

Culture in Action: Diversity Training With a Cultural Double

DANIEL J. TOMASULO

ABSTRACT. The author introduces a cultural double technique as a vehicle for cultivating the appreciation of different cultures. He compares the various types of doubling, discusses the use of the technique in an international business setting, and considers the implications for diversity training in other environments.

Key words: action methods, diversity training, role playing, sensitivity training

It is not the same to talk of bulls as to be in the bullring.
—Spanish proverb

IN THIS ARTICLE, I DESCRIBE a cultural double that can be used to provide a practical understanding and awareness of culturally diverse material. I draw from such varied disciplines as cross-cultural psychology, international business, and sociodrama and suggest this technique as training method for understanding ethnic, social, racial, religious, and cultural differences.

For a variety of reasons, our need for understanding culturally sensitive values has mushroomed in the last several years. The advent of the World Wide Web and of instant language translations has simultaneously shrunk our world and made the understanding of other cultures a necessity. From an American perspective, we appear to be on the brink of experiencing what Harvard sociologist Daniel Bell (1976) identified more 25 years ago as a weakening of America's infrastructure through consumer-driven individualism. Because of that, programs that have worked in the past appear to need change. Americans' earlier success with a clear division of labor and staunch individualism needs to evolve to a type of voluntary integration. If we do not learn what is important to others, we cannot attain what is important to us. Indeed, the individualist approach to any culture seems to be in need of such

an evolution. The arrival of the Information Age has forced a communal process to emerge in the wake of individualism. The rapid dissemination of information makes people instantly aware of things that happen on the other side of the globe. The problem appears to be not in the translation of the information but rather in the functional interpretation and understanding of it. To quote Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (1998):

The extension of the division of labor would cause the individual to share fewer and fewer characteristics with other individuals . . . and would call for a new form of . . . biological-type integration as found in developing organisms, which are both differentiated and integrated . . . [a] necessary synthesis of individualism and communitarianism in increasingly complex, differentiated, and interdependent societies. (pp. 58–59)

Let us consider the 1998 economic turbulence in Asia resulting in the U.S. stock market's negative reaction, the so-called "Asian flu" response by Wall Street. The domino effect of worldwide markets was halted once the problem was reinterpreted as a domestic issue for the nations of the Pacific Rim, rather than as an international issue. Alternately, the U.S. stock market not only recovered but soared with that reinterpretation and our reorientation to our own domestic issues. Approximately 2 months after the Asian flu struck, the U.S. markets posted record gains in the technology stocks, and the Asian market swelled. That prompted Nikkei officials to say thank you to Wall Street. Although the jury is still out on the Asian economic crisis, my point is that that mutuality of responses can be seen as an example of the type of synthesis to which Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner refer.

A glance at today's *New York Times* will show that multicultural issues are woven into the fabric of our daily existence. Although that has probably always been true, it appears that the investigation and understanding of different cultures are currently center stage for social, developmental, and organizational psychologists. That statement may be particularly true for American psychologists. The 25th anniversary of the International Association for Cross-Cultural Psychology (IACCP, which is considered central to the development of cross-cultural psychology) was held, for the first time, in the United States in August 1997. The October 1998 issue of the *American Psychologist's* lead article was titled "Cross-Cultural Psychology as a Scholarly Discipline" (Segall, Lonner, & Berry, 1998). In 1999 at the Solomon Asch Center of the University of Pennsylvania, a new program began for the study of ethnopolitical conflict.

In business and politics, the understanding of culturally sensitive issues has become a necessary means for survival. The merger of Chrysler and Daimler-Benz, multinational space programs, human rights violations in China and Yugoslavia, and culturally sensitive issues before the U.S. Supreme Court are but a fraction of the issues requiring consideration on a daily basis. Business,

the arts, religious freedom, politics, and world peace are affected by our understanding of other cultures, or our lack of it.

Ample business and educational materials are available on diversity as well as on the aforementioned issue of individualism–communitarianism (Kagitcibasi, 1997; Smith & Schwartz, 1997; Triandis, 1995). Yet, the vast majority of references are curriculum based, and only a handful of those address the topic of training methods (Bhagat & Landis, 1996; Hui & Luk, 1997). It seems the issue of *how* diversity could be taught is a concern secondary to content.

The introduction of action methods through role playing has traditionally been a primary vehicle for presenting curriculum in an experiential learning process. My current proposal not only advocates for the use of role playing in developing cultural diversity awareness but also further suggests that trainees encounter the impact of their interactions through feedback from a *cultural double*. Cultural doubles reflect the reaction of a culture to an interchange and may be independent from the response of other auxiliaries in the role play. To illustrate how a cultural double can be used, I sought curricula from a highly results-oriented field to highlight both the necessity and consequences of understanding different cultures. I found such literature in the practice of international business.

Some Principles in Understanding Cultural Diversity

I reviewed training materials from a number of diversity training managers for large businesses. Most were proprietary materials that specified the curricula to be learned. I found that one reference appeared on most lists of managers working in global business. Because of its popularity, the text *Riding the Waves of Culture: Understanding Diversity in Global Business* (2nd edition) by Fons Trompenaars and Charles Hampden-Turner (1998) was used as the basis for my understanding issues central to diversity training. The use of a business application is particularly successful because it moves the need for cultural awareness from the abstract to the concrete. My goal here is to augment the principles outlined by these authors through the specific use of selected action methods. The purpose for doing that is to make the learning process more experiential by extracting greater understanding and to increase competence in settling culturally sensitive dilemmas. This example places the cultural issues in such a way that they need not only to be understood but also to be reconciled. The pragmatic basics of business and politics serve as a vehicle to demonstrate the methods. Readers should extrapolate from the examples ways in which the method can be used in their particular discipline.

Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner draw on five relational orientations that were originally proposed by Talcott Parson (1951):

Universalism vs. Particularism	(Rules vs. Relationships)
Communitarianism vs. Individualism	(Group vs. Individual)
Neural vs. Emotional	(Range of feelings expressed)
Diffuse vs. Specific	(Range of involvement)
Achievement vs. Ascription	(How status is accorded)

Although these authors do not mention the use of role play or other action methods as part of their training, the emphasis on using experiential techniques seems consistent with the goals Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner have set out:

Transcultural effectiveness is not measured only by the degree to which you are able to grasp the opposite value. It is measured by your competence in reconciling the dilemmas, i.e., the degree to which you are able to make both values work together. (p. 46)

J. L. Moreno, the founder of group psychotherapy and psychodrama, identified the use of action methods to study racial, spiritual, or cultural issues as *axiodramas* (Blatner, 1987). Although that term is useful to describe the arc of the present topic, I wish to introduce a more specific term relevant to an action method used for cross-cultural investigations. That term is *cultural double*. I use it throughout this article to highlight the specific function of the method and to distinguish it from other types of doubling often used in the clinical aspects of psychodrama and sociodrama. A second shift in terminology is the use of the phrase *split double*, rather than *paired double*. Although paired doubling is often used to highlight and identify conflicting perspectives or ideas, I use the term *split double* to define more accurately the chasm in an internal dialogue between an individual and his or her culture. Finally, I believe it will be helpful to use descriptors such as “primary protagonist” and “secondary protagonist” to determine more easily the subject being discussed.

Application of Sociodrama and Psychodrama Concepts

The use of a double is an action method that is employed for three main purposes (Tomasulo, 1998): providing emotional support, giving emotional expression, and reorganizing perceptions. Although all three purposes are important, the “cultural double” is the vehicle devoted to the reorganization of culturally sensitive perceptions. Standard doubling and aspects of the split double (represented by the term *other double* when graphed alongside the cultural double) encompass the support and expression elements. The position of the double is directly behind the protagonist. For my purpose, the protagonists are those immersed in the negotiation directly. This may be a dual protagonist situation, as in a simple distributive bargaining, or something more complex

with multiple protagonists in an integrative bargaining situation. In those instances, it may be helpful to identify a “primary” and a “secondary” protagonist (referring to those people that way for naming purposes only, not status). In a mediation or arbitration exercise, it may be valuable to label the mediator or arbitrator as the protagonist and the positions represented by others as auxiliaries. Such differentiation allows for greater clarity when assigning doubles.

It is best to think of the standard double as a person who understands the protagonist’s thoughts and feelings. The most reliable conditions for standard doubling (not necessarily for the cultural double) occur when the facilitator allows the protagonist to select his or her own double. The protagonist knows best whom to pick because of *tele*, the natural connections and understandings between people. Here the facilitator asks the protagonist, “Who in the training do you think best understands your thoughts and feelings about your position?” A trainee may volunteer to be the double, or the facilitator may choose the double. The choice of a cultural double may be assigned to a trained auxiliary, who knows the culture being encountered, or to another trainee who the facilitator suspects has knowledge of the culture. It is also possible for the protagonist to double himself or herself.

In each case, the double, standing or sitting directly behind the protagonist, tries to identify the feeling of the protagonist. The facilitator may then ask the double how he or she thinks the protagonist feels. It may be necessary for the facilitator to prompt the double to speak in the first person in order to reflect the protagonist’s feelings by cueing the double to say, “I feel . . .” and then asking the double how he or she thinks the protagonist feels. In the beginning, the facilitator may have to do that several times to orient the people who are doubling. The facilitator may need to demonstrate how the doubling is done in an effort to show the chosen double more accurately what to do. Once the doubling routine becomes part of the regular procedure within the group, the members usually spontaneously offer “I” statements from the double role.

To enhance the depth of support in the group or the range of potential reactions, the facilitator may want to use more than one double with a protagonist, a procedure called a “multiple double.” When the facilitator invites several people to come into the double role, that allows the protagonist to feel the support and range of reactions in a direct way. Again employing multiple double technique, the facilitator has the protagonist sit or stand across from the other protagonist(s), auxiliary(s), or empty chair(s) to reflect the adversarial nature of the role play. People from the training group then stand behind the protagonist to speak his or her thoughts and feelings about the negotiation about to take place. Once the first trainee has spoken, he or she returns to a seat, and the next group member speaks, and so on.

Each of the statements may be a portion of what the protagonist is feeling. Some may be more accurate than others; some may be wrong (see the section that follows on correcting the double). In any case, the array of feelings explored usually gives the protagonist both a feeling of being understood and food for thought. One of the multiple doubles may have said something the protagonist had not thought of previously (such as, “I wish I had more time to negotiate this contract. I didn’t realize how long each phase would take”). The protagonist can select from those doubles the one (or two if a paired double) who can be used to further his or her understanding in the situation. Once the doubles have been chosen, the facilitator asks them to continue with their line of thinking. In that way, the protagonist can more readily experience the depth and breath of the situation.

A multiple double has the advantage of helping the other trainees understand the protagonist’s issues. The technique offers a wide perspective on the issues confronting the person from that culture in that role. Adding action to the training program captures the trainees’ attention and interest. Once the parameters of the negotiation have been identified, the stage is set for the protagonist to experiment with potential resolutions.

If there are opposing thoughts or ideas, the double function may be served best by a pair who take opposite perspectives or by a single double who alternates between those perspectives. In this article, I refer to that as a split double in which one-half of the double is devoted exclusively to cultural issues. Although it may seem contraindicated to have doubles verbalize internal conflict, it is both supportive and insightful for the protagonist to experience the struggle as it is understood by peers.

If a pair is playing the double, it is best to have one person behind the protagonist to the left and the other behind to the right. Often a member of the group plays one half of the pair, and the facilitator or trained auxiliary plays the other half. Two group members can also do that quite effectively. In portraying the inner struggle of the protagonist, one voice of the split double expresses culturally relevant information while the other voice presents conflicting cultural information or emotive reactions.

The Use of the Cultural Double

Let us suppose that you are the primary protagonist and that you are planning your first negotiation with a Japanese firm. You decide to begin the negotiation session with a joke. That is a time-tested, classic opening back in the States, and you assume that a joke helps to start the session off with the right atmosphere. You tell it and receive almost no response, other than a polite smile from one or two members of their negotiating team. Two people representing the split double might react in the following role play, in which the

two people serving as split doubles stand behind the primary protagonist as they voice their response to the situation.

The *cultural* double: “These people are so uptight! I can’t believe they didn’t laugh at that joke. They seem so repressed with their feelings. I can’t read them like I can others.”

The *other* double: “Now what am I going to do? If they didn’t like that maybe they won’t like the rest of what I have prepared. I was more sure of that joke than I was about our initial offer. What am I going to do now? Maybe I should change my strategy.”

A facilitator can have the protagonist play his or her own double as a way of showing trainees how he or she feels or what he or she is thinking. That is particularly helpful if the protagonist does not seem able to choose a double and there are no volunteers. If the protagonist is acting as his or her own double, the facilitator can ask him or her to reverse roles with the space behind his or her chair. In the role of his or her own double, the protagonist may make statements about personal thoughts and feelings for which the facilitator can then have amplified, restated, or altered in some way to enhance clarity. That procedure does not preclude other forms of doubling. A facilitator may still wish to use a single, multiple, or split double after the protagonist has acted as his or her own double. The value of such procedures comes from the clarification, awareness, and acknowledgment that often result from playing this role. As an added benefit, it provides a prescriptive role for others in the group to understand the protagonist more deeply when they double for him or her. As evident in this example, the cultural double for the primary protagonist is not sensitive to the dynamics of the situation. That then becomes the primary focus of the training.

A double can be corrected in two ways. First, the person playing the double can adjust previous statements once it is realized that the statements do not match the internal state of the protagonist. The protagonist can also reverse roles with the double to clarify the statements. When a double says something to the protagonist, the facilitator must check it out, saying something to the protagonist, such as, “Does that sound right to you?” That gives the protagonist a chance to clarify what was said. If the double has made an error, he or she may correct it by trying again with a modified statement. Returning to the joke teller, let us suppose that the other double had said something like this:

This really makes me angry. I can’t believe they don’t even laugh out of respect for me coming all the way out here to meet them. If they want to play hardball, I’ll play hardball!

Suppose now that this misses the mark completely, that the protagonist cannot relate to it or that it is too strong. The protagonist would then have the chance to reverse roles with the other double and say,

I'm disappointed. Maybe I need to rethink how I approach these people. I'm not on my usual playing field, and maybe I need to spend more time learning the rules.

The correction by the protagonist gives the person playing the other double a chance to clarify his or her statements to align them with the protagonist's thinking. The correction also serves to alert others in the group (multiple double) to the more accurate thought process of the protagonist. However, what is equally important in this process is the fact that the protagonist may have clarified his or her own thinking in doing the correction. Thus, this process works on different levels:

1. It corrects the person playing the double.
2. It serves to inform other trainees about the more accurate scope of the doubling.
3. It clarifies the protagonist's own thinking.

If the protagonist is in agreement, then we can move on. If not, and a modification was not forthcoming, the facilitator asks the protagonist to reverse roles with the person playing the double and correct the statement. That then serves as a role prescription for the person playing the double. The facilitator next asks them to reverse roles (back to original positions), and the double repeats what the protagonist said. That will ensure that the thoughts and feelings are on target because the protagonist has identified them during the role reversal. In that way, the protagonist is alerting others in the group to what he or she is feeling, and group members (doubles) will then be more able to indicate accurately the thoughts of the protagonist. Sometimes it is necessary for the protagonist to repeat the process. Doing the role reversal with the double significantly enhances the clarity of the protagonist's thinking. It is important to remember that the people who are playing the double position use projection to try to place themselves into that role. In doing that, they run the risk of not accurately understanding the protagonist's feelings and unwittingly revealing their own. Correction through the role reversal is the way to identify more precisely with the protagonist's intentions.

The process and techniques used in doubling include the following:

speaking the unspoken (what the person needs to say but is not saying)
exaggerating
minimizing
introducing alternatives
restating
amplifying (highlighting the key part of the statement)
verbalizing the resistance (why the person does not want to say something)
introducing paradoxes (as would be done with a split double)
clarifying (Tomasulo, 1998)

Strengths and Differences of the Cultural Double Technique

The cultural double differs from other doubles in three important ways. First, the cultural double incorporates the more generic purposes of doubling but is limited in scope to the cultural perspective. The cultural double may be supportive, expressive, or reorganizing of perceptions. These perspectives emanate from the culture being portrayed (from an auxiliary or secondary protagonist) or from the reaction to the culturally bound behavior of others (as would be the case with the primary protagonist).

Second, the reaction of the cultural double can be either collective or individual. The cultural double in this regard provides a value-laden perspective that may be challenged by the range of individual motivation. The collective is the enculturated reaction expressed by the individual. The individual reaction is more personal. The cultural double reacts as the collective voice of the culture's sense of indignation being expressed through the individual, whereas the individual reaction is personalized. There is no difference in the impact either of these expressions makes. It is merely a difference in how the cultural double can be expressed.

To illustrate the difference, let me repeat a situation offered by Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (1998, p. 200). They tell of an American CEO who arranged business cards on the conference table, aware of the Japanese custom of laying business cards in the same pattern as the seating pattern for a delegation as an easy reminder of names. Alas, when he grew bored and impatient with the evasive answers he was receiving, he absentmindedly picked up one of the business cards, rolled it up, and started cleaning his nails with it. When he looked up, he saw that the Japanese team members were horrified. The card he was using was that of the Japanese president. The president stood and left the room, and the interpreter called an intermission.

What would the cultural double of the Japanese president say? The double may have a collective reaction, an individual reaction, or both. Some possible choices follow:

Cultural double's collective reaction: I am offended by the way you Americans are so arrogant! You aren't interested in listening to our ideas, you only want to express your own. You are preoccupied when we speak. You are not interested in building a relationship with us.

Cultural double's individual reaction: I am offended personally by your behavior. I am insulted because of the way you have shown disrespect for me. Doing that with my card was a deliberate attack. I won't stand for it.

The third way a cultural double differs from the traditional double is that the person being doubled does not have to but may repeat what is being said by the cultural double. Traditionally, the double speaks, and the protagonist repeats what the double says if it is true to his or her thoughts and feelings.

The cultural double may be being used for instructive purposes, and the comments may not need to be repeated. It is only when a cultural double expresses thoughts, and there is certain disagreement with the protagonist that the protagonist should feel compelled to speak and correct what was said.

The Cultural Encounter

Let us now return to the seven domains identified earlier by Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (1998) and use the first dimension—Universalism vs. Particularism (Rules vs. Relationships) as an example.

The universalist presents rational arguments and wants to get down to business. The position is usually legalistic and bound by the terms of the deal. The particularist sees the relationship at the core of the deal and does business with the intention of having the relationship evolve. For particularists, there is no right or wrong, but rather many different ways of looking at the problem. They see themselves as being flexible on the terms of a deal. Table 1 contains a synopsis of the two styles and has been adapted from the text of Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (1998).

A dilemma that falls in the universalist/particularist domain is as follows: Mr. Teok is a second-generation American Chinese employee of a New Jersey pharmaceutical firm based in Tokyo. His goal was to get a joint venture with the largest pharmaceutical firm in Japan. He had negotiated for four years, and the contracts were ready to be signed. He was sent the contract from New Jersey and was extremely distraught when he saw it. It was several inches thick. Because of the complexity of the deal, the legal department said the contracts were necessary. A “letter of intent” was not sufficient. Teok’s career was in

TABLE 1
Contrasting the Views of a Universalist and a Particularist

Universalist	Particularist
1. Focus on rules not relationships	1. Focus on relationships rather than rules
2. Legal contracts readily drawn up	2. Legal contracts readily modified
3. You are trustworthy if you honor your word or contract.	3. A trustworthy person is one who honors mutual need for changes.
4. There is only one truth, the one agreed to.	4. There are multiple possibilities, each relevant to the different participants.
5. A deal is a deal.	5. Relationships evolve.

jeopardy. If he insisted that the Japanese sign the contract, they would see it as proof that little trust had been developed over the four years. It could cost him the deal. If he tried to go with a letter of intent, the legal department would be up in arms and not satisfied.

There are different ways of setting this scenario as a role play, using a cultural double. The following is one way it might be done:

1. Use an empty chair to represent Mr. Teok as the primary protagonist.
2. Across from that chair, set another empty chair for the Japanese CEO.
3. Begin with multiple doubling for Mr. Teok. Different training members can take turns. Some possible responses follow. (Cultural and other doubling might be mixed when a facilitator begins with a multiple double. That does not matter. From the content, it will be easy to discern which is which.)

When the multiple doubles respond, each statement is spoken by a different trainee, who stands behind the empty chair for Mr. Teok.

This is terrible. I've been working for four years with one purpose. Now this. I don't know what to do.

They just don't understand back in New Jersey. If I do this, if I present this contract, it's like a slap in the face. It has taken me all this time to get to this point and the Japanese CEO will just think that I never really trusted him.

I have to make this deal work or I'm through. Back in New Jersey they don't care about anything other than the bottom line. If I don't get him to sign the contract, they won't give me any responsibility.

I don't even want to show the contract to the CEO.

I feel betrayed by Headquarters. They sent me here to do the job because of my background and experience. Then, when it comes time to close the deal, they dump this on me.

How can I make this work? I've invested four years of my life in this project, and I know what everybody needs. What can I do to bring this together?

4. Following this episode, I might assign a cultural double for the Japanese CEO. That double would be a trainee, or a trained auxiliary with knowledge of the Japanese culture. This would give the primary protagonist, Mr. Teok, an opportunity to experiment with new ways to interact with the CEO.

5. To broaden the range of possible solutions, I might then ask members of the training team to take the role of Mr. Teok's double and experiment with different solutions. If two trainees play a split double, the set up is as follows: The primary protagonist in the role of Mr. Teok faces the empty chair of the Japanese CEO. The two trainees playing a split double stand side by side behind the primary protagonist. A cultural double also stands behind the empty chair of the CEO.

6. The primary protagonist in Mr. Teok's role begins by trying out different ideas. To begin, he might say, "I'm sorry about the size of the contract. You know how lawyers are. Please take all the time you need to review it."

Next, those acting as the split double speak. The cultural double says, "I know he isn't going to like this. But I am stuck. He doesn't understand what I'm up against in the USA. We have dozens of lawyers putting these types of contracts together. This is how we do business." The other double comments, "I'm nervous about presenting this way. I hope he understands. I don't have any options."

7. Then the cultural double for the Japanese CEO speaks in reaction to Mr. Teok's remarks:

What is this! For four years, we have worked together, and I thought I could trust you! This is insulting to me. I thought we had the principles of this deal worked out. How can you do this? I have invited you into my home. We have spent much time together. You know my family, and I know yours. Why is this being put in front of me at this time? I'll have to think about this. I am certainly not ready to sign it. I have second thoughts about the contract altogether.

8. As director, I now reverse the roles of Mr. Teok and the cultural double for the Japanese CEO. That allows the primary protagonist in Mr. Teok's role to experience the cultural double of the Japanese CEO. I might then have him start with the last statement the cultural double said. The trainee as Mr. Teok, now in the role of the cultural double of the Japanese CEO, stands behind the empty chair and says,

I am certainly not ready to sign it, and I have second thoughts about the contract altogether. I really feel put off by this. I wish you didn't dump this on me like this. This doesn't feel right. It is too much of a surprise.

9. The trainee formerly playing the cultural double for the Japanese CEO is now sitting in Mr. Teok's chair. Because the function of this role is to help the primary protagonist (the trainee originally playing Mr. Teok), the person might ask a spontaneous question. The trainee formerly playing the cultural double for the Japanese CEO is now sitting in Mr. Teok's chair and says, "What would I have to do to somehow make this more presentable? I certainly don't want to offend you, but I have a problem and don't know what to do about it."

10. Next, the primary protagonist has a chance to think this through in the CEO's double position. The primary protagonist as Mr. Teok is in the role of the cultural double standing behind the empty chair of the Japanese CEO and states,

I think I would have appreciated it if you had told me what the problem was. Because we have mutual respect for one another, I would have seen your dilem-

ma as one that we could work on together. I would have appreciated it if you had acknowledged our relationship first by doing this. That would have let me know that you value what we have developed with each other more than you do some contract.

11. At this point in the process, I, as director, have them reverse roles and return to their original positions. The primary protagonist, back in the chair as Mr. Teok, now tries again:

Our American headquarters have sent me a rather extensive contract concerning our mutual interests. In America, this is standard practice, but I don't want to insult you by bringing it to you. I would like to hear your thoughts on how we might proceed.

Next those in the role of the split double respond. The cultural double says, "My company has sent me here to make this work. I do know both sides of the coin and don't want to force the situation. I would rather it take a longer time and the relationship is preserved than to try and push it and blow the whole thing." The other double comments, "This feels better. I am sharing the dilemma. Instead of Me vs. Him, we have joined forces to mutually deal with the problem. This feels more constructive."

12. Depending on the nature of the exercise, this might be a place to stop and return to the training to discuss and analyze what was done. This pause is similar to the sharing phase following a typical enactment. However, the facilitator/director should use this time to highlight principles and practices that should be observed. The facilitator of the previous example might come up with the following guidelines for trainees:

UNIVERSALISTS (for particularists)	PARTICULARISTS (for universalists)
Be prepared for logical rational arguments designed to persuade you to their way of thinking.	Be prepared for personal stories unrelated to the topic.
They are not being rude when they want to "get down to business," it is just their way.	Small talk is their way of getting to know you. To know you better is the link in doing business with you.
Consult with a lawyer concerning the legal implications of your contract.	Consider the personal impact of your contract (as in the previous example).

Summary

The sample dialogue demonstrates the use of action methods to enhance the understanding of different approaches when there are practical dilemmas. The methods allow for involvement, experimentation, observation, insight, confrontation of stereotypes, conflict resolution, empathy, reconsideration, self-reflection, and spontaneity. The role of the facilitator/director of the action methods is to shift the presentation of the material to an experiential level for the trainees. I believe that it is in this fashion that diversity is appreciated, and the greater goal of making both values work together is achieved.

The primary protagonist in this training technique is exposed to a cultural double who spontaneously responds to his or her efforts. It is through immediate feedback that experiential learning is maximized.

Although these examples are drawn from the world of business, the idea is for trainers to use these experiential action methods within their own disciplines with the goal of increasing awareness of different ethnic, social, racial, religious, and other cultural factors.

I close now with a quote from Segall, Lonner, and Berry (1998) that I found to be inspirational.

. . . cross-cultural psychology will be shown to have been successful when it disappears. For when the whole field of psychology becomes truly international and genuinely intercultural—in other words, when it becomes truly a science of human behavior—cross-cultural psychology will have achieved its aims and become redundant. (p. 1108)

Note: The author wrote this article while he was a visiting faculty member in the Mid-Career Fellowship Program at Princeton University. The author thanks Professor John Darley of the psychology department for his comments and insights.

REFERENCES

- Bell, D. (1976). *The cultural contradictions of capitalism*. New York: Basic Books.
- Bhagat, R., & Landis, D. (Eds.). (1996). *Handbook of intercultural training*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Blatner, A. (1987). *Foundations of psychodrama: History, theory and practice*. New York: Springer.
- Hui, H., & Luk, C. L. (1997). Industrial/organizational psychology. In J. W. Berry, M. H. Segall, & C. Kagitcibasi (Eds.), *Handbook of cross-cultural psychology: Social behavior and applications* (Vol. 3, pp. 371–411). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Kagitcibasi, C. (1997). Individualism and collectivism. In J. W. Berry, M. H. Segall, & C. Kagitcibasi (Eds.), *Handbook of cross-cultural psychology: Social behavior and applications* (Vol. 3, pp. 1–49). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Parson, T. (1951). *The social system*. New York: Free Press.
- Segall, M. H., Lonner, L., & Berry, W. W. (1998). Cross-cultural psychology as a scholarly discipline. *American Psychologist*, 53(10), 1101–1110.

- Smith, P. B., & Schwartz, S. (1997). Values. In J. W. Berry, M. H. Segall, & C. Kagitcibasi (Eds.), *Handbook of cross-cultural psychology: Social behavior and applications* (Vol. 3, pp. 77–118). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Tomasulo, D. J. (1998). *Action methods in group psychotherapy: Practical aspects*. Philadelphia, PA: Accelerated Development.
- Triandis, H. C. (1995). *Individualism and collectivism*. Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Trompenaars, F., & Hampden-Turner, C. (1998). *Riding the waves of culture: Understanding diversity in global business* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

DANIEL J. TOMASULO is an associate professor at New Jersey City University and a psychologist who is in private practice in Holmdel, New Jersey. His e-mail address is TOMASULO@worldnet.att.net, and his mailing address is 723 North Beers Street, #2B, Holmdel, New Jersey 07733.

ASGPP ANNUAL CONFERENCE



Friday, May 3 through Tuesday, May 7, 2002

at the

New York Marriott World Trade Center



Preconference Workshops on Friday
Conferences on Saturday through Monday
Workshops on Tuesday

For more information about proposals
and reservations,
please send requests by e-mail to
<asgpp@ASGPP.org>.