



BRILL

JOURNAL OF PHENOMENOLOGICAL
PSYCHOLOGY 51 (2020) 1–15



brill.com/jpp

From Personal Threat to Cross-Cultural Learning: an Eidetic Investigation

Eugene M. DeRobertis

Department of Psychology, Brookdale Community College, USA
ederobertis@brookdalecc.edu

Andrew M. Bland

Department of Psychology, Millersville University, USA
Andrew.Bland@millersville.edu

Abstract

This study was an eidetic, phenomenological investigation of cross-cultural learning that involves overcoming an experience of personal threat. The study and its findings were placed within the context of Husserl's genetic phenomenology and the extant humanistic literature on cross-cultural encounter. This appeared especially appropriate given phenomenology's history "within the movement of the so-called 'Third Force' psychology" (Giorgi, 1970, p. xi). The eidetic reduction revealed the phenomenon to be rooted in an essential unfamiliarity with the other compounded by presumptions of the other as representing a substandard foreignness harboring danger. For the phenomenon to unfold required the learner to witness spontaneous emotional expression and empathically discover that the other struggles and suffers "like any other human being." Openness to the other progressively builds and new meanings emerge from the interpersonal exchange as compartmentalized, intellectualized understandings of the other are outmoded.

Keywords

cross-cultural learning – cross-cultural encounter – co-creation of culture
phenomenology – eidetic analysis – humanistic psychology

• • •

The thing that [affected] me most was when my enemy came close / And I saw that his face looked just like mine

BOB DYLAN (1963)



This study revives themes introduced by Husserl (1999, 2001) in the development of his genetic phenomenology. This period of Husserl's work highlights the manner in which constituting subjectivity is itself co-constituted intersubjectively within a developmental process. Beginning with the maternal relation in utero and continuing within a widening spectrum of interpersonal relationships after birth, the ego inherits the bases of what will become its habitualities (Allen, 1976; see also Erikson, 1959/1994). Habitualities are progressively forged into relatively unique, multilayered sedimentations over time as part and parcel of the ego's drive toward personality integration. This process is nowise "purely" or "merely" passive, as genetic phenomenology seeks to illuminate the developmental origins of the socioculturally- and historically-embedded subject without resorting to an historicist reductionism. Specifically, healthy maturing individuals fulfill their humanity via the emergence of the formal act of empathy, complemented by an evolving intuitive discernment that allows one to participate in the life of reason and responsible stance-taking. Thus, as Donohoe (2004) put it, the ego "is not constituted through ... blind adherence to all its previous positions" (p. 92). This, in our view, implicates the most fecund power of *learning* in the life of a developing person, which is its potential for transcending sedimented mental and/or behavioral habitualities.

1 Cultural Co-Creation as Context for Learning

The kind of learning studied here exemplifies this power to shed layers of sedimented habit in the context of a cross-cultural encounter. As Biceaga (2010) has shown, the importance of cross-cultural encounter played an important role in Husserl's later writings. In Husserl's view, the ego and alter-ego belong to a homeworld (*Heimwelt*) and an alienworld (*Fremdwelt*), respectively. The self, as embedded within a meaningfully-structured cultural homeworld, is not impervious to the other from his or her alienworld due to a fundamental receptivity inherent in the formation of both egos and cultures. Homeworlds are, *by necessity*, modulated by contact with alienworlds to some extent due to the

essential non-self-sufficiency and incompleteness, if not open-endedness, of any given culture. On this view, the self and the other, by mutually participating in familiar homeworlds and unfamiliar alienworlds, “balance each other out and temper the risks that would befall their unilateral affirmation” (p. 122). Optimally, then, the self participates in the co-constitution of culture, but not merely by the uncritical acceptance of the traditions of either homeworld or alienworld. Rather, there is a building upon and expansion beyond what has been received from previous generations with an openness to what lies past the boundaries set in place by the sedimentations of those traditions. As Biceaga put it:

Passivity necessarily places both homeworlds and alienworlds in the open space of an encounter.... Cultural self-understanding includes interpretations received from without and autochthonous responses to those interpretations, both homeworlds and alienworlds are made to acknowledge their non-self-sufficiency along with the possibility of being infinitely transformed through their encounters. (p. 125)

2 Extant Research on Cross-Cultural Encounters

Research within the humanistic tradition of psychology has supported this viewpoint and continues to do so. To illustrate, Moats, Claypool, and Saxon (2011) reflected that their cross-cultural encounters as graduate students studying in China prompted a movement “from a theoretical and cognitive/rational understanding ... to a deeper, soulful, emotional, and experiential understanding”; both their individual and collective paths were “[illuminated] ... to new insights” in which “external, political, and religious ideologies faded to the background as the feeling of oneness of humans that were thrown into this world were embraced [and] melted into [their] being” (pp. 280–281). Likewise, Kim, Heo, King, & Kim (2014) observed that (a) White Americans’ exposure to Korean values and beliefs (e.g., collectivistic thinking, group harmony, reverence for old age and wisdom) via Taekwondo prompted their adoption of “new and respectful behaviors” and a more interdependent worldview which they could generalize to interactions in other settings (p. 367) and (b) for Americans of East Asian descent who participated in Taekwondo training with White Americans, the development of cross-group friendships was conducive to better assimilation of the American worldview and participants’ ability to “maintain two cultural identities” (p. 368). Similarly, Barreto (2013) noted that, for individuals who emigrated to the U.S. to continue their careers as therapists:

The borderland, or living in-between cultures, experience was unsettling and disturbing; however, it allowed [them] to understand and empathize with others' similar experiences and to contain feelings associated with the trauma of immigration, transforming them into therapeutic tools.... [They were] reminded constantly not to take things for granted or predict the other's response in diverse situations. However, it also led them to exercise holding back [their] own cultural or personal assumptions and to become open to clients' experiences. (pp. 348, 353)

Accordingly, such experiences also served to shatter the “faulty conclusion that only persons of like cultures should work together therapeutically” (Vontress & Epp, 2015, p. 474).

3 Contributions of This Study

Against this background, an EBSCO search conducted in June 2019 suggested that the topic of cross-cultural encounter has rarely if ever been broached in the literature on psychology of learning (which typically focuses on behavior and mental processes as passively determined and/or shaped by external forces—i.e., conditioning or exposure to models—without accounting for the stream of embodied consciousness, intentionality, self-transcendence, and the co-constitution of the world via shared meaning-making, DeRobertis & Bland, 2019). Thus, the dual contributions of this study are (a) to introduce a dimension of culture to the learning literature and (b) to discuss the findings of this study in relation to the extant literature on cross-cultural encounter, specifically within the humanistic tradition in psychology where the topic has long been of interest (e.g., Adler, 1975; Combs, 1999; Halverson, 2017; Jourard & Landsman, 1980; Maslow, 1999; Montuori & Fahim, 2004; Murphy, 1958; Tate, 1973a, 1973b; Van Kaam, 1961) and where phenomenology has traditionally found its home (Giorgi, 1970).

4 Method

4.1 *Recruitment and Participants*

IRB approval for research with human participants was obtained from the primary author's institution in October 2018. Participants were solicited via announcements made around campus. The primary author met with volunteers as they came forward to determine if their experiences matched the focus of the study. In total, eleven volunteers were screened until a baseline

of three participants were identified (see Giorgi, 2009). These included: (a) a 54-year-old Chinese female who moved to the United States when she was approximately 30 years old, (b) a 36-year-old White American female, and (c) a 32-year-old White American male. Although the third participant had previously been a student of the primary author, none of the participants were current students of the primary author at the time of the research. No compensation was provided for participation in this study.

4.2 Procedure

This study utilized Giorgi's (2009) descriptive phenomenological methodology for its analytic procedures. In brief, the steps of the method were as follows:

1. Adopt the phenomenological attitude of the *epoché*, bracketing or provisionally setting aside what one knows (or thinks one knows) about the object of study to free oneself from the objectivism of both the everyday natural attitude and its naturalistic/natural scientific attitudinal derivation.
2. Read through each individual account of the phenomenon under investigation for a sense of the whole.
3. Reread each account for the purpose of distinguishing units of meaning.
4. Transform the meaning units, expressing their essential meanings in psychological language to disclose the thematic constituents of the phenomenon at the level of each individual account.
5. Synthesize a general structural description from the invariant themes or essential meanings running across the individual data sets.

Each of these steps is articulated in more detail below.

The primary author carried out the data collection and analysis and collaborated with the secondary author to construct the broader narrative, placing this research within the context of the extant empirical and theoretical literature. Having provided written consent, the participants were duly informed that the proposed research involved voluntarily disclosing personal experiences of having encountered another culture, initially feeling threatened, and then overcoming this feeling in a cross-cultural learning experience. Each participant responded to the following query:

Please describe an instance where you were exposed to another culture's lifestyle and/or viewpoints and initially felt threatened, but then learned something that broadened your personal horizons. Please include in your response how the experience began and played out. Proceed as if you are speaking to someone who knows nothing at all about such experience but who wants to know what it is like to go through it.

Participant interviews were transcribed for protocol analysis. The method employed in this study demanded a phenomenological attitude of disciplined openness to meanings, especially those meanings that may deviate from what the research would otherwise expect to find. That is, the bracketing of one's presuppositions was required. In accordance with the phenomenological *epoché*, presuppositions were not merely put into doubt, but rather provisionally held in abeyance to allow for a fresh, unbiased appreciation of the phenomenon. The *epoché* both facilitates a heightening of the researcher's presence to the activity of consciousness and allows one to experience the phenomenon under investigation beyond the confines of the natural attitude, thus guiding the entirety of the research process. Stated differently, the *epoché* provides the basis upon which the researcher attains a means for overcoming the prejudices of both everyday assumptions embedded within the participants' personal accounts as well as the researcher's scientific assumptions. As Giorgi (2009) noted, the phenomenological attitude allows the researcher to understand the natural attitude better than the natural attitude "understands itself" (p. 99).

The analysis called for a synoptic reading of the data in order to obtain a holistic sense of each response. This entailed deriving both a coherent grasp of each participant's global intentional orientation and a sense of the ways the meanings embedded within each description are structurally related to each other. Once completed, "units" of psychological significance were explicated from each protocol. Shifts in meaning were thematically expressed as revelatory of the phenomenon. As Giorgi (2009) stated, "the parts of the experiential stream are identified as 'moments' and not pieces" (p. 81). Accordingly, the researcher notes when and where "one experiences a significant shift in meaning" (p. 130).

Thereafter, the participants' expressions were transformed so that they would clearly convey the psychological meanings inherent to the phenomenal whole of each participant's protocol. Imaginative variation was used to distinguish between meanings that were incidental to the unfolding of the phenomenon and those that were essential to the unfolding at the level of the individual participant. The phenomenologist "wants to know more precisely how to articulate what makes the object [of study] a specific example or instance of the type of phenomenon it is" (i.e., "what is essential about it") (Giorgi, 2009, p. 88).

Individual themes were then studied *across* participant data in order to delineate and explicate the meanings that were significant to the phenomenon in general. Accordingly, imaginative variation was employed once again in order to facilitate a move from what Giorgi (1975) considers an initial idiographic

focus to a focus on general structural meanings or the trans-individual meanings that undergird the phenomenon as revealed by the participant sample. By using the method of imaginative variation, the phenomenon was “reduced to its essence” and explicated (Giorgi, 2009, p. 90). The method of imaginative variation thus provided the means for accomplishing an *eidetic reduction*. General themes were integrated into a general structural description of the psychological significance of the phenomenon as revealed by the participants of this study.

5 Results: Transitioning from the Experience of Personal Threat to Cross-Cultural Learning—a General Structural Description

For the phenomenon of transitioning from the experience of personal threat to cross-cultural learning to occur, the learner begins in a state of essential unfamiliarity with the real lives of others belonging to the culture that one finds threatening. That is, the learner has had either (a) no (or very little) contact with this culture or (b) if there was some kind of sustained contact, substantive relating was lacking.

From the learner’s initial viewpoint, the behavior of others belonging to this culture is held to radically deviate from the norm to which one is accustomed. This radicality is founded upon a judgement concerning the core of one’s social value system, a belief that members of the other culture fail to meet a certain standard of how one ought to conduct oneself in relation to other people. Consequently, the others’ behavior is deemed impenetrable, incomprehensible, and personally unacceptable from the learner’s preexisting worldview. The others’ behavior is also looked upon as somehow dangerous on the basis of negative stereotyped associations (e.g., such people are likely to be radical, mentally ill, diseased, etc.). These associations can be formed via mere hearsay or the learner can generalize beyond known facts.

Thus, the threatening character of the others’ behavior rests upon a twofold foundation, appearing as a substandard social foreignness that also harbors the potential to place the learner’s well-being in jeopardy. The feeling of threat can be rooted in an exceptionally high degree of moral preoccupation with the others’ lifestyle, which is deemed objectionable on this basis (e.g., as decadent, evil, sinful, etc.). In this instance, there may be an additional concern over being socially rejected for tolerating the other culture’s ways. However, the phenomenon can unfold without a pronounced, fervent moralism. In either case, the learner will have formed an implicit assumption of the others

as being people of a relatively impoverished humanity. This is an emotionally driven process of creating an oversimplified conceptual bifurcation that portrays oneself and the others as different “kinds” of people.

For change to unfold, currently held assumptions regarding the others’ culture must be shown to be untenable from other people who provide different information that challenges one’s beliefs and implicit expectations. To put the process in motion requires a laying of the foundations for dialogue, an openness manifested concretely as freedom of expression, listening, and a modicum of respect at a minimum. The learner is then confronted with a perspective on the others’ culture that proposes a new possibility: that their lives are more complex than what the learner had imagined. Once this possibility is seriously entertained, the learner begins a gradual process of opening up to a new experience of the others that requires the development of a revised, more multifaceted and refined sort of intellectual understanding. However, this revision cannot be brought to fruition by purely intellectual means, as the new understanding must also become concrete and relatable, with grounding in an intuitively grasped, embodied manner of knowing. Thus, it is possible for the change process to begin on the basis of new input from any number or variety of others, be they proximal or remote. However, having already presumed the others to be radically different in an emotionally driven manner, a fully revised understanding can only be achieved via personalized experiences with the threatening others themselves.

Firsthand experience makes it possible for the learner to get to know specific others whom they perceive as threatening face-to-face, in the flesh, in person—and to find that, in reality, they are not as different as was assumed. The learner discovers a wealth of contextualizing data within the flow of live interaction that makes specific situated others comprehensible, which would not have been possible from mere discussions about the others in the third person. Most importantly, the learner witnesses spontaneous and genuine emotional expression, particularly vulnerable interpersonal emotion, which indicates to the learner that these others have rich affective lives that make them “like any other human being.” The most significant contributor to the decisive unfolding of a gradual change in the learner’s thinking and general orientation toward the others is instantiated upon seeing their range of emotionality in response to universal human needs, desires, and struggles.

In full sway, the change process involves the learner co-existing courageously with the now less-threatening others amid a free-flow of information that is incongruent with what was initially expected. Threat progressively diminishes and courage progressively builds as the learner comes to increasingly see these others in the abundance of their humanity, which thereby outmodes any

compartmentalized, intellectualized understanding that conceptualizes them and their life situations anonymously and in the abstract. Within the learner's field of experience, the radically different, incomprehensible others-that-threaten are in the process of being transformed into familiar others who struggle and suffer "like we all do." These increasingly familiar others are coming to be seen as representing a widening field of positive human values and social goodness. The learner is becoming capable of seeing these others as individuals with legitimate human viewpoints that the learner can accept and validate from one's own point of view.

Once this form of learning occurs, it engenders an intellectual humility in the learner in which one is no longer quick to maintain assumptions and make prejudgments concerning the others' culture. The learner becomes better able to shift from an avoidance orientation to a relative openness orientation through deepening intrapersonal and interpersonal dialogue. This is, however, a *process* and it takes varying amounts of time to unfold. Even after the learning has occurred, the others are still relatively new to the learner and thus in ways still unknown. The learner will struggle to keep assumptions and stereotypes in check and work to resist the temptation to pass judgement as an ongoing task. The learning impresses upon the learner the need to repeatedly leave the comfort of a self-protective posture, allowing one to be temporarily vulnerable. Effort is required to remain empathic and relational. The emergence of a new orientation toward the others does not mean that apprehensions instantaneously vanish. The learner continues to feel unease to differing degrees. Apprehensions progressively diminish without necessarily having to go away altogether, although they may with the passage of time.

6 Discussion

This study focused on a specific kind of cultural learning, i.e., one that involves overcoming a feeling of personal threat. The feeling of threat was shown to be connected to a perception of the other as representing a substandard foreignness associated with negative stereotypes, which means that the results have relevance for an understanding of human prejudice. The data show the phenomenon studied here to be rooted in a lack of familiarity. This lends support to Allport's (1979) observations on the nature of prejudice concerning social distancing and in-group/out-group formation. It is important to highlight, however, that unfamiliarity as social distance cannot be reduced to merely being a function of "objective," geometrical space. One can live close to others in terms of measurable distance without getting to know them. The case of the

male participant serves as a relevant example. This participant lived among the people he feared as a military police officer and interacted with them daily before his learning experience unfolded. However, policing is not necessarily relating in a manner that would allow one to really get to know other people.

More importantly, in-group/out-group process cannot be reduced to a series of intellectualist cognitive operations. Even when the process of becoming familiar with foreign others begins, the results of this study indicate that first-hand interactions are necessary to give the learning process its decisive momentum. What is vital in this regard is the element of emotionality, especially as concerns the development of a newfound ability to see the other as capable of suffering “like we all do.” To make a truly personal human connection means just this, and the establishment of this connection appears to be the most reliable antidote for the vicissitudes of the cognitive dissonance created by exposure to evidence that contradicts the stereotypes that one has formed prior to the familiarization process.

Human learning involves a structural reconfiguration of a person’s being-in-the-world, a reorganization of the individual’s manner of relation to self, others, and/or things in varying degrees of magnitude and significance (DeRobertis, 2017). As a phenomenon that brings about alterations in experiential and/or behavioral form, learning cannot be reduced to a mere addition or change of content. In the current study, this aspect of learning came to bear most strikingly in the emergence of a newfound intellectual humility, a lived necessity to keep presuppositions about the other in check, which nonetheless appeared to require as much (is not more) of a disciplined effort in real life as it does in the bracketing involved in phenomenological research (see Morley, 2010). The ability to suspend judgement fundamentally altered the participants’ entire manner of subsequently viewing and approaching the other. This proved to be a change that entailed an ongoing effort to transform anxieties. These results confirm what the first author has argued elsewhere, that cultural learning appears to involve a dialectical interplay of relations with the other in both his or her closeness/familiarity and distance/foreignness (DeRobertis, 2017). Stated in terms of the current research, intentionally and intimately engaging the other is conducive not only to enhancing one’s appreciation of cultural differences (Kim et al., 2014) but also to empathically recognizing the universality of human suffering which helps to maintain the learner’s openness to both experience and diversity (McQueen, 2018).

Encountering others in both their closeness/familiarity and distance/foreignness thus serves as a critical and revitalizing source of challenge to one’s sense of self that supports growth (see also Kim, Suh, & Heo, 2012). That is, the kind of learning studied here makes it more possible for a person to transcend

the unreflective adoption of social meanings (Barreto, 2013; Combs, 1999; Jourard & Landsman, 1980; Montouri & Fahim, 2004) and ultimately to courageously enter a widening field of creative world-engagement to potentiate self-cultivation (DeRobertis, 2017; O'Hara, 2018; Richards, 2018). In a grounded theory analysis of middle age adults who left behind a comfortable work life in the U.S. for extended travel abroad, Hirschorn and Hefferon (2013) arrived at a similar conclusion. Specifically, they noted that their participants had moments wherein they had realized that they had been "playing it safe" in their home environments, which prompted them to face their fears and discover their authenticity in a foreign setting (p. 294). In leaving their familiar surroundings, encountering hardships (real and perceived) during their journeys abroad, engaging in self-determined activity, becoming exposed to cultural differences, and living anonymously, the participants experienced the "fulfillment and presence" of their true self (p. 296), which they attributed to "learning life lessons about the value of courage" as a "source of vitality and meaning in life" (p. 294).

Such conclusions lend support to the pioneering work of Adler (1975), who reconceptualized cross-cultural encounters beyond trauma-laden culture shock (as they have been traditionally viewed). Rather, they are opportunities for "transitional experiences" in which "new facets and dimensions of existence" that one had not previously considered are taken up as possibilities and contribute to the "growth and development of personality along [several] dimensions" (pp. 18, 20):

At the perceptual level, it represents the movement of personality through a *symbiotic* state of single reality awareness to a *differential* state whereby there is an awareness and acceptance of the interdependence of many realities. Emotionally, the transition marks the change from *dependence* on reinforcements to *independence*, while in the largest sense of self-concept, it is the change from a *monocultural* to an *intercultural* frame of reference. Similarly, transitional experiences can be essential to a working through of self-concept. The tensions and crises of change demand that the individual answer the confusions of life experiences with a reaffirmation of [one's] uniqueness as an individual in relationship to others. (p. 20)

Adler's narrative nicely captures the differential-integrative character inherent to the process of becoming oneself as situated within an intercultural frame and that occurs not only within but also between individuals (Richards, 2018). Having recognized one's culture-bound presuppositions by way of

cross-cultural encounter (Barreto, 2013; Hirschorn & Hefferon, 2013; Moats et al., 2011; Montouri & Fahim, 2004), one is better able to become loosened from their grip. Accordingly, the possibility arises for a differentiating learning experience that paves the way for a creative-productive, revolutionizing reorganization of the self-system along the lines of new meanings (DeRobertis, 2017) characterized by enhanced ability to handle complexity and ambiguous circumstances (DeRobertis & Bland, 2019; O'Hara, 2018). Thus, in a relevant follow-up to Adler's work, Montuori and Fahim (2004) further explained:

Cross-cultural interaction requires the ability to improvise and respond to what is happening in the moment instead of falling back on previously learned norms for social behavior.... The encounter with another culture, therefore, becomes an opportunity to understand who we are, what we value and hold dear, and what we feel strongly about. This does not imply that there may be no change in these values, for instance. It rather suggests that as they disclose themselves, they present the opportunity for critical inquiry and reflection.... Cross-cultural encounters ... lead [individuals] to explore [their] own assumptions and beliefs and to accept different ways of being and thinking. This is something most people who do not have exposure to other cultures are not often inclined to do. (pp. 260, 254, 261)

The findings of this study establish a research foundation for the model of cross-cultural experience evolving within the ranks of humanistic psychology. Together, our data and this ever-developing model form a natural progression of Husserl's genetic phenomenological observations concerning the relations between homeworlds and alienworlds in intersubjective life. More generally, this progression indicates that future psychological phenomenological research ought to turn its focus to the psychogenesis of self-construal (Markus & Kitayama, 1991) as a function of the interrelationship that holds between self-knowledge and cultural identity (see Berger & Luckmann, 1966; DeRobertis, 2015; Hall, 1966, 1983; Hannush, 2007; Moats et al., 2011; Murray, 2001; Vontress & Epp, 2015). Furthermore, this research lends credence to the importance of reintroducing the humanistic-phenomenological self (Arons, 1999b; Hoffman, Stewart, Warren, & Meek, 2015; Polkinghorne, 2015), universal hierarchical values-ethics (Arons, 1999a; see also Fromm, 1947; Graves, 1970; Wilber, 2000), and an unapologetic notion of *humanistic science* (Husserl, 1970) as alternatives to both positivistic reductionism and postmodern deconstruction in psychological discourse on learning and culture. Despite the latter's efforts to transcend value-free science and promote a heterogeneity of worldviews in academia, the postmodern attitude has ironically provided an all-too-convenient

conceptual backdrop for tribalism and xenophobia as it has once again come into fashion in America and abroad (Wilber, 2017). Thus, the continuation of this research is as needed today as it was during Husserl's lifetime.

References

- Adler, P. (1975). The transitional experience: An alternative view of culture shock. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology, 15*, 13–23. doi:10.1177/002216787501500403.
- Allen, J. (1976). A Husserlian phenomenology of the child. *Journal of Phenomenological Psychology, 6*, 164–179. doi:10.1163/156916276X00052.
- Allport, G. (1979). *The nature of prejudice*. New York, NY: Addison Wesley.
- Arons, M. (1999a). Abraham Maslow: Yesterday, tomorrow, and yesteryear. In D. Moss (Ed.), *Humanistic and transpersonal psychology: A historical and biographical sourcebook* (pp. 334–346). Westport, CT: Greenwood.
- Arons, M. (1999b). Self, multiple selves, and the illusion of separate selfhood. *The Humanistic Psychologist, 27*, 187–211. doi:10.1080/08873267.1999.9986904.
- Barreto, Y. K. (2013). The experience of becoming a therapist in a foreign culture. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology, 53*, 336–361. doi:10.1177/0022167812471076.
- Berger, P. L., & Luckmann, T. (1966). *The social construction of reality: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge*. New York: Anchor Books.
- Biceaga, V. (2010). *The concept of passivity in Husserl's phenomenology*. New York, NY: Springer.
- Combs, A. W. (1999). *Being and becoming: A field approach to psychology*. New York, NY: Springer.
- DeRobertis, E. M. (2015). Toward a humanistic-multicultural model of development. In K. J. Schneider, J. F. Pierson, & J. F. T. Bugental (Eds.), *Handbook of humanistic psychology* (2nd ed., pp. 227–242). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- DeRobertis, E. M. (2017). *The phenomenology of learning and becoming: Enthusiasm, creativity, and self-development*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- DeRobertis, E. M., & Bland A. M. (2019). Lifespan human development and “the humanistic perspective”: A contribution toward inclusion. *The Humanistic Psychologist*. Advance online publication. doi:10.1037/hum0000141.
- Donohoe, J. (2004). *Husserl on ethics and intersubjectivity: From static to genetic phenomenology*. New York, NY: Humanity.
- Dylan, B. (1963). *John Brown*. Retrieved from: <http://www.bobdylan.com/songs/john-brown/>.
- Erikson, E. H. (1994). *Identity and the life cycle*. New York, NY: Norton. (Original work published 1959.)
- Fromm, E. (1947). *Man for himself: An inquiry into the psychology of ethics*. New York, NY: Holt.

- Giorgi, A. (1970). *Psychology as a human science: A phenomenologically based approach*. New York, NY: Harper and Row.
- Giorgi, A. (1975). An application of phenomenological method in psychology. In A. Giorgi, C. Fischer, & E. Murray (Eds.), *Duquesne studies in phenomenological psychology, Volume II* (pp. 82–103). Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne University Press.
- Giorgi, A. (2009). *The descriptive phenomenological method in psychology: A modified Husserlian approach*. Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne University Press.
- Graves, C. W. (1970). Levels of existence: An open system theory of values. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, 10, 131–155. doi:10.1177/002216787001000205.
- Hall, E. T. (1966). *The hidden dimension*. New York, NY: Anchor.
- Hall, E. T. (1983). *The dance of life: The other dimension of time*. New York, NY: Anchor.
- Halverson, J. D. (2017). Walking in two worlds. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*. Advance online publication. doi:10.1177/0022167816688313.
- Hannush, M. J. (2007). An existential-dialectical-phenomenological approach to understanding cultural tilts: Implications for multicultural research and practice. *Journal of Phenomenological Psychology*, 38, 7–23. doi:10.1163/156916207X190229.
- Hirschorn, S., & Hefferon, K. (2013). Leaving it all behind to travel: Venturing uncertainty as a means to personal growth and authenticity. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, 53, 283–306. doi:10.1177/0022167813483007.
- Hoffman, L., Stewart, S., Warren, D. M., & Meek, L. (2015). Toward a sustainable myth of self: An existential response to the postmodern condition. In K. J. Schneider, J. F. Pierson, & J. F. T. Bugental (Eds.), *Handbook of humanistic psychology* (2nd ed., pp. 105–133). Los Angeles: Sage.
- Husserl, E. (1970). *The crisis of European sciences and transcendental phenomenology*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.
- Husserl, E. (1999). *Cartesian meditations*. Norwell, MA: Kluwer.
- Husserl, E. (2001). *Analyses concerning passive and active synthesis: Lectures on transcendental logic*. Norwell, MA: Kluwer.
- Jourard, S., & Landsman, T. (1980). *Healthy personality: An approach from the viewpoint of humanistic psychology* (4th ed.). New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Kim, J., Heo, J., King, C., & Kim, S. (2014). Cultural understanding and personal growth through taekwondo as cross-cultural activity. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, 54, 356–376. doi:10.1177/0022167813504826.
- Kim, J., Suh, W., & Heo, J. (2012). Do Korean immigrant adolescents experience stress-related growth during stressful intergroup contact and acculturation? *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, 54, 3–27. doi:10.1177/0022167812468614.
- Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review*, 98, 224–253. doi:10.1037/0033-295x.98.2.224.

- Maslow, A. H. (1999). *Toward a psychology of being* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Wiley.
- McQueen, K. S. (2018). Kindness can change the world. *Walk the talk speaker series*. Retrieved from: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=X3fe29S75OE>.
- Moats, M., Claypool, T. R., & Saxon, E. (2011). Therapist development through international dialogue: Students' perspectives on personal and professional life changing interactions in China. *The Humanistic Psychologist, 39*, 276–282. doi:10.1080/08873267.2011.592439.
- Montuori, A., & Fahim, U. (2004). Cross-cultural encounter as an opportunity for personal growth. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology, 44*, 243–265. doi:10.1177/0022167804263414.
- Morley, J. (2010). It's always about the epoché. In T. F. Cloonan & C. Thiboutot (Eds.), *The redirection of psychology: Essays in honor of Amedeo P. Giorgi* (pp. 277–288). Montréal, Québec: CIRP (Interdisciplinary Circle of Phenomenological Research).
- Murphy, G. (1958). *Human potentialities*. New York, NY: Basic.
- Murray, E. L. (2001). *The quest for personality integration: Reimagining our lives*. Pittsburgh, PA: Simon Silverman Phenomenology Center.
- O'Hara, M. (2018). Humanistic cultural praxis for an emerging world. In R. House, D. Kalisch, & J. Maidman (Eds.), *Humanistic psychology: Current trends and future prospects*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Polkinghorne, D. E. (2015). The self and humanistic psychology. In K. J. Schneider, J. F. Pierson, & J. F. T. Bugental (Eds.), *Handbook of humanistic psychology* (2nd ed., pp. 87–104). Los Angeles: Sage.
- Richards, R. (2018). *Everyday creativity and the healthy mind: Dynamic new paths for self and society*. London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Tate, G. A. (1973a). Humanistic psychology and Black psychology: A study of parallels. In F. Richards & I. D. Welch (Eds.), *Sightings: Essays in humanistic psychology* (pp. 159–166). Boulder, CO: Shields.
- Tate, G. A. (1973b). Re-mythologization: Toward a Black psychology of the healthy personality. In F. Richards & I. D. Welch (Eds.), *Sightings: Essays in humanistic psychology* (pp. 143–149). Boulder, CO: Shields.
- Van Kaam, A. (1961). Humanistic psychology and culture. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology, 1*, 94–100. doi:10.1177/002216786100100110.
- Vontress, C. E., & Epp, L. R. (2015). Existential cross-cultural counseling. In K. J. Schneider, J. F. Pierson, & J. F. T. Bugental (Eds.), *Handbook of humanistic psychology* (2nd ed., pp. 473–489). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Wilber, K. (2000). *Integral psychology: Consciousness, spirit, psychology, therapy*. Boston, MA: Shambhala.
- Wilber, K. (2017). *Trump and the post-truth world*. Boulder, CO: Shambhala.