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Introduction

In understanding how the human person develops and learns, the age-old debate over nature versus nurture has been challenged by the growing body of contemporary wisdom affirming the latter’s profound significance. Theorists and their theories—that have attempted to study humans in isolation—devoid of their embedded culture and specific socialization, have been critiqued, analyzed and found wanting. Many psychologists in the past have raised the issue of the developmental environment as a determinant in the overall development of the individual. However, psychology, being a science of the Western worldview, and its mainstream gatekeepers has insisted on studying the individual as though he or she develops and comes into full maturity of self without being affected by the social and eco-cultural environment in which the development occurs.

Not all Western psychologists and human scientists, though, are so naïve and lacking in intellectual prowess, for some, those affiliated with Critical Psychology and Cross-Cultural Psychology, have dared to acknowledge that the social context of the individual in fact, determined the very experimentation (the methods, tools and tasks) researchers used to determine development. Consider: The use of a paper and pen to answer researchers’ questionnaires is a western socialized construct.

The problem with Western theories is that they are just that—Western theories. Consequently, the assumption of universality—the belief that the findings (or the results) of studies done in narrow and unique cultural contexts (though few have been done with the socio-cultural context in mind) are universal and applicable to all human contexts— is fraught with error, misconceptions and misinformation. As a western minority person and as an experienced traveler and novice teacher, I am keenly aware of the inapplicability of some popular development theories to my own sense of development and to certain people groups I have had the privilege to visiting in Africa. With eagerness, I have sought to know what theorists and/or educators from the African continent had to say about human development (and learning) in their own context. So I was delighted to discover the writings of the theorist I am presenting in this paper.

He is a psychologist from the West African country of Cameroon, trained in his native country, in Nigeria and in the United States who posits the imperative that human development in Third World (a term no longer in vogue in the 21st century) countries is to be understood and investigated quite differently from human development in the West. He argues “Western worldviews and social reality that organize and inform research differ markedly from those of Third World cultures” (Nsamenang 1992b:16).

His name is Augustine Bame Nsamenang (preferably called, Bame). His professional and academic work is identified with Critical Psychology and his theory of
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human development embraces a biological, ecological, sociological, political and cultural paradigm. His book, *Human Development in Cultural Context: a Third World Perspective* is an expose of the “characterization of ontogeny as a cumulative process of integration within the community and clan [that] differs in theoretical focus from the more individualistic accounts proposed by Freud, Erikson and Piaget” (Serpell, 1994:18)

In this paper, I will attempt to articulate 1) the impetus for such a different way of understanding human development, 2) Bame Nsamenang’s nine-stage theory, 3) a synopsis of his empirical studies done with Nso children of his country, and 4) his perceived shortfall of effective psychological studies in his and other African contexts. Subsequently, I will suggest how Bame’s theory and those of other critical and/or social theorists inform the cross-cultural education and missiological communities. Lastly, I will attempt to show what biblical and/or theological integration came be made from this particular view of human development.

**Definition of Terms**

1. **Apprenticeship** (used metaphorically) is an activity in which novices advance their skills and understanding through participation with more skilled partners in culturally organized activities. The extended value of the apprenticeship model is that it includes “more people than a single expert and a single novice: the apprenticeship system often involves a group of novices (peers) who serve as resources for one another in exploring the new domain and aiding and challenging one another” (Rogoff 1990:39).

2. **Ecology of human development** involves the scientific study of the progressive, mutual accommodation between an active, growing human being and the changing properties of the immediate settings in which the developing person lives as this process is affected by relations between these settings and by the larger contexts in which the settings are embedded. It includes reciprocity (Bronfenbrenner 1979:21-22).

3. **Ecological environment** (Bronfenbrenner 1979:22-26) is conceived topologically as a nested arrangement of concentric structures, each contained with the next. These structures are referred to as the micro-, meso-, exo-, and macrosystems.

   a) **Micro-system** – a pattern of activities, roles, and interpersonal relations experienced by the developing person in a given setting.

   b) **Meso-system** - comprises the interrelations among two or more settings in which the developing person actively participates (such as for a child, the relations among home, school, and neighborhood peer group; for an adult, among family, work, and social life).

   c) **Exo-system** refers to one or more settings that do not involve the developing person as an active participant, but in which events occur that affect, or are affected by what happens in setting containing the developing person.

   d) **Macro-system** refers to consistencies in the form and content of lower order systems (micro-, meso-, exo-) that exist or could exist at the level of the subculture or the culture as a whole, along with any belief systems or ideology underlying such consistencies.

4. **Ecological experiment** is an effort to investigate the progressive accommodation between the growing human organism and its environment through a systematic contrast between two or more environmental systems or their structural components, with a
careful attempt to control other sources of influence either by random assignment (planned experiment) or by matching (natural experiment). The purpose of which is “not hypothesis testing but discovery—the identification of those systems properties and processes that affect and are affected by the behavior and development of the human beings” (Bronfenbrenner 1979:37-38).

5. **Ecological transition** occurs whenever a person’s position in the ecological environment is altered as the result of a change in role, setting, or both (Bronfenbrenner 1979:26).

6. **Ecological orientation to research** emphasizes the subjects definitions of the situation and accord far more importance to the knowledge and initiative of the persons under study (Bronfenbrenner 1979:32).

7. **Experienced** as used in micro-systems is used to indicate that scientifically relevant features of any environment including not only its objective properties but also the way in which these properties are perceived by the persons in that environment . . . . Very few of the external influences significantly affecting human behavior and development can be described solely in terms of objective physical conditions or events: the aspects of the environment that are most powerful in shaping the course of psychological growth are overwhelmingly those that have meaning to the person in a given situation” (Bronfenbrenner 1979:22).

8. **Human Development** (in the environmental context) is the process through which the growing person acquires a more extended differentiated and valid conception of the ecological environment and becomes motivated and able to engage in activities that reveal the properties of, sustain, or restructure that environment at levels of similar or greater complexity in form and content (Bronfenbrenner 1979:27).

---

**Biographical Information**

A. Bame Nsamenang presented a paper—a chapter from the book, *Sibling and Peer Relationships* that he co-authored with Dr. Ashley Maynard at the Workshop on Cultural Pathways at UCLA in Los Angeles, California in June this year. For the 2002-2003 school year he had been at Stanford University as a visiting lecturer and researcher at the Center for Advanced Study in Behavioral Sciences as a CASBS fellow. Presently he is back home in Cameroon where he serves as the Director of the Human Development Resource Centre, a center he founded in 1995 (ECDVU 2003:7) in Bamenda, N.W. Province. He is also the Senior Lecturer in Psychology and Guidance & Counseling at the University of Yaoundé 1 (E.N.S.).

Bame was born on August 23, 1951 in Kitiwum, Kumbo in Cameroon. His earlier education was parochial leading to completion of his O levels in General Education. He worked as a health care provider for three years, then, passed his A Levels in Geography. In Nigeria, he studied at the University of Ibadan and received his Bachelor of Science with Honors in Undergraduate Nursing in 1979. A year later, from the same university he completed the Master of Education in Guidance and Counseling. He was accepted in the Ph. D. program for Clinical Child Psychology and received that distinction in 1984. As a Fogarty fellow, Bame studied and lectured at the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development for three years at Bethesda, Maryland in the U.S.A. from 1987 – 1990. As mentioned above, most recently he served as a scholar in residence at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences,
Stanford, CA, where he completed a major book draft, *Cultures in Human Development and Education: Challenge to Growing up African*, now under consideration for publication.

Bame worked as a nurse before going into clinical counseling. While working on his Ph. D., he began to reflect on the inadequacy of developmental theories to make assumptions about development in his hometown, among his own people.

I realized from my graduate years at the University of Ibadan, Nigeria, that the social reality and goals of human development and education presented in standard textbooks in education and psychology were somehow different from my perception and experience of them in African societies . . . . I became wary of their relevance to African realities (Nsamenang 2000:94).

His sensitivity to the Eurocentric nature of mainstream psychology and the fallacious assumptions of psychology to address how people in Third World countries sensitized him to the influence and scholarship of several critical psychologists, among them were Supo Laosebikan, Robert Serpell, Michael Lamb, Moghaddam, Patricia Greenfield, Barbara Rogoff, Michael Cole and Colleen Loomis. Seeding his thinking on human development generally, is a long line of social psychologists including such names as Urie Bronfenbrenner, Jaan Valsiner, Gustav Jahoda, Charles Super and Sara Harkness, and John Ogbu, to name a few.

In explaining why he wrote his book, *Human Development in Cultural Context: A Third World Perspective*, Bame asserts, “I took issue with the assumptions and fallacies that undergird research and scholarship in psychology, including the lack of clarity about whose mind and behavior psychology studies and developmental stages based on biological maturation” (Nsamenang 2000:95).

**Motivation for an Indigenous Perspective on Development**

Bame’s focus was born out of the need for a theory of human development that gives more attention or as much attention to the milieu in which a person is developing. He realized that the theories he had studied and the conclusions made by the theorists could not be validated in his environment, nor could the schema or stages advanced by certain theorists fit his experience. Bame builds on Bronfenbrenner’s ecological treatise on human development and the implications of the ecological environment’s impact on human ontogeny. In his evaluative statement below, Bronfenbrenner scathingly debunks traditional developmental experimentation. In 1979 Bronfenbrenner stated, “it can be said that much of developmental psychology, as it now exist, is the science of the strange behavior of children in strange situations with strange adults for the briefest possible periods of time” (1979:18-19). Here Bronfenbrenner was referring to Larson’s (1975) studies done between 1972 – 1974 in which 76% of 902 studies were done in the laboratory paradigm, 17% with pencil and paper and only 8% done under observational studies. Bronfenbrenner further asserts “the understanding of human development demands more than the direct observation of behavior… it requires examination of multi-person systems in interaction . . . [with] aspects of the environment beyond the immediate situation containing the subject” (1979:21).

development in other cultures from an interdisciplinary perspective and with a broader focus.

[W]e must now move beyond the relatively narrow confines of cognitive development in cross-cultural studies. We need to advance our understanding of the manner in which children come to adopt the prevailing social categories, values and norms in the context of their widening social relationships. We want to know not merely how children grow up thinking, but also feeling and acting as members of a particular society…

He was not alone in his thinking, for the book contains papers by a number of researchers who show the need to modify methods and expectations to grapple with the differences found in cross-cultural societies. Basic to all of these approaches is the relevance of culture i.e. the external influences on the development of the child.

Psychologists like Super and Harkness who introduced “the developmental niche framework” for directing research in different cultures (1997:28) and Ogbu who posited the “frame of reference” paradigm for understanding the differences in development within technologically advanced cultures and those that are not (Ogbu 1994:365-366) suggest that different cultures have different kinds of intelligence and these differences are embedded in the eco-cultural and social environment in which the child is nurtured. According to Barbara Rogoff (1990:35) even Vygotsky’s theory was built on the premise that individual intellectual development cannot be understood without reference to the social milieu in which the child is imbedded. For Vygotsky, children’s cognitive development must be understood not only as taking place with social support in interaction with others, but also as involving the development of skill with socio-historically developed tools that mediate intellectual activity.

Convinced that Bronfenbrenner was on to something—something more relative to his West African experiences, Bame sought to develop a new paradigm—a different way of looking at development from the perspective of the ecological and social influences on the individual. Working from Bronfenbrenner’s ecological experiment—seeking to discover rather than to test contrived hypothesis (Bronfenbrenner 1979:37-38), Bame, in his book informs his readers of the need to approach non-western research from an eco-cultural framework. He expounded the relativity of the above by positing that “human development always occurs in a specific eco-culture defined by geography, history, climate and the socio-cultural system. Physical and social environments,” he said “provide culturally meaningful experiences for their occupants” (Nsamenang and Lamb 1994:134). In contrasting African with European and North American cultures, Bame echoes Ogbu above “whereas some, especially western cultures emphasize academic, technological, or cognitive modes of social integration, other, especially African cultures place primacy on socio-affective socialization [cf. Mundy-castle, 1968,1974]” (1994:134). In essence Bame posits a theory that is based on socialization and a collectivistic rather than individualistic frame of reference (Nsamenang and Lamb 1994:136). “Socialization is not organized to train children for academic pursuits or to
become individuals outside the ancestral culture. Rather it is organized to teach social competence and shared responsibility within the family system and the ethnic community” (1994:137).

**His Research**

A description and explanation of Bame’s empirical study is appended to this paper labeled Appendix A and is taken from Nsamenang and Lamb 1994:138-141. Nsamenang set out to discover how the Nso children acquired cultural competence. Three distinctive patterns emerged 1) observation and imitation, 2) attention to the themes of prototypic stories and 3) co-participation in major activities, especially within the peer culture (peer mentoring). His conclusions affirm that Nso children are active in their own socialization, emphasis of which is based on obedience and social responsibility not on verbalizations and individuality (144).

**Bame’s Theory of Developmental Stages in West African Ontogeny**

According to Bame, West African ontogeny recognizes three basic dimensions of personhood. First there is a spiritual self-hood beginning at conception and ending with naming; the social self-hood extends from naming until death (which is more acceptable in old age); and the ancestral self-hood that follows biological death (Nsamenang 1992b:144). It is within the social ontogeny that the stages of development (seven) are articulated in the chart below. I will include the two spiritual-transitional stages as well for a total of nine distinctive stages. These distinctions are taken from Nsamenang 1992b:145-148 and from Serpell 1994:18.

A Perspective on Ontogeny in West African View of Life Stages (Conventional stages are in italics).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEQUENTIAL STAGE</th>
<th>CORE FEATURES</th>
<th>DEVELOPMENTAL TASK(S)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Spiritual self-hood  
  *Prenatal*  | Infant is a “project—in-progress. Human frame to shelter a spiritual self-hood | Beginning at conception and ending at the naming ceremony |
| 2. First social stage  
  *Neonatal*  | The newborn period identified by happiness for the safe arrival, the gift, and the projections regarding his/her future | The naming ceremony, names determined on the basis of historical and circumstantial factors—transcendent, character-evoking, expectation-laden |
| 3. Second social stage  
  *Infancy*  | Infancy period. Pre-social | Social priming such as smiling, crying, teething and sitting up |
| 4. Third social stage  
  *Childhood*  | Social apprentice, novice | Initiated into social roles. Expected to recognize, cognize and rehearse social roles. |
| 5. Fourth social stage  
  *Puberty*  | Social entrée. | Appearance of secondary sex characteristics. May attend initiation ceremonies. |
| 6. Fifth social stage  | Probation and “socialized” | Social induction. |
### Adolescence

7. **Sixth social stage**
   - **Adulthood**
   - Preparation and training for adulthood
   - Marriage and responsible parenthood. Seniority increases with the birth of each child.

8. **Seventh social stage**
   - **Old Age**
   - Grandparent. Epitome of social competence. Offspring living with the blood in them.

9. **Ancestral Self-hood**
   - **Biological death**
   - Transcendence. Extends to rituals of the higher spiritual realms.


**Limitations and Critiques**

By his own admission, Bame suggests that his terms (in identifying the stages) need refinement. He states, “There is urgent need to undertake research in order to demarcate and describe each of these stages as well as their core developmental tasks (Nsamenang 1992b:147). In Serpell’s review of Nsamenang’s *Human Development in Cultural Context: a Third world Perspective*, he projects:

> We may hope to see more of Nsamenang’s attention devoted to descriptive accounts of contextual variables and psychological processes based on systematic fieldwork…so that his work advances the accumulation of the databases that his analysis shows to be so sorely needed if developmental psychology is to expand the scope of its usefulness.

The critical phenomena regarding research and understanding ontogeny in developing nations is the reality of the ecological transition taking place in these countries. Modernity is clashing with traditionalism (Nsamenang 1992b:138) rapidly. Understandably, a new approach—one that can embrace the socio-political and cultural changes—is necessary. He realizes that he has merely tapped the surface as to the potential and the need for psychological studies done by Africans and he desires more cross-cultural studies by Westerners who have the eco-cultural framework of research as the paradigm. Bame strongly advises cross-cultural researchers to African countries to take a learning posture (1992b:204-5). It will make for a more effective trans-contextual research.

**Educational Implications of Bame’s Theory**

Bame’s book and the theoretical approach to development that he promotes is worthy of consideration for teachers and educators for it brings to light the affective nature of the environment on the child’s cognitive and social learning. John Ogbu (1994:365-391) has written a powerful article articulating the significance of the child’s frame of reference to his learning potentiality. I believe Bame’s eco-cultural theory echoes some of what Ogbu says:
Children are socialized to acquire cognitive skills or patterns of intelligence that exist already in their culture because their culture requires it; it is functional in the culture. Socialization is an intermediate variable, a means or formula through which people transmit that which already exists in the culture. A society that is technologically advanced will possess a repertoire of cognitive skills appropriate for advanced technological culture. In contrast, members of a non-technologically advanced culture are not going to possess technological intelligence because it is not the intelligence appropriate for the culture, nor is it required for competence in the culture. Differences in intelligence among populations with different socio-cultural adaptations within their distinct political boundaries are primarily due to cultural differences.

What teachers and educators of cross-cultural or multicultural classrooms can take from what Ogbu is saying above and what Bame implies in his book is the understanding that a learner brings to the learning environment prior learning skills—frames of references from the past (and/or concurrent) culture that affect the learning process. To effectively teach, to effectively raise the skill competency of learners to what is necessary in a given learning program, the instructor would do well to know as much as possible about the cultural background and socialization of the learner(s).

Barbara Rogoff affirms this salient reality as she discusses the socio-cultural-historical theory posited by Vogotsky who “argued that children learn to use the tools for thinking provided by culture through their interactions with more skilled partners in the zone of proximal development—[ZPD] (2003:50). In laymen terminology, teachers can only bring learners up to a higher level by first going over to where they are and getting them. Peers are considered a part of the “skilled partners” pool as well. In Bame’s paradigm, the ZPD is a comparable construct.

How this Theory Informs Cross-Cultural Missionaries

With painful chagrin, I read Bame’s chapter on West Africa’s heritage. Admittedly, he affirms the many positive contributions Europe and the West made to the continent, yet he highlights the negative because it is those consequences that mar Africa’s realities today. Regarding the westernization of Africa’s elite, Bame states, Western education generally whetted African expectations but prevented their fulfillment through selfish policies” (1992b:118-9), thus the rise of African nationalism. That same nationalistic fervor has reconstructed the church of Jesus Christ on the continent of Africa as well. Kenyan pastor, Oscar Muriu of Nairobi Chapel spoke at Wheaton College two years ago and pointed out that the time has come for a new missionary paradigm to come from the West, if it comes at all. He stressed that the church in Africa still need Western missionaries. But, he empathetically declared that no longer is it appropriate to assume that “If it works in the West, let’s transport it to the Rest.”

One thing Bame said that I think is worthy of contemplation by missionaries is this, “A theorist’s view of development is closely tied to his or her view of human nature, a view intimately tied to his or her conception of how the universe works” (1992b:210). In a sense, a missionary is a theorist. Our theory is “Everybody ought to know who Jesus is.” This theory is tied to our concept of how the universe works. Therefore if we are to convince others of our theory, we must first understand how others conceive their world,
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then we can conceptualize about moving them into our concept—the biblical and absolute TRUTH; about GOD who made the universe and how it works.

As Bame so cogently posits the impetus to look at West Africa and other developing nations from a different perspective in the field of psychology and human development—to come with an abandonment, so to speak, of Western methodologies in exchange for the discovery of new methods, new ways of understanding, new concepts about development and intelligence; so must missionaries who want to be effective in transmitting the truth about God and his love for humans. The 21st century missionary to developing countries (and to the multicultural cities of this nation for that matter) would do well to perceive of their role as first and always a learner.

From Bame we, missionaries should first consider how our target people learn. This will lead us to consider our tools. Will these work in that culture? We should consider our language, even if it is the same language, what are the semantic and cultural differences in the meanings? We should give serious consideration to their concepts of maturation. Our presentation of the Gospel message and our programs for discipleship should reflect our understanding of their understanding of growth. We must not be satisfied that a proselyte can regurgitate our lingo, we need to know that he/she has internalized the concepts the way new information is received and processed in the target culture.

Missionaries can also take from Bame’s book a healthy respect for the people of Africa and hopefully begin to think more about the desires, goals and needs as perceived by the target people rather than satisfying Western contrived ambitions, be they that of the sending agencies or of the individual missionary. Bame reminds us “research focus has almost exclusively been on issues that are more pertinent to Western social reality than to the harsh realities of life in African communities” (1992b:192). How true for missionary endeavors is this fact as well. As with researchers, missionaries must be cognizant of the personal culture they bring with them to the new culture. They must be aware that their presence in the culture reconfigures the social dynamics. Missionaries have to be adaptive persons.

The Eco-Cultural/Social Theory and Biblical Theological Themes

In the book of Acts, the church becomes a multiethnic and multicultural phenomenon. It was no small matter to reconcile the differences between the Jews and the various Gentiles. How to replicate (i.e. validate “scientifically”) what had taken place in Jerusalem and Judea in other places, especially places where Gentiles also heard the Gospel and became believers. Should the practices of the fellowships in and around Judea be the model for Gentile fellowships in Antioch? Paul and Peter (Acts 10, 11 & 15) struggled with this major dilemma. When the decision was made in Acts 15, it demonstrated a collective sensitivity, re-constructed, though it was, by the Jerusalem leadership by affirming the deference that should be made to the eco-cultural and socio-historical differences of non-Jewish believers.

From Paul’s conversion and subsequent ministry to the Gentiles and Peter’s situational dilemmas that readjusted his prejudices, I believe we can sense that the Bible is not silent about the issues of differing perspectives on paradigms of learning and that of spiritual development. We can see Paul utilizing ZPD with the Athenians in Acts chapter 17. He showed how a Christian can adapt his methods to accommodate the mode of learning experienced by the culture to which he was making entrance. He utilized an
Eco-cultural framework to first understand how the people thought. He spent time with them, learning, discussing, asking and being asked questions, and observing. When it was time for him to make his findings and results known, he had solid evidence to present. He had gained the knowledge and the position of respect by being in the milieu with his subjects. Thus, I conclude that the impetus for Bame’s theory is descriptively paradigmatic for missionary outreaches. Bame’s insight for further research in Africa (though not expounded in this paper) is most reflective of a methodology used by Paul, the greatest biblical missionary.

**Further Studies Needed**

Bame is exhaustive in his articulation of the need for further studies. In Chapter 11, the last chapter in his book, he asserts the need for increase environmental awareness across cultures (and across discipline [implied]); the need to foster understanding between the two scientific orientations—the socio-affective (non-western, expressive cultures) and the techno-economic (Western, instrumental cultures). He posits that more attention needs to be given to Africa and Third world countries (1992b:222) by the West. He would like to see cross-cultural developmental research reflect cross-cultural variations and universals (1992b:223).

**Conclusion**

While I admit that this paper does not reflect the depth of my personal learning regarding human development from Dr. A. Bame Nsamenang’s Third World perspective, I hope it shows that I have a greater appreciation for accepting and validating differences in knowing and learning. I must say that in participating in the class and in studying these particular theorists, I struggled to find some aspect of reality relative to my own life. Erikson and Vigotsky resonated in some ways more than the others, but by researching Nsamenang, I have been exposed to critical psychology and a host of other theorist whose social perspective has affirmed my presuppositions (based on experience) that the socialization of the person is a major factor in his/her development. From a Christian perspective, this research has caused me to appreciate the varied, multicultural, multi-denominational, multi-ethnic and multi-national exposure God has given me. I find it easier to see, hear, and understand ecclesiastical differences among other believers.

Finally, I am moved by this study to become more “other” oriented in my way of thinking and evaluating and even in my perceived understanding of things. I think I shall have in the back of my mind the question, “How does _____ perceive this or that? I am giving more thought to my faith and those elements of my faith that are absolutes and those that are not. I am thinking about how do I seek to express my beliefs (my Absolutes, in particular) without disrespecting the frame of references and/or the cultural contexts of others.
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