Working with Kwok Leung: Reflections from Four Grateful Collaborators

Michael H. Bond,[1] Fons J. R. van de Vijver,[2] Michael W. Morris,[3] and Michele J. Gelfand[4]

1 Department of Management and Marketing, Faculty of Business, Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Hong Kong, China
2 Department of Psychology, Tilburg University, Tilburg, The Netherlands
3 Department of Management, Columbia Business School, Columbia University, New York, NY, U.S.A.
4 Department of Psychology, University of Maryland, College Park, MD, U.S.A.

Keywords

Correspondence

Michael H. Bond, Faculty of Business, Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Hung Hom, Kowloon, Hong Kong, S.A.R., China;
e-mail: ssmhb@polyu.edu.hk

Abstract

This article is a set of tributes about Kwok Leung, a colleague of the four colleagues who collaborated with Kwok over more than three decades and provide their reflections on working professionally with him. The four content areas of their academic contributions were justice, social axioms, and methodology in cross-cultural research and creativity. The focus of each tribute is upon Kwok Leung's collaborative style and particular genius.

You have been told that, if we today see further than our predecessors,

it is only because we stand on their shoulders. But this is an occasion on which

I should prefer to remember, not the giants upon whose shoulders we stood,

but the friends with whom we stood arm in arm. . .colleagues in so much of my work.

Peter B. Medawar, from his Nobel Prize Banquet speech (December 10, 1960)

This quote, from one of the great writers on science and how good science gets done, seems apt for this tribute to the work of Kwok Leung, whose stellar career in the social psychology of justice, cross-cultural methodology, interpersonal harmony, and worldviews was cut short by his death this past year at age 57. For, Kwok was a collaborator whose contributions to the content and the process of creating new and useful knowledge blessed his co-creators; he was humble, smart, fast, reliable, imaginative, funny, careful, respectful, well-grounded in the relevant literature, and appreciative of his co-creators. He was the complete package as both friend and colleague.

Kwok raised the game of anyone who worked with him. In this retrospective article, four of his most frequent collaborators briefly describe their memories of working in their various ways with Kwok, assessing how they developed interpersonally and what they learned about doing social science in his company, in person across oceans and continents. Kwok would only regard this exercise as worth our time and effort in writing out our recollections if reading these offerings would help readers improve their collaborative process and outcomes in what for him was the great and vital mystery of human social behavior. That mystery gets closer to resolution if one masters the process of doing research. As Medawar

puts the matter, "The art of research [is] the art of making difficult problems soluble by devising means of getting at them" (1984, p. 20). Kwok was a master of this intellectual and social art.

Working with Kwok Leung on Social Axioms—Michael Harris Bond

Of our dear brother's death, the memory be green.

Shakespeare, *Hamlet*

Kwok was admitted to the Chinese University of Hong Kong in 1977, a time when only 2% of the age cohort made it through the stringent exam system that characterizes all Chinese legacy polities since the Sung Dynasty. He was obviously a smart, diligent, well-organized student capable of mastering a demanding high school curriculum. But, so too were the many other undergraduates who took my course in social psychology. What made Kwok special was his eagerness in turning a cleverly designed, class group project on attribution into a publishable article (Bond, Leung, & Wan, 1982). We accomplished this rare feat for an undergraduate over the summer of 1979 (Figure 1), while he helped support himself, his younger brother, and his single mother by tutoring high school students.

That year and the next, we worked extensively to draft our first publication (Leung & Bond, 1982). Kwok was first author and deservedly so, since he sourced the literature on distributive justice available then by ferreting through the Psychological Abstracts in the library shelves (no Google search then!), sourcing an American data collector for our bi-cultural comparison, analyzing the data, and writing much of our first draft. Over the next 31 years of writing together until 2013, we produced 26 publications of various sorts, together and with others. I note in pleased retrospect that Kwok was the first author on half; for our ten joint authorships, he was the first author eight times. That distributive reckoning seems right to me.

At my insistence, we always established the order of authorship first and laid out the work schedule accordingly, since I knew that, as a Chinese student, Kwok would always insist on being second author; as a Chinese student ("Once a student, always a student!") however, he would comply with my insistence

Figure 1. Michael H. Bond and Kwok Leung, first photograph together, July, 1979.

on an up-front decision before embarking on our researching and writing; as a colleague of the first order, Kwok would then deliver the necessaries to validate that order of authorship, on time and on target. How did he learn these essentials of authorship in psychology so quickly and so well? I think of him as "a natural" at the game of social psychology; he simply had to find the right collaborators for the job at hand.

On the basis of his extraordinary merit, Kwok was admitted to the Ph.D. program at the University of Illinois despite not having an undergraduate degree in psychology—there was no such degree available at the Chinese University until 1983, so Kwok chose to major in Biology. These next four years in America were his further baptism in intercultural fire (after me!). Incredibly, by his second year, Kwok was teaching undergraduate social psychology to a class of more than 100 and working productively with Alan Lind on procedural justice (Leung, Tong, & Lind, 2007). The allied concept of interactional justice made a profound impact on Kwok, morphing into his later work on harmony, while continuing to characterize the way he always worked with others—respectfully, generously, and open-mindedly.

After earning his PhD, Kwok was hired to teach psychology at the Chinese University, adding organizational behavior to our faculty skill set. This hiring made eminent sense (local boy makes good in the Big Time for training psychologists, the Golden Mountain, as North America is affectionately termed by Hong Kong Chinese), but was also personally fortuitous—for the next 15 or so years, my curious, adventurous, interculturally adroit, now-colleague was down the hallway 15 m from my office and always eager to wrestle with emerging intellectual puzzles.

These conversations were not gossip sessions, but psychologically speculative idea gestations; they invariably led us somewhere provocative; a shared awareness of issues emerged, and typically neither of us could remember who suggested what. These were joint creativity sessions, where Yeats would be right in observing, "O body swayed to music, O brightening glance, How can we know the dancer from the dance?" (from "Among school children", Yeats, 1960). I cannot now say who provided what voltage from the lightening rod of our exchanges, but once we had an idea we considered worth pursuing, we divided up the labor and moved fast but separately, meeting frequently throughout the process, with new ideas for subsequent research frequently emerging and put on our table for later. This Michael, who loves word play, remarked to Kwok that, "Curious, collaborative colleagues should constantly converse constructively"!

Discovering Social Axioms

These moveable conversations usually took place in the context of our on-going debate about whether some observed behavior was "Chinese" or alternatively, pan-cultural, and hence explicable by basic social psychological processes. I took the former stance; Kwok, the latter. These discussions focused us both on the need to "unpackage" whatever cross-cultural differences we were considering. At the time, the cross-cultural construct of choice was values, legitimized for studying by Hofstede (1980) at the level of nations and later by Schwartz (1992) at the level of individuals. So, the logic went, individuals from different cultures behaved differently because they wanted to realize different goals or outcomes. Kwok and I had previously unpackaged some of our cross-cultural findings in this way, using cultural value differences as explanations (Bond, Wan, Leung, & Giacalone, 1985).

One day, however, Kwok and I were discussing Pascal's observation that, "There are truths on this side of the Pyrenees which are falsehoods on the other." (Hofstede, 1980, p. 7) In the course of our conversation, we came to wonder if the cross-cultural differences we were regularly studying could be explained not by differences in a people's values, but by differences in their beliefs; not by what they considered good, but by what they considered true. Ironically, the Pascal quote had fronted Hofstede's magisterial 1980 opus on values, and we wondered if we could disentangle this conflation of what the person considered good (values) from what the person considered true (social axioms).

This is how so much of our subsequent research began—by exploring a confusion that occurred to us, often because our own cultures sensibilities provoked one of us to ask the other, "Why did that Westerner or that Chinese do (or not do!) that?!" These puzzles often emerged out of our on-going experience with Hong Kong culture and one another. We loved playing with that social scientific *koan*.

Kwok and I worked in three distinguishable areas: distributive justice, the logic of cross-cultural analysis, and "social axioms," as we chose to term the study of a person's beliefs about his or her world. I focus here on our process of developing the social axioms concept scientifically, the content of which is covered in our last article together (Leung & Bond, 2013). True to our operating procedure for doing social psychology, negotiated over our first 20 years of colleagueship, we decided and proceeded to: represent as many cultural "voices" as feasible in the process of researching beliefs, de-centering our Hong Kong-Canadian selves culturally as much as possible; use clear, simple English edited by both of us in our collaborative communications around the world; invite collaborators to add their own scales or items of interest, be they new social axioms or other constructs when collecting social axiom data in their country, thereby resulting in separate publications for them, while extending the nomological net for the axiom construct; submit a first draft of any article involving other collaborators to them (with a time line!) for comments to be considered before initial submission and subsequent revisions; dedicate conferencing and writing to sharing the axioms construct with colleagues, inviting them to add their cultural voice and perspective to the growing data base; include everyone who collected data following our instructions and format in the author list on our first publication, alphabetically, following the names of collaborators who had made conceptual and analytic contributions, in order of merit, as judged by Kwok and me in consultation (this decision-making algorithm about authorship was established in our initial approach to potential collaborators *before* their data were collected); and respond to all inquiries about the axioms concept and requests for its measurement, setting up a web page to ease our communicative load and reinforce what we said or wrote elsewhere.

The Value of Beliefs for Conflict Resolution

It is instructive and telling that from the get-go, Kwok and I agreed that we wanted to add social axioms to the social scientific armamentarium of useful constructs only if it proved to be incrementally valid when combined with the dominant constructs of the day in cross-cultural psychology, viz., values and the Big Five personality dimensions. We worried that we might merely be putting the same old wine into new bottles. To address that possibility, we designed measurement scenarios which included the axioms scales together with values or personality measures to discover if axioms picked up extra variance in the outcome measures of interest.

One study in this vein took a measure of styles for resolving conflict as an outcome of interest (Bond, Leung, Au, Tong, & Chemonges-Nielsen, 2004). A standard, self-report measure of conflict resolution was used (Rahim, 1983). Using our then-measure of the five axiom dimensions, we discovered that,

> Hierarchical regression analyses showed that social axioms added moderate predictive power over and above that provided by values to...methods of conflict resolution... Specifically, reward for application was related to preference for...accommodation in conflict resolution; religiosity was related to accommodation and to competition in conflict resolution; social cynicism was related negatively to collaboration and to compromise in conflict resolution...and social complexity was related to compromise and to collaboration in conflict resolution...(p. 177)

On the basis of this wide array of findings, we thus reached the satisfying conclusion that, "...measures of respondents' beliefs about the external, social world supplement measures of their internal motivations to achieve various goals." (p. 177) Social axioms were not values disguised as wish-fulfilling projections; they were a conceptually and empirically distinct construct, just as we had hoped but insisted on testing. For Kwok, as for me, practice was the test of truth in social science.

Surveying our decades of work and trying to extract the formula for our successful partnership, I think that we were striving to work under the shadow of some ancient Chinese advice: "The clever combatant

looks to the effect of combined energy, and does not require too much from individuals. Hence his ability to pick out the right men and to utilize combined energy" (Sun Tzu, *The art of war*, Book 5, Verses 21–22, L. Giles, trans.). That would be my take on our working process and procedures. Although he never talked or wrote in a preachy, philosophical way, Kwok's take might have been derived from the *I Ching*: Hexagram 48: The Well

> …however (much) men may differ in disposition and education, the foundations of human nature are the same in everyone. And every human being can draw in the course of his education from the inexhaustible wellspring of the divine in man's nature.

Kwok vibrated with that wisdom; me, with the other; together, we produced what we did in the way we did it (Figure 2). I am forever grateful.

Kwok's Methodological Contributions to Cross-Cultural Psychology—Fons J. R. van de Vijver

In the mid-1990s, an update of the 1980 Handbook of Cross-Cultural Psychology was scheduled; the Handbook editors preferred to have two authors with a different cultural background writing a chapter, assuming that this diversity would enhance the quality of the manuscript. Kwok (I always called him by his first name, as he adopted an easy, informal quality with colleagues) and I were invited to write a chapter on methodological issues of cross-cultural comparisons. We did not know each other well, but we had met a few times and knew each other's work. In retrospect, the idea of diversity only applied at a superficial level. Kwok's Chinese and my Dutch background were indeed very different, but our training was rather similar and we soon discovered that our views on many issues in cross-cultural methods were remarkably similar. We needed very few words to discuss ideas for publications and agree on what to write. This "meeting of minds" was already true for our first publications (Leung & Van de Vijver, 1996; Van de Vijver & Leung, 1997a,b) and has continued until our last (Leung & Van de Vijver, 2008; Van de Vijver & Leung, 2011).

Kwok's Style

It was a privilege to work with Kwok, as he combined a unique set of characteristics: His great intelligence, wisdom, and creativity were truly remarkable; his kind, unassuming, levelheaded demeanor never

Figure 2. Michael H. Bond and Kwok Leung, last photograph together, January, 2015.

changed over the years of our collaboration. He always knew the latest developments in cross-cultural and mainstream psychology, held an open and antidogmatic view on the field, assumed a cosmopolitan outlook, and took a noncompromising focus on quality. His evaluations of individual studies and the field of cross-cultural psychology in general were always strategic in nature, assessing the novelty of a study or theory, its capacity to advance the field, and its linkages to the latest developments in mainstream psychology. He was exceptionally skilled in combining all these considerations.

His nondogmatic nature helped him not to choose between or reject perspectives, but rather to see how approaches could be combined. Kwok felt strongly linked to mainstream psychology and had an intimate knowledge of Chinese culture. He was a master at using this link. He did not exploit his Chinese background to rebel against mainstream psychology, nor did he copy Western psychology uncritically in his own studies. His unique vantage point at the crossroads allowed him to examine how he could enrich mainstream psychology by using a Chinese perspective and inform cross-cultural psychology by linking with mainstream psychology. His ease at combining seemingly incompatible perspectives was also clear in other areas. He is one of the very few cross-cultural psychologists who initiated projects that were aimed at uncovering universal aspects (such as the social axioms project; e.g., Leung & Bond, 2004) as well as culture-specific aspects (such as the personality project; e.g., Cheung & Leung, 1998) of individual functioning.

Kwok's Work

His first, single-authored article in a top journal (*Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*) already showed the qualities which would become characteristic of his later work (Leung, 1987). He compared conflict resolution preferences in Hong Kong Chinese and American participants. The introduction clearly spelled out the novelty of the study, the manuscript was advanced from a theoretical perspective and used up-to-date methods. Kwok was a strong advocate of advanced methods, but he was pragmatic about methods, always focusing on how methods could help to resolve substantive problems. Like his integration of mainstream and Chinese psychology, he could integrate methods and theories in a harmonious manner. He could easily see the value of novel methods (or lack thereof) but was only satisfied if he could use these to make a substantive point.

His contribution to the conflict resolution literature has not only been methodological; Kwok was intrigued by differences in conflict resolution styles between Chinese and Americans, using individualism—collectivism as a theoretical framework. For instance, he showed that Hong Kong undergraduates were more likely to pursue a conflict with an out-group member than were U.S. undergraduates; the reverse pattern was found for conflicts with in-group members (Leung, 1988), and that Chinese were more likely to mediate and to bargain than were Americans (Leung, 1987). His early work has been instrumental in putting the role of culture in conflict resolution on the agenda.

Kwok published a few articles with only a methodological focus. For example, he worked on a problem that occurs in comparing factor structures obtained in exploratory factor analyses (Chan, Ho, Leung, Chan, & Yung, 1999). Together with colleagues from his university, Kwok developed a procedure to estimate the sampling distribution of the statistic to compare factor structures using bootstrapping. The article was published in a top journal (*Psychological Methods*). Articles with such an almost exclusive focus on methods are rare in Kwok's oeuvre, and his most important contributions, as measured by citations of his work, were elsewhere.

An area in which Kwok made a long-lasting contribution to the field of cross-cultural psychology is multilevel modeling. In the first article, published in 1989, Kwok described all the main conceptual issues in multilevel models (Leung, 1989; see also Leung & Bond, 1989). He clearly described the difference between models of psychological functioning at individual and cultural levels. In those years, the first statistical models dealing with multilevel modeling had just been published. A new generation of regression models had been developed in which an individual score, such as a conflict resolution style preference, was analyzed as a function of relevant psychological characteristics, such as personality traits and values,

but also as a function of relevant cultural characteristics, such as individualism—collectivism. At a later stage, such models would be extended; this new generation of models could compare factor structures at individual and cultural level, enabling a rigorous statistical test of whether a structure found at individual level (e.g., the 5-factor model of personality) could also be found at country level. Even without access to these latter models, Kwok had an excellent understanding of the conceptual issues of multilevel modeling and their relevance for cross-cultural psychology. He understood the self-imposed boundaries of a cross-cultural psychology that restricted itself to the analysis of psychological variables. It was very clear to him that cross-cultural psychology should reach out to disciplines that deal with cultures and countries at a more global level, such as sociology (he mentions this discipline explicitly in his 1989 article). His plea to reach out to other disciplines is very much in line with his idea that a discipline like cross-cultural psychology can only survive if it can make a difference in mainstream psychology.

Another area where Kwok made important contributions is in his appreciation of the strategic importance of choosing good research designs. Many of his publications start with the observation that there is a commonly held view, which is then critically examined in the article. A good example is a study early in his career on conflict processing in two collectivistic cultures (Leung, Au, Fernández-Dols, & Iwawaki, 1992). The article starts with the observation that harmony-enhancing procedures for conflict resolution are endorsed more in collectivistic countries than in individualistic countries. However, he then observes that all published supportive studies confounded individualism—collectivism with Western versus Eastern cultures. As a consequence, it may well be that the preference for harmony is not a collectivistic characteristic, but a characteristic of Eastern cultures. The study tested the theory by comparing Japanese and Spanish participants, as both groups are collectivistic; yet, Japan is in Eastern country and Spain is a Western country. In hindsight, it is remarkable to see that he resolved a problem in the early 1990s that has been brought up repeatedly afterward: Many studies of individualism—collectivism compare Japan and U.S., but these two countries differ in many cultural features, not only individualism—collectivism. Kwok was fond of this type of debunking by careful study design.

The final, and in my view most compelling, impact of his work is his contribution to the professionalization of the field, based on his career-long, unique combination of clever theorizing, up-to-date analytic procedures with a noncompromising focus on quality as the basis. Kwok was a frontrunner in the use of methods to enhance the validity of his studies and was among the first in cross-cultural psychology to test mediation and moderation effects (Leung et al., 1992) and to use structural equation modeling for testing measurement invariance in a cross-cultural conflict resolution study (Leung et al., 1992).

Kwok's Place

Kwok was a charter member of what I like to call the second generation of cross-cultural psychologists. This generation comes after the trailblazers who established the field from the 1960s onwards. Many of these trailblazers emphasized the uniqueness of cross-cultural psychology in their writings, a strategy which is understandable when attempting to establish an emerging science. However, the interests of the second-generation are different. This generation no longer needs to defend the uniqueness of its field—the journals were established, there was a professional organization, and there was quite some interest in the field shown at international conferences (Figure 3). For the second generation, increasing professionalization and further advancing the field are crucial. Kwok has played an essential role in the professionalization and development of his field. This gentle giant of cross-cultural psychology will be dearly missed.

Working with Kwok Leung on Culture, Justice and Creativity—Michael W. Morris

We met in spring of 1994 at the Treasure Floating Restaurant in Sha Tin, Hong Kong. I was a first-year professor, (supposedly) chaperoning a group of MBA students around China. Kwok was in his mid-30s,

Figure 3. Fons J. R. van de Vijver and Kwok Leung at the IACCP Congress, July, 2012.

but already a major figure in cross-cultural psychology and a department chair. I had emailed Kwok asking if we could meet when I passed through Hong Kong to discuss some of his articles on cultural values and procedural justice. Once we spotted each other in the crowd (I was the lost-looking *guilo* (foreigner), and he was the chuckling Chinese guy with the friendly wave), we took a table and swapped 2-min versions of our life stories. He had studied biology at the nearby Chinese University of Hong Kong, met Michael Bond and become fascinated by cross-cultural psychology, trained with Harry Triandis in Illinois, and then returned to teach at his *alma mater*. I had studied literature and cognitive science at Brown, trained in cognitive and social psychology at Michigan, then done a cross-cultural study on attribution for my dissertation (Morris & Peng, 1994), and (unexpectedly) landed a job at Stanford Business School.

The dim sum arrived, and we plunged in with our chopsticks, Kwok heralding each new culinary delight as it arrived. We chatted about the field—people, conferences, and controversies—discovering shared friends and shared opinions. When I thought it was time to get down to business, I pulled out one of his articles on culture and dispute resolution procedures (Leung, 1987) to ask about some peripheral results, and he impressed me by rattling off the correlations in the relevant table from memory. Anthropologists had argued that East Asians differ in their dispute resolution preference from Westerners (favoring bargaining/mediation over arbitration/adjudication) because they value harmony or animosity reduction more. Kwok found that the difference in preference exists between Hongkongers and Americans, but it was driven not by the valence they placed on harmony as opposed to other values, such as outcome fairness, but instead by their expectancies about which procedures give rise to harmony. When I suggested that these different expectancies might come from different attributions for conflict behaviors, Kwok became intrigued. He pressed me with probing questions, but kept the levity with irreverent jokes about academia. Soon we were talking like close friends, disclosing our newest ideas, anticipating one another's objections, and finishing one others' sentences. It felt like a Vulcan mind meld—as if I were thinking about the issues with a bigger brain than usual.

By the end of the lunch, we had planned a study and he had invited me to visit his department the following year. It was a fateful meeting—one that altered the arc of my research and my life. The impressions Kwok made in this first meeting—the speed of his mind, the precision of his memory, his curiosity and openness—were to impress me over and over again during the two decades of our working together.

While Kwok's sheer mental candlepower struck me most at the time, I realize in retrospect that an equally remarkable strength was his gift for rapport and trust. Negotiation research helps us understand this essential ingredient. Establishing rapport through positivity and synchrony of emotional expression propels negotiators to disclose information and cooperate (Drolet & Morris, 2000). This is crucial at the start of relationship—breaking the ice—so that the two parties become willing to invest time to learn what the other can offer (Morris & Keltner, 2000). This affect-based trust is particularly important in collaborative work, because creativity through collaboration comes from disclosing novel ideas to each other. Scholars, like artists and entrepreneurs, are loathe to share their most novel and original ideas, as these ideas could be ridiculed or could be stolen (Chua, Morris, & Mor, 2012). Cultural self-awareness or metacognition predicts creative success in cross-cultural collaborations because it enables the development of this affective trust (Chua et al., 2012). Kwok's powers of abstraction were stunning, but his talent for creating and maintaining relationships was equally impressive. Over the years, I've watched him strike up camaraderie with scholars from every corner of the world, through his warmth, humor, and sensitivity.

Collaborating in Person

In the winter of 1995, I flew to Hong Kong to spend the spring term at the Chinese University. After 2 years under the tenure-track magnifying glass at Stanford, I relished the anonymity, solitude, and strangeness of the campus: walking to work through bamboo groves alive with birdsong, ordering from menus based on the few Chinese characters I could recognize, and listening to radio broadcasts of ping pong championships from China. But soon Kwok and his colleagues made me feel at home, particularly Michael Bond, surprisingly young in spirit despite his eminence, who would share coffee and tales of the expat life, and Darius Chan, rising star and Hong Kong hipster, who would bring me along for evenings of nightclubbing, gambling, and noodles. Kwok would spring into my office between his meetings, not taking time to sit down, speed-reading vignettes and dictating changes, staring at large correlation matrices, and inferring the best multivariate models. As the department chair, statistics guru for seemingly every project on the floor, and father of two young children, Kwok handled the hectic schedule by multitasking and optimizing his time. "Every second is precious, Michael. Every second is precious."

Although Kwok was not that much older than me, he saw I had much to learn about the field and took on a mentor role. He gave me classic articles and statistics books to read. He explained best practices for collaboration, citing his past experiences with Michael Bond and Fons J. R. van de Vijver. He even gave me personal advice, chiding me about my disorganized office, over-consumption of coffee, and late night schedule. But much of what I gained—and saw others gain—from Kwok was more intangible. Kwok's name 覺 means "to wake up" and he had that effect on me and others, his focus and concentration was contagious. A homophone, 郭, means "the wall that surrounds a city," and fittingly Kwok lent security to others through his intellectual confidence and command of his subject. As a young scholar trying to learn the cross-cultural field, I had felt under siege, anxious that my projects would not withstand the critiques from many directions. Having Kwok on my team, I felt emboldened to carry them forward.

I also gained from Kwok a stronger conviction about the purpose or our work. I had been attracted to cultural psychology in part to challenge scientific ethnocentrism, the Western-centered field of social psychology presented Western cultural habits as universal human nature (Bond, 1988). For Kwok, this political agenda was more than an abstraction; he played an enormous role in the ascent of Asian social psychology—he collaborated with many emerging scholars, held summer research workshops for students, and largely organized the *Asian Association of Social Psychology,* hosting its inaugural conference at the Chinese University in June 1995, bringing together researchers from eight Asian countries for this first time. Its slogan? "Asians studying Asians for Asia." I was merely there as a non-Asian supporter, but it was thrilling to witness scientific (and political) history in the making.

After that year, we continued to collaborate through email, jet-lagged meetings at conference-hotel coffee shops and bars, and shorter visits to one another's universities. Kwok brought his family to escape humid Hong Kong for arid Palo Alto in the summer of 1996, and I passed through Hong Kong every year. Our empirical projects on procedural justice found publication and achieved modest impact (Leung, Su, & Morris, 2001; Morris, Leung, & Iyengar, 2004; Morris et al., 1998). We went on to write several review articles and conceptual articles about culture and justice, drawing on our countless conversations and debates about how to conceptualize cultural influence (Leung & Morris, 2001; Morris & Leung, 2000; Morris, Leung, Ames, & Lickel, 1999). Leung and Bond (1982, 1984) had launched this field with findings that Hongkongers distribute resources according to a generosity principle to in-group members, but according to the same equity rule favored by North Americans to out-group members. Our division of labor was always very explicit: We reached an outline together, the first author wrote most sections, the second author a few sections, and then each edited the other's writing and the first author handled the publication process. I took first author role more often, but I often thought that Kwok was following the generosity principle when proposing that I do so.

Differences are often blamed for conflicts, but conflict scholars know that differences are also the key to win–win deals and collaborations. Kwok and I had great chemistry as collaborators because we differed in our needs, our capabilities, and our expertise: He knew Chinese culture from inside, and I American: He knew the cross-cultural field, and I knew cognitive psychology; I was eager to learn; he was eager to teach. I was an assistant professor with time on my hands for the grunt work; he was an overscheduled chair who could add tremendous value in brief meetings, so long as the collaborator could follow the rapid-fire pace of his advice.

If collaborators have enough trust that they can get over the misunderstandings that inevitably arise with differences, they can negotiate integrative solutions that satisfy each person's most important priorities. Also they can forge innovative studies and frameworks through creative combination—bringing together ideas that have not been previously combined. Collaborating with a similar partner is easy, but it does not offer nearly as much upside and synergy as does collaborating with someone different.

In 2000, I returned to Hong Kong for another semester, eager to experience how the 1997 "handover" to China had changed the universities and everyday life. Kwok and I revisited our favorite restaurants from years before and shared our newest ideas and findings. But he was enmeshed with administration and his projects on social axioms and harmony; I was increasingly busy with projects about the dynamics of cultural schemas—how they are triggered by priming and by motivations (Briley, Morris, & Simonson, 2005; Chiu, Morris, Hong, & Menon, 2000; Hong, Morris, Chiu, & Benet-Martinez, 2000). Through my association with Kwok, I had acquired a network of collaborators in Hong Kong, an academic *guanxi* (Chua, Morris, & Ingram, 2009; Morris, Podolny, & Sullivan, 2008). In the years that followed, Kwok and I continued to meet when our paths crossed, relying on each other as sounding boards and critics (Figure 4).

Collaborating Long-Distance

Kwok moved to City U to build a research-oriented management department. I moved to Columbia in New York, which afforded less Asian travel. Increasingly, my research was proposing that cultural influences are carried by norms, rather than values or belief schemas (Zou et al., 2009). Kwok was an invaluable critic, pointing out limitations of these accounts and strengths of alternative accounts. This was a difference in our intellectual styles that surfaced again and again: I'd write a draft arguing theory A was all wrong and theory B the answer; Kwok would tone down the polemics, acknowledging that no account could handle all of the findings, and suggesting how different accounts might apply under different conditions.

Around 2006, Kwok and I met up over beers at a conference somewhere and discovered that we had both started working on culture and creativity. He asked me to join him in a chapter on the topic, and

Figure 4. Kwok Leung introducing himself and symposium members at the IACMR Conference, Shanghai, June, 2010; Michael H. Bond and Michael W. Morris to his left.

we divided the labor as usual (Leung & Morris, 2010). We decided to host a conference on this theme, bringing together Chinese and Western researchers in Hong Kong at the City U in December, 2008. As always, the division of labor was clear-cut and efficient: He would recruit the Chinese scholars; I'd convince the Western scholars. He'd organize the dinners; I'd lead the postdinner carousing. The City U served tea and dim sum in the morning; I arranged Starbucks for the jet-lagged. As he did most of the conference organizing, I took the lead on the special issue that followed. Our interdisciplinary review article, "Creativity East and West," (Morris & Leung, 2010) has been influential in this growing area. Some of Kwok's major studies in this area are still in progress, and his widow, Yumi Inoue, is organizing some of his former students to take them over.

In 2013, Kwok reached out to me by email saying he had envisioned an important conceptual article that we should do together. It was a very busy time for me, editing a special issue on culture and norms and developing several new courses, but Kwok was emphatic and our prior colleagueship so fruitful that I agreed. He wanted to integrate three important psychological mechanisms for cultural influences – values, schemas, and norms. Perhaps with some premonition of his mortality, Kwok repeated many times that, if we could nail it this article, it would eventually be one of the most cited articles of his career. I was inspired. It was the first time we collaborated entirely by email, both too busy to travel and never sensing a need to set up a phone meeting. He was the lead author, and I was assigned to draft some sections and to play critic. We each wrote our sections, but the whole did not cohere. As we revised, I pushed for a simpler, narrower thesis; he insisted on accommodating more empirical complexity. I've always thought of Kwok as the Bruce Lee of cultural psychology for peerless speed, skill, and discipline. But beyond that, Kwok's great ability to learn from evidence is well captured by Bruce's Taoist-inspired advice to his students:

> Be like water making its way through cracks. . .Adjust to the object, and you shall find a way around it or through it. If nothing in you stays rigid, outward things will disclose themselves. . . If you put water in a cup, it becomes the cup. . .Be water, my friend.(Lee, 2001)

We battled back and forth by email, to the point of withering critiques and long comments in CAPS. It was by far the most conflictual of our interactions. But I didn't worry about the pyrotechnics, because by this point, our relationship and respect was rock solid. In the 2-year process of email collaboration, we never even had a phone call. Through all my emails critiquing the article, Kwok kept insisting that he expected it to become one the most influential articles of his career.

Eventually, through our struggles and a helpful review process, a cogent framework emerged (Leung & Morris, *in press*). I looked forward to laughing with him about this strained process the next time our

paths crossed, but as fate would have it, I never saw or talked to Kwok again. To give our theorizing a chance of having the impact that Kwok envisioned, I am editing a special issue of MOR in Kwok's honor about this central thread of his career—understanding the respective roles of values, schemas, and norms in cultural influence. So profound were our prior exchanges that I feel that we are still collaborating, without even email this time. Our trust, long tempered, rings true still.

A Tribute to Kwok Leung, from his Younger Intellectual Sister—Michele J. Gelfand

Over his remarkable career, Kwok Leung moved the field of cross-cultural psychology forward in countless ways. He pioneered many methodological and analytic advances in cross-cultural research (Leung & Bond, 1989; Van de Vijver & Leung, 1997a,b), led foundational work on the social axioms of cultural variation (Bond et al., 2004; Leung & Bond, 2004), conducted research on how culture affects international business (Leung, Bhagat, Buchan, Erez, & Gibson, 2005), justice (Kim & Leung, 2007; Leung, 1987, 1997; Leung & Bond, 1984; Leung, Tong, & Ho, 2004; Morris et al., 1999), and the management of conflict (Leung, 1987, 1988; Leung, Koch, & Lu, 2002; Morris et al., 1998), and made countless other scholarly contributions through his teaching and mentorship of younger scholars. In all of this research, Kwok was a master of theoretical and methodological creativity and a role model for his sensitivity to emic and etic elements of culture (Cheung et al., 2001; Leung, Chen, Zhou, & Lim, 2014; Morris et al., 1999; Triandis et al., 1986). His impact across these fields is astounding, with an H index of over 60 and over 20,000 citations to date! Kwok has been, and will continue to be, my intellectual hero for his passion and far-reaching influence across social and cultural psychology, organizational behavior, research methods and statistics, and conflict management.

I have personally known Kwok for 25 years, and he has been a great friend and mentor to me, since I arrived to work with Harry Triandis at the University of Illinois in 1990. Kwok had left Champaign in the mid-eighties, but his intellectual soul was always present there. At Illinois, Kwok was known to all of us as one of Harry's best students and an intellectual rock star. My fellow students and I were awestruck with his intellect and leadership in the field of culture, and we took pride in being one of his intellectual siblings. In particular, I was forever inspired with his courage to go on the road less traveled. Kwok pioneered the field of culture and justice, and after reading his amazing work on reward allocation and justice (Leung, 1989; Leung & Bond, 1984), I was so impressed that I decided to focus my research on negotiation and justice, and began to work on an empirical study on how voice might be more important in contexts of low power distance, a hypothesis which we later confirmed and published together (Brockner et al., 2001).

As his younger intellectual sister, I always felt fortunate to follow in his footsteps as he chartered new territory, making the research world a more receptive place for me. His work on culture and reward allocation was of the first to examine how the situation could be an important moderator of cultural effects, in this case, whether the person you are interacting with is an ingroup or outgroup member (Leung & Bond, 1984). This work inspired me to move beyond main effects of culture in my dissertation and beyond to look at how the context interacts with culture to affect negotiation behavior (Gelfand & Realo, 1999; Gelfand et al., 2013). His large-scale study on social axioms inspired me to march forward to do work across on social norms across many nations (Gelfand et al., 2011). Throughout my entire career, like a cherished older brother, Kwok reliably gave me "tough love"; through our many email exchanges and countless meetings over the years at the International Association for Cross-Cultural Psychology, Academy of Management, and International Association for Conflict Management, he provided critical but very supportive comments. It was always clear to me that he was there to help and make me a better scholar. More recently, he and I, along with Zeynep Aycan, began to work on a 100-year review of cross-cultural organizational psychology for the *Journal of Applied Psychology*, and I will be forever grateful for basking his brilliance as we wrote and revised drafts together until his untimely death. I will always won-

der what my big brother and I would have done together after this article, as writing the JAP piece gave us a sense of shared reality on how we view the evolution of the field and a mutual empowerment to keep improving it together. However, his intellectual voice will always be talking to me, and I will try to emulate him in all that I do (Figure 5).

But most important, Kwok's personhood had as profound an influence on me as his intellectual contributions. Kwok had a hilarious sense of humor and endless, positive energy. He was a courageous, fun-loving, and adventurous person who lifted us up and brought love and friendship to our intellectual lives. As Ben Schneider once said, "The people make the place," and cross-cultural psychology would not be nearly the same thriving discipline without him. He will be sorely missed and will live on always in our hearts and minds.

Coda

This has been a set of reminiscences about Kwok Leung—one colleague who impacted four collaborators at different stages of his trajectory into the discipline of social psychology. He was the curious and enterprising student, the disciplined and creative collaborator, and the perceptive and inspiring senior to many students and junior colleagues in North America, Europe, and Asia. His reach was pan-cultural; he was cheerful, open-minded, brilliant, generous, and fair, so that others gravitated to his colleagueship, eager to learn from exchanges with him, generate ideas from these encounters, and re-culture the psychological enterprise from its Western roots by infusing it with inspiration from Chinese culture, judiciously assessed. He leaves us his life and work as an example to emulate.

Farewell I bid you here;

Away ten thousand miles you drift, like lone tumbleweeds in the wind blow.

The floating clouds convey a traveler's sentiment;

The setting sun the affection to a friend I owe.

Upon waving of hands and the neigh of the horse,

Figure 5. Kwok Leung, presenting at his last conference, Mora, Sweden, August, 2014.

Alone, off you go.Li Bai, *Farewell to a Friend* (C. K. Ho, trans.)

此地一為別，孤蓬萬里征。

浮雲遊子意，落日故人情。

揮手自茲去，蕭蕭斑馬鳴。李白，《送友人》

References

Bond, M. H. (Ed.) (1988). *The cross-cultural challenge to social psychology*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Bond, M. H., Leung, K., Au, A., Tong, K. K., & Chemonges-Nielsen, Z. (2004). Combining social axioms with values in predicting social behaviors. *European Journal of Personality*, *18*, 177–191. doi:10.1002/per.509

Bond, M. H., Leung, K., & Wan, K. C. (1982). The social impact of self-effacing attributions: The Chinese case. *Journal of Social Psychology*, *118*, 157–166. doi:10.1080/00224545.1982.9922794

Bond, M. H., Wan, W. C., Leung, K., & Giacalone, R. (1985). How are responses to verbal insult related to cultural collectivism and power distance? *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *16*, 111–127. doi:10.1177/0022002185016001009

Briley, D. A., Morris, M. W., & Simonson, I. (2005). Cultural chameleons: Biculturals, conformity motives, and decision making. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, *15*, 351–362. doi:10.1207/s15327663jcp1504_9

Brockner, J., Ackerman, G., Greenberg, J., Gelfand, M. J., Francesco, A. M., Chen, Z. X., Leung, K., Bierbrauer, G., Gomez, C., Kirkman, B. L. & Shapiro, D. (2001). Culture and procedural justice: The influence of power distance on reactions to voice. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *37*, 300–315. doi:10.1006/jesp.2000.1451

Chan, W., Ho, R. M., Leung, K., Chan, D. K., & Yung, Y. F. (1999). An alternative method for evaluating congruence coefficients with Procrustes rotation: A bootstrap procedure. *Psychological Methods*, *4*, 378–402. doi:10.1037/1082-989X.4.4.378

Cheung, F. M. C., & Leung, K. (1998). Indigenous personality measures: Chinese examples. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *29*, 233–248. doi:10.1177/0022022198291012

Cheung, F. M. C., Leung, K., Zhang, J. X., Sun, H. F., Gan, Y. Q., Song, W. Z., & Xie, D. (2001). Indigenous Chinese personality constructs: Is the Five-Factor Model complete? *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *32*, 407–433. doi:10.1177/0022022101032004003

Chiu, C. Y., Morris, M. W., Hong, Y. Y., & Menon, T. (2000). Motivated cultural cognition: The impact of implicit cultural theories on dispositional attribution varies as a function of need for closure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *78*, 247–259. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.78.2.247

Chua, R. Y. J., Morris, M. W., & Ingram, P. (2009). Guanxi vs networking: Distinctive configurations of affect- and cognition-based trust in the networks of Chinese vs American managers. *Journal of International Business Studies*, *40*, 490–508. doi:10.1057/palgrave.jibs.8400422

Chua, R. Y. J., Morris, M. W., & Mor, S. (2012). Collaborating across cultures: Cultural metacognition and affect-based trust in creative collaboration. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *118*, 116–131. doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1861054

Drolet, A. L., & Morris, M. W. (2000). Rapport in conflict resolution: Accounting for how face-to-face contact fosters mutual cooperation in mixed-motive conflicts. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *36*, 26–50.

Gelfand, M. J., Brett, J., Gunia, B. C., Imai, L., Huang, T. J., & Hsu, B. F. (2013). Toward a culture-by-context perspective on negotiation: Negotiating teams in the United States and Taiwan. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *98*, 504–513. doi:10.1037/a0031908

Gelfand, M. J., Raver, J. L., Nishii, L., Leslie, L. M., Lun, J., Lim, B. C., . . . Yamaguchi, S. (2011). Differences between tight and loose cultures: A 33-nation study. *Science*, *332*, 1100–1104. doi:10.1126/science.1197754

Gelfand, M. J., & Realo, A. (1999). Individualism–collectivism and accountability in intergroup negotiations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *84*, 721–736. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.84.5.721

Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Hong, Y. Y., Morris, M. W., Chiu, C. Y., & Benet-Martinez, V. (2000). Multicultural minds: A dynamic constructivist approach to culture and cognition. *American Psychologist*, *55*, 709–720.

Kim, T. Y., & Leung, K. (2007). Forming and reacting to overall fairness: A cross-cultural comparison. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *104*, 83–95.

Lee, B. (Director). (2001). Bruce Lee, a warrior's journey [Motion picture]. Warner Home Video.

Leung, K. (1987). Some determinants of reactions to procedural models for conflict resolution: A cross-national study. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *53*, 898.

Leung, K. (1988). Some determinants of conflict avoidance. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *19*(1), 125–136.

Leung, K. (1989). Cross-cultural differences: Individual-level vs. culture-level analysis. *International Journal of Psychology*, *24*, 703–719. doi:10.1080/00207598908247840

Leung, K. (1997). Negotiation and reward allocations across cultures. In C. Earley & M. Erez (Eds.), *New Perspectives on international industrial/organizational psychology* (pp. 640–675). San Francisco, CA: The New Lexington Press.

Leung, K., Au, Y. F., Fernández-Dols, J. M., & Iwaaki, S. (1992). Preference for methods of conflict processing in two collectivist cultures. *International Journal of Psychology*, *27*, 195–209. doi:10.1080/00207599208246875

Leung, K., Bhagat, R. S., Buchan, N. R., Erez, M., & Gibson, C. B. (2005). Culture and international business: Recent advances and their implications for future research. *Journal of International Business Studies*, *36*, 357–378.

Leung, K., & Bond, M. H. (1982). How Americans and Chinese reward task-related contributions: A preliminary study. *Psychologia: An International Journal of Psychology in the Orient*, *25*, 2–9.

Leung, K., & Bond, M. H. (1984). The impact of cultural collectivism on reward allocation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *47*, 793–804. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.47.4.793

Leung, K., & Bond, M. H. (1989). On the empirical identification of dimensions for cross-cultural comparisons. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *20*, 133–151. doi:10.1177/0022022189202002

Leung, K., & Bond, M. H. (2004). Social axioms: A model for social beliefs in multi-cultural perspective. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, *36*, 119–197. doi:10.1016/S0065-2601(04)36003-X

Leung, K., & Bond, M. H. (2013). Social axioms: A cross-cultural theoretical framework based on general beliefs. In K. D. Keith (Ed.), *The encyclopedia of cross-cultural psychology* (Vol. 3, pp. 1187–1191). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Leung, K., Chen, Z., Zhou, F., & Lim, K. (2014). The role of relational orientation as measured by face and renqing in innovative behavior in China: An indigenous analysis. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, *31*(1), 105–126.

Leung, K., Koch, P. T., & Lu, L. (2002). A dualistic model of harmony and its implications for conflict management in Asia. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, *19*, 201–220.

Leung, K., & Morris, M. W. (2001). Justice through the lens of culture and ethnicity. In J. Sanders & V. L. Hamilton (Eds.), *Handbook of justice research in law* (pp. 343–378). New York, NY: Kluwer.

Leung, K., & Morris, M. W. (2010). Culture and creativity: A social psychological analysis. In D. De Cremer, R. Van Dick & J. K. Murnighan (Eds.), *Social psychology and organizations* (pp. 371–390). New York, NY: Routledge.

Leung, K., & Morris, M. W. (2015). Values, schemas, and norms in the culture-behavior nexus: A situated dynamics framework. *Journal of International Business Studies*, *46*, 1028–1050. doi:10.1057/jibs.2014.66

Leung, K., Su, S., & Morris, M. W. (2001). When is criticism not constructive? The role of fairness perceptions and dispositional attributions in employee acceptance of critical supervisory feedback. *Human Relations*, *54*, 1155–1187.

Leung, K., Tong, K. K., & Ho, S. S. Y. (2004). Effects of interactional justice on egocentric bias in resource allocation decisions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *89*, 405–415.

Leung, K., Tong, K. K., & Lind, E. A. (2007). Realpolitik versus fair process: Moderating effects of group identification on acceptance of political decisions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *92*, 476–489.

Leung, K., & Van de Vijver, F. J. R. (1996). Methodology for cross-cultural research. In F. T. L. Leong & J. T. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology research handbook: A primer for graduate students and research assistants* (pp. 351–358). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Leung, K., & Van de Vijver, F. J. R. (2008). Strategies for strengthening causal inferences in cross-cultural research: The consilience approach. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, 8, 145–169. doi:10.1177/1470595808091788

Medawar, P. B. (1984). *Pluto's republic.* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Morris, M. W., & Keltner, D. (2000). How emotions work: The social functions of emotional expression in negotiations. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 22, 1–50.

Morris, M. W., & Leung, K. (2000). Justice for all? Progress in research on cultural variation in the psychology of distributive and procedural justice. *Applied Psychology*, 49, 100–132.

Morris, M. W., & Leung, K. (2010). Creativity east and west: Perspectives and parallels. *Management and Organization Review*, 6, 313–327.

Morris, M. W., Leung, K., Ames, D., & Lickel, B. (1999). Views from inside and outside: Integrating emic and etic insights about culture and justice judgment. *Academy of Management Review*, 24, 781–796.

Morris, M. W., Leung, K., & Iyengar, S. S. (2004). Person perception in the heat of conflict: Negative trait attributions affect procedural preferences and account for situational and cultural differences. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 7, 127–147.

Morris, M. W., & Peng, K. (1994). Culture and cause: American and Chinese attributions for social and physical events. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67, 949–971.

Morris, M. W., Podolny, J., & Sullivan, B. N. (2008). Culture and coworker relations: Interpersonal patterns in American, Chinese, German, and Spanish divisions of a global retail bank. *Organization Science*, 19, 517–532.

Morris, M. W., Williams, K., Leung, K., Larrick, R., Mendoza, M. T., Bhatnagar, D., Li, J., Kondo, M., Luo, J.-L., & Hu, J.-C. (1998). Conflict management style: Accounting for cross-national differences. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 29, 729–748.

Rahim, A. H. (1983). A measure of styles of handling interpersonal conflict. *Academy of Management Journal*, 26, 368–376. doi:10.2307/255985

Schwartz, S. H. (1992). Universals in the content and structure of values: Theoretical advances and empirical tests in 20 countries. In M. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 25, pp. 1–65). Orlando, FL: Academic.

Triandis, H. C., Bontempo, R., Betancourt, H., Bond, M. H., Leung, K., Brenes, A., Georgas, J., Hui, C. H., Marin, G., Setiadi, B., Sinha, J. B. P., Verma, J., Spangenberg, J., Touzard, H., & Montmollin, G. D. (1986). The measurement of the etic aspects of individualism and collectivism across cultures. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, 38, 257–267. doi:10.1080/00049538608259013

Van de Vijver, F. J. R., & Leung, K. (1997a). Methods and data analysis of comparative research. In J. W. Berry, Y. H. Poortinga & J. Pandey (Eds.), *Handbook of cross-cultural psychology* (2nd ed., Vol. 1, pp. 257–300). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Van de Vijver, F. J. R., & Leung, K. (1997b). *Methods and data analysis for cross-cultural research.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Van de Vijver, F. J. R., & Leung, K. (2011). Equivalence and bias: A review of concepts, models, and data analytic procedures. In D. Matsumoto & F. J. R. van de Vijver (Eds.), *Cross-cultural research methods in psychology* (pp. 17–45). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Yeats, W. B. (1960). Among school children. In O. Williams (Ed.), *Immortal poems of the English language* (pp. 493–494). New York, NY: Washington Square Press.

Zou, X., Tam, K. P., Morris, M. W., Lee, S. L., Lau, I. Y. M., & Chiu, C. Y. (2009). Culture as common sense: Perceived consensus versus personal beliefs as mechanisms of cultural influence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 97, 579–597. doi:org/10.1037/a0016399

Michael Harris Bond throughout his career, has toiled to present a clear, strong case for the Mainstream to answer through his collaborative research on both indigenous and imported cultural constructs. His current multi-cultural research and books on social psychology across cultures have introduced Chinese and other cultural logics into an integrated, pan-cultural model for understanding human interpersonal behavior.

Fons van de Vijver is a chair in cross-cultural psychology at Tilburg University, the Netherlands and an extraordinary chair at North-West University, South Africa, and the University of Queensland, Australia. The main topics in his research involve bias and equivalence, psychological acculturation and multicul-turalism, cognitive similarities and differences, response styles, translations and adaptations. He is a former editor of the *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* and President-Elect of the *International Association for Cross-Cultural Psychology*.

Michael Morris is the Chavkin-Chang Professor at Columbia University in the Business School and the Psychology Department. Previously he worked at Stanford University and, as a visitor, at universities in China, Japan, Korea, and Spain. He has studied cultural differences in judgments, decisions, interactions and relationships. In recent years his research focuses on the psychological dynamics of cultural influence, learning, adaptation, and change.

Michele J. Gelfand is a Professor of Psychology and Distinguished University Scholar Teacher at the University of Maryland. She received her PhD in Social/Organizational Psychology from the University of Illinois. Gelfand's work explores cultural influences on conflict, negotiation, justice, and revenge; diversity and discrimination; and the- ory and methods in cross-cultural psychology.