., 69
Jung, C., 115

Kasuper, R., 84
Kagan, J., 126, 172
Kamudu, A., 97
Kasson, J. F., 52
Kato, P. M., 208
Kawachi, I., 68
Keats, J., 206
Keenan, J. P., 165
Kelleher, K. J., 181
Kennedy, P., 68
Kerchner, G. A., 145
Kerr, S. A., 165
Khachaturian, H., 209
Khayam, O., 206, 208
Kigar, D. L., 145
Kimmel, M. S., 97
Kirby, R. S., 181
Kitman, T., 221
Kleinman, A., 83, 208, 209
Kohlberg, L., 167, 169, 170, 171
Koslow, S. H., 209
Kosslyn, S. M., 165
Koutstaal, W., 165
Knudsen, C. M., 83
Kolomitskii, B., 37
Kramer, P., 200, 209
Kuller, L., 144
Kumagai, F., 97

Lamb, M. E., 181
Lambton, A. K., 97
Lamiell, J. T., 126
La Piere, R., 123
Lauren, P. G., 52

Lawler, A., 235
Lederhendler, I. I., 209
Leontiev, A. N., 126
Lessnoff, M., 126
Leung, K., 235
LeVine, R., 110
Lewin, K., 20
Lewis, M. L., 181
Li, K.Z.H., 165
Lieb, J., 208
Lipset, S. M., 55, 69
Lin, G., 145
Locke, J., 40
Lombroso, C., 135
Lonner, W. J., 126

Maccoby, E. E., 89, 97
MacKay, S., 97
Madison, J., 40
Madra, A. S., 84
Mann, T., 208
Manolio, T. A., 144
Maril, A., 165
Markoe, G. E., 97
Marsella, T., 209
Marx, K., 34, 35, 37, 64, 67, 68, 69, 74, 77, 109
Maslow, A., 115, 122
Matteo, S., 97
Matson, M. P., 84
May, S. A., 97
McAdams, D. P., 126
McCrae, R. R., 126
McEvoy, G. M., 165
McGarty, C., 69
McGuffin, P., 72, 84
McMurrer, D. P., 69
Meeks, K., 37
Meinecke, D. L., 209
Meisels, S. J., 181
Mendel, C., 120
Mernissi, F., 97
Meyer, J., 37
Mezzich, J. E., 209
Middlebrook, D., 165
Middlebrook, K. J., 37
Miller, D. L., 37
Miller, J., 113
Miranda, J., 208
Mischel, W., 123, 127
Moghaddam, F. M., 20, 53, 69, 97, 221, 235
Montesquieu, C., 6
Murray, C., 130, 141

Nakamura, R. K., 209
Neiderhiser, J. M., 181
Nietzel, M. T., 53
Nisbet, R., 37
Nozick, R., 119

Ogletree, S. M., 97
Opie, I., 181
Opie, P., 181
Otero, A., 209
Owens, W., 143

Paine, T., 40
Pareto, V., 34, 35, 37
Parron, D. L., 209
Parsons, T., 7
Pascual-Leone, A., 165
Payer, L., 196, 209
Person, E. R., 110
Perusse, L., 193
Pesson, E., 69
Phillips, D. A., 181
Piaget, J., 167, 169, 170, 171, 173, 174
Pilling, A. R., 52
Plato, 33
Plomin, R., 84, 181
Popper, K., 171
Posner, M. I., 20
Powers, C. H., 20
Pribram, K., 12, 20
Proust, M., 162, 165
Putnam, R., 50, 69

Raichle, M. E., 20
Rambele, M., 83
Rampon, C., 145
Rao, D. C., 193
Rapson, R. L., 110
Rayussin, R., 193
Rawls, J., 119
Rawls, R. L., 193
Reiss, D., 181
Reynolds, P., 83
Rice, T., 193
Riley, D., 84
Rogers, C., 115, 122
Rosen, B. R., 165
Rosenblatt, R., 193
Rosenthal, R., 221
Rothenberg, P. S., 69
Rothman, D. J., 53
Rothman, S. M., 53
Rorte, M., 165
Rousseau, J. J., 40
Ryan, R. M., 209

Sabat, S., 218, 219, 220, 221
Salisbury, H. E., 37
Sapolsky, R., 84
Sargent, C. E., 97
Sato, S., 110
Sawhill, I. V., 69
Schachter, D. L., 165
Schafauser, N., 69
Schaie, K. W., 145
Schama, S., 31, 37
Schildkraut, J. J., 209
Schneider, C., 69
Schubert, K., 84
Schulz, L. O., 193
Segal, Z. V., 208
Sekuler, R., 20
Selmett, R., 69
Shakespeare, W., 102, 105, 107, 170, 171
Shermanski, L., 144
Sherif, M., 74, 75
Shimizu, R., 145
Shonkoff, J. P., 181
Sidorenko, A., 221
Siegel, A., 84
Simonides, 156
Sing, C., 84
Singer, A. T., 98, 110
Singh, P., 84
Thomp
Thorn

Singer, A. L., 98, 110
Singh, P., 84
Skinner, B. F., 115, 121, 123, 125
Sloan, T., 127
Smith, J., 181
Snidemand, N., 126
Song, W., 235
Sonnert, G., 97
Spencer, H., 130
Spunsel, L., 84
Steele, C., 138, 221
Stein-Brelaeus, B., 84
Sternberg, R. J., 110, 131, 145
Stevens, S. S., 20
Sukel, K. E., 165
Sun, H., 235
Suomi, S., 172
Swift, J., 61

Tajfel, H., 59, 61
Tanaka-Matsumi, J., 209
Tang, Y. P., 145
Taylor, D. M., 69
Terman, L., 143
Thomas, S., 97
Thompson, D., 157
Thompson, J. K., 193
Thompson, W. L., 165
Thorndike, E. L., 125
Thurstone, L. L., 123
Tilghman, S. M., 208
de Tocqueville, A., 65
Tomasello, M., 181
Tsien, J. Z., 136, 137
Turner, J. C., 61
Turner, J. H., 20, 69
Turner, J. R., 193

Urbina, S., 126

Valencia, M. R., 193
VanDuijn, C. M., 221
Vendantam, S., 235
Venter, J. C., 84
Verma, J., 110
Vitkovic, L., 209
Vonneman, R., 65
Vygotsky, L., 119, 127, 175, 176, 181, 219, 231

Wagner, A. D., 165
Walsh, A., 110
Watson, J. B., 181
Wazlawick, R., 33, 37
Weakland, J. H., 20
Weart, S., 84
Weigert, S. C., 126
Weinberger, J. L., 126
White, L., 69
Wilcox, C., 97
Winkler, M. G., 181, 231
Wiseman, C. V., 193
Wittelson, S. B., 145
Woodbel, S., 84
Wijghsman, L. S., 53
Wundt, W., 231

Xie, D., 235

Yates, F., 156, 165
Yeats, W. B., 164
Yeh, M., 84
Yerkes, R., 139, 140
Yeung, W. J., 181

Zaleman, S., 209
Zandy, J., 69
Zhang, J., 235
Zhao, Z., 19, 165
Zhue, M., 145
Zuckerman, M., 110

Subject Index

Aggression
  and children, 81–82
  cultural explanations, 77–83
  materialist explanations, 74–75, 76
  psychodynamic explanations, 75–76
  sociobiological explanations, 71–72, 76
Alzheimer's disease
  active lifestyle importance, 215
  association with age, 213–214
  stereotypes of, 216–218
  testing for, 210–211, 221
American dream, 3, 41–48
American exceptionalism, 8–9, 55, 64
Army Alpha and Beta intelligence tests, 143
Authority relations, 27–29

Beauty ideals, 184–185
Berkeley Growth Study, 143
Big Five personality traits, 116–118
Biological processes, 6, 7, 17, 96, 100, 136–138, 189–190, 201–203, 214
Bowling alone, 50, 55

California Personality Inventory (CPI), 117, 124
Carriers, 8–11, 23–25, 27–28, 30, 33, 41–50, 77–83, 111–112, 129–130, 151–153, 176–178, 184, 195–196, 216–218, 222–225, 232–235
Categorization
  non-social phenomena, 60–61
  relation to social class, 64–65
  social phenomena, 61–64
Causation, 12, 14–16, 159–160, 174–175, 226–228
Change, 5, 6, 8, 9, 16–17, 23, 29–35, 87–89, 107–109, 118, 124, 132–133, 186–190, 228–231
Children and violence, 81–83
Collaborative construction, 5, 7, 11, 13, 28, 196
Collectivism, 45, 50–51
Communist societies, 6
Consciousness, 75–77
Consumerism, 185–186
Crystalized intelligence, 132

Depression
  and behavioral style, 194–197, 203–205
  bipolar–unipolar, 198
  and culture, 205–208
  drug therapy of, 200–203
  gender differences in, 198
  hereditary factors, 199
Development
  as biological destiny, 172
  as collaborative construction, 174
  stage models of, 167–173
Discrimination, 87–89
Displaced aggression, 76
Divorce, 104–108

Eating disorders
  biological factors in, 189–190
  and cultural values, 190–192
  and girls, 182–189
  weight control, 186–188
Emotional intelligence, 131
Experimental methods, 12

False consciousness, 67–68
Folk psychology (*Volkerpsychologie*)
Formal "black letter" law, 32, 39–40
Fluid intelligence, 132
Flynn effect, 141–142

Gender
  activism outside the home, 85–
  continuity in Iran, 89–92
  continuity in Japan, 92–94
  continuity in the West, 94–95
  discrimination, 87–89
Gestalt psychology, 57–59

H.M., case of, 159
Human duties, 38, 45–47, 50–52
Human Genome Project, 72
Human rights, 38, 45–47, 50–52,

Idiographic approach, 197
Immigrants, 4, 9, 66–68, 128–129
Individualism, 45, 50–52, 55–56
Informal "common sense" law, 32
In-group, 60–64, 74
Intelligence
  genetic basis, 136–138
  lifespan changes, 142
  myth of declining intelligence,
  physiological measures of, 134
  relation to context, 139
  and social inequalities, 130–13
  types of, 132–134
Interdisciplinary approach, 6, 7,
Iran, 21–29
Islamic fundamentalism, 25, 26, 7

Khomeini, 25

Laboratory methods, 12
Leadership, 25–29, 36–37, 42–43

Machiavellian intelligence, 131
Macrosociology, 6–7

False consciousness, 67–68
Folk psychology (*Volkerpsychologie*), 231–233
Formal "black letter" laws, 32, 39–40, 46–47, 88
Fluid intelligence, 132
Flynn effect, 141–142

Gender
  activism outside the home, 85–87
  continuity in Iran, 89–92
  continuity in Japan, 92–94
  continuity in the West, 94–95
  discrimination, 87–89
Gestalt psychology, 57–59

H.M., case of, 159
Human duties, 38, 45–47, 50–53
Human Genome Project, 72
Human rights, 38, 45–47, 50–53, 107

Idiographic approach, 197
Immigrants, 4, 9, 66–68, 128–129
Individualism, 45, 50–52, 55–56
Informal "common sense" laws, 32, 45–47, 88
In-group, 60–64, 74
Intelligence
  genetic basis, 136–138
  lifespan changes, 142
  myth of declining intelligence, 139–142
  physiological measures of, 134–136
  relation to context, 139
  and social inequalities, 130–131
  types of, 132–134
Interdisciplinary approach, 6, 7, 17
Iran, 21–29
Islamic fundamentalism, 25, 26, 70

Khomeini, 25

Laboratory methods, 12
Leadership, 35–29, 36–37, 42–43

Machiavellian intelligence, 131
Macrosociology, 6–7
Mao Zedong, 26
Margin of generational development, 178–180
Margin of performance expectations, 218–220
Materialist explanations, 74–75
Memory
  and aging, 163–164
  and brain localization, 158–160
  as capacity, 153–155
  collective memory, 151–153
  engram, 157
  implicit/explicit, 157
  method of *loci*, 156
  reconstructed, 149–151, 161–163
  types of, 154–155
Micro/macro law of change, 32–34
Microsociology, 6–7
Militarism, 79–82
Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI), 117, 124
Minority groups, 87–89
Motivation, 4
Multiple intelligence, 131–132

Neuroimaging techniques, 158–160
Neurons, 201–202, 214
Nomothetic approach, 197
Nonsense syllables, 153–154
Normative distance, 230
Normative vs. causal explanations, 14–16, 95–96
Norms, 5, 6, 9, 27–28

Obedience, 38, 42, 47, 49–50
Out group, 60–64, 74
Ownership rules, 179–180

Perception, principles of organization, 56–61
Performance capacity, 12–18, 116–118, 226–230
Performance style, 12–18
Personality
  assumed stability in, 111–112, 118–120, 122–125
  commonsense personality, 113

Personality (*continued*)
popular culture and, 112–113
and temperament, 120–122
tests of, 116–117
Practical intelligence, 131
Primitive social relations, 40
Projective tests, 117, 124
P.S., case of, 159–160

Reciprocity, 43, 46
Reductionism, 125–126, 174–175, 225–226
Revolution, 21–25, 29, 34–35, 48–50, 89–92
Roles, 9
Romantic love
as central carrier, 98–99, 106–109
in classic literature, 101–104
and fairytales 98
gender differences, 106
social stability, 108–109
universal features, 100
Rorschach inkblots, 117
Rules, 9

Scaffolding (Vygotskian), 176, 230
Seattle Longitudinal studies, 143
Sikhs, 80–81

Social class
and American exceptionalism, 54–56, 64–67
and cognitive processes, 56–64
and consciousness, 67
and continuity, 238
Social contract, 119–120
Social mobility, 55, 65
Sociobiology, 71–73, 74, 77
Stability in behavior, 108, 118, 123–125
Stereotypes, 138–139, 216–218
Structured tests, 124
Superordinate goals, 74–75

Temperament, 120–122
Thematic Apperception Test (TAT), 117
Torture, 48–50
Trust, 43–44
Turn-taking, 40, 45
Type A/Type B personality, 116

WAI, 70–71, 73, 76–83

Zone of proximal development, 175–176

The Individual and Society
A Cultural Integration

Fathali M. Moghaddam
Georgetown University

How is it that individuals grow up to be independent beings with private thoughts and feelings, yet also become integral parts of a continuous collective life? This book explores the fascinating relationship between the individual and society through a multi-disciplinary approach, drawing from research in social psychology, sociology, political science, anthropology, cultural psychology, neuroscience, and cognitive psychology. The concept of carriers, such as national flags and other symbols through which styles of behavior are socially manufactured, individually appropriated, and collectively passed on from generation to generation, is introduced to explain the merging of individuals in society and the penetration of the social into all aspects of behavior. The multi-disciplinary approach is matched by the breadth of the topics discussed, from romantic love, personality, intelligence, memory, eating disorders, depression, and Alzheimer's disease, to more macro-level topics of revolutions, human rights and duties, social class, gender, and collective aggression.

About the Author

Fathali M. Moghaddam is Professor of Psychology at Georgetown University. Through his numerous books and scientific papers Dr. Moghaddam has gained international recognition for his original contributions to an interdisciplinary understanding of human behavior. He lives in Maryland with his wife, daughter, and son, and his hobby is travel across national and disciplinary borders.

ISBN 0-7167-5222-0