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Abstract. Honor cultures have often been associated with herding societies in the anthropological literature. This has led Nisbett and Cohen (1996) to conflate the honor psychology they describe in their book *Culture of Honor* with the pastoral personality that was documented in earlier anthropological studies of herding societies. I argue that although honor psychology and pastoral personality appear very similar they are analytically distinct psychologies profiles as they are acquired through participation in different routines. To illustrate my argument I discuss how FulBe children may acquire a pastoral personality and honor psychology through participation in everyday routines.
Honor cultures have generally been associated with herding societies in the ethnographic literature (Campbell 1964; Riesman 1975; Schneider 1971). In their study of the culture of honor, Nisbett and Cohen (1996) make an explicit link between these two types of societies in terms of the psychological profile of its members. Based on earlier anthropological studies of pastoral societies that emphasized the economic precariousness of the pastoral economy, Nisbett and Cohen make an explicit link between the honor culture in the U.S. South and the “pastoral” origins of the Europeans that migrated to the south (1996). They describe an *honor psychology* that is very similar to the *pastoral personality* that emerged from anthropological studies of herder societies, which showed that the ecology of herding has profound cultural as well as psychological consequences (Bolton, et al. 1976; Edgerton 1971; Ekvall 1974). However, I will argue that the psychological profiles of honor and pastoral personality are not one and the same as Nisbett and Cohen suggest (1996:6). They are analytically distinct and are acquired through participation in different everyday routines. I will make my case by discussing how FulBe children develop a pastoral personality through participation in everyday herding routines and honor psychology through participation in another distinct set of routines. Finally, I will discuss the implications of my argument for the link between honor and herding societies.

**Honor Cultures and Honor Psychology**

There are many varieties of the culture complex of honor in the Mediterranean (Boehm 1984; Campbell 1964), Middle East (Peters 1964; Stewart 1994), Central Asia (Keiser 1991), and East Africa (Evans-Pritchard 1940; Spencer 1965), but they all have one element in common: the individual is prepared to protect his honor (Nisbett and Cohen 1996). Honor usually refers to an
individual's personal honesty or integrity; however, in honor cultures it refers also to a man's social status, precedence, or right to respect (Stewart 1994). The classic definition of honor comes from Pitt-Rivers: "The notion of honor . . . is a sentiment, a manifestation of the sentiment in conduct, and the evaluation of this conduct by others, that is to say, reputation. It is both internal to the individual and external to him – a matter of his feelings, his behavior, and the treatment that he receives" (1968:503). Stewart disagrees with Pitt-Rivers in the sense that he views honor as a right to respect or recognition within a particular society rather than a sentiment (1994). These views are not necessarily incompatible; the sentiment of honor can be regarded as the reaction to that right to respect (Lund 1999). In this paper I consider honor cultures those cultures that have what Stewart calls reflexive honor in which there is an honor code that demands that the man whose honor is impugned mounts a counterattack; while if he fails to do so, he loses his honor (1994:145-147).

A feature of many honor cultures is that men are prepared to use violence and even die to defend their reputation as honorable men. Moreover, aggressive violence in these specific contexts is regarded as legitimate and necessary by the society at large. It is institutionalized. Other elements often associated with honor cultures are: a concern with the chastity of women, extreme concern with reputation and insults, assertive and often violent relations outside of small kin groups, atomistic male autonomy, and patrilineal kin groups (Boehm 1984; Campbell 1964; Fiske, et al. 1998:954; Keiser 1991; Pitt-Rivers 1968).

Honor cultures have generally been associated with societies in which the individual is at economic risk from his fellows and the state is too weak (or non-existent) to protect the individual’s property (Blok 1981; Campbell 1964; Schneider 1971). These conditions are generally met by herding societies where herders risk losing their livelihood overnight to raids
from fellow herders and others. Under these conditions herders must always be prepared to defend their herd, advertise this ability, and respond to any suggestion, insults for example, that implies they are too weak to do so. Insults, especially those that are directed at the female members of a man's family, challenge a herder's strength and honor and must therefore be punished with violence or even death.³

While anthropologists have primarily relied on ethnographic methods to describe and analyze honor cultures (Boehm 1984; Campbell 1964; Gilmore 1987; Keiser 1991; Peristiany and Pitt-Rivers 1992; Schneider and Schneider 1976), Nisbett and Cohen are the first to use psychological experiments to study the culture of honor and specifically its associated psychology. Their laboratory studies show that when southern college students in the U.S. are insulted they manifest a range of physiological, cognitive, and behavioral reactions (1996:82). Southern males have internalized the cultural model of honor to such an extent that it affects an individual’s psychology and physiology; for them the need for preparedness to defend one’s honor is just as natural as drinking water (pers. comm. Richard Nisbett). The psychological profile of honor that emerges from the experiments is that when Southerners are insulted they become upset (as indicated by higher cortisol levels and emotional display of anger), they are cognitively primed, and they show physiological preparedness for dominant and aggressive behavior (as indicated by a higher testosterone levels). In other words, the insults produce effects that go far beyond mere cognitive changes; the insulted Southerner feels his reputation threatened, he becomes angry, and he is cognitively and physiologically prepared for aggression (1996:50-1).

Recent studies have lent support for some of the findings of Nisbett and Cohen (e.g., Figueredo, et al. 2004; e.g., Hayes and Lee 2005; Paciotti 2002). Although, other scholars have
argued that it remains unclear what an honor culture is, whether there is one in the U.S. South, and whether it (or something else) is responsible for the physiological and cognitive responses of Southerners in the experiments (D'Andrade 2002; Hayes and Lee 2005). I argue that honor and herding are not inseparable as my discussion of socialization of FulBe children will make clear.  

**Pastoral personality**

Walter Goldschmidt and his colleagues (1965) examined how cultural adaptation to ecology affects individual psychology in the Culture and Ecology Project, which involved comparative ethnographic and psychological analyses of farmers and herders in four East African tribes: the Pokot, the Sebei, the Hehe, and the Kamba. Goldschmidt’s model of cultural adaptation assumed that the institutions of a society are integrated wholes and that changes in one sector require adjustments in other sectors of the social system (1965). In this comparative functional theory the environment is treated as the independent variable; then the patterns of economic exploitation (e.g., farming or herding) become the intermediate variables, while the institutions of society, cultural attitudes, behavior patterns, and psychology become the dependent variables (1965:403).

Goldschmidt (1965) argues that pastoralism requires that people adjust their lives to the requisites of the animals: pastures and water. This means that people must remain mobile while permanent resources such as water must be protected and shared. Mobility requires flexible and independent households, while protection of resources requires the ability to organize in larger units, either through age-grades or segmentary lineages. The everyday handling of cattle requires
masculine freedom from childbearing; the result is highly sex-segregated societies. When herding alone herders must make independent decisions and act on them. Finally, since cattle can easily be lost, not only to drought and diseases, but also to raids by other herders, it requires aggressive militaristic herders (Goldschmidt 1965:404). Thus there are two ways in which the economy of herding shapes pastoral personality: structural features of the herding economies (e.g., mobility, flexible social organization) and the everyday activity setting of herding (e.g., dominance over animals, independent decision-making while in the bush)(see, Lott and Hart 1977). Consequently, the personality attributes of the ideal pastoralist are summarized by Goldschmidt as "a high degree of independence of action; a willingness to take chances; a readiness to act, and a capacity for action; self-containment and control, especially in the face of danger; bravery, fortitude, and the ability to withstand pain and hardship ...."(1965:404-5).

Within the Culture and Ecology Project, Robert Edgerton conducted an extensive comparative psychological study of about 60 farmers and 60 herders of both sexes in each of the four tribes (1971). Edgerton concluded that Pokot herders are more like Pokot farmers than like herders from the other three tribes and likewise for the Sebei, Kamba, and Hehe; in other words, culture is a better predictor of a subject's personality than economic mode of life. There were, however, consistent differences between herders and farmers within each tribe that could be attributed to ecological variation. Herder attitudes were associated with the following variables or attributes: affection, direct aggression, divination, independence, self-control, adultery, sexuality, guilt-shame, depression, respect for authority; and to a lesser extent: fear, bravery, brutality, and death (1971:275). In general, the picture of herders that emerges is that they are more open emotionally and freer in their expression, more direct in interpersonal relationships,
more independent-minded in their behavior, and have stronger and more sharply defined social values such as independence, self-control, and bravery (Goldschmidt 1971b: 132-3).  

In the early seventies, Bolton et al. (1976) replicated Edgerton's study in two Peruvian Andean villages with eighteen boys and girls ages five to seven. The children were all from Quechua speaking agro-pastoral families that combined agriculture and pastoralism, the only difference was the everyday tasks the children were engaged in. Nine children were primarily engaged in agricultural tasks and the other nine primarily in herding tasks. The authors conducted various psychological experiments in which they measured eight personality dimensions that were associated with the “pastoral personality” in Edgerton’s study. The dimensions used were aggression, self-reliance, cooperation, need for achievement, responsibility, independence, obedience, and decision-making time. The results partially confirmed Edgerton’s findings; moreover, it showed that psychological differences between farmer and herders are already significantly distinct at a very early age. 

**Eco-Cultural Theory of Development**

How is it that young children who belong to the same ethnic group, grow up in the same village, and speak the same language develop such different psychological personalities only because they are engaged in different tasks? And how do children internalize the cultural model of honor such that when they are insulted their psychology and physiology prepares them for immediate retaliation? In other words, how does the socialization of children in herding and honor societies shape their personality? The ecocultural theory of development provides a holistic and systematic analytical framework for the study of socialization and development of children

Weisner views everyday cultural activities as families’ adaptations to the ecocultural context (1997; 1998). Children’s participation in these everyday activities or routines in a local ecology is the single most important influence on their development; children are prepared to learn from and respond to activity settings and it is through participation in these everyday routines that they become competent cultural members of their community (see also, Super and Harkness 1980; Weisner 1997:182; Whiting and Edwards 1988; Whiting, et al. 1975). The activities and settings change along with the changing developmental needs and abilities along developmental pathways or cultural careers (Goldschmidt 1990; Weisner 1998). Along with the continuing development of cultural competence, increasingly complex and elaborate schemas for organizing cultural knowledge develop in the mind. “The mind and mental processes of the child develop interdependently with ecocultural daily routines along culture-specific pathways” (Weisner 1998:72).

Through participation in culturally meaningful routine practices children not only become competent members of their community, the everyday routines and practices also shape their psychology and personality. In addition, children also internalize the cultural models of their community (Spiro 1984). D’Andrade argues that these cultural models have a directive motivational force in that they influence, affect, and motivate people (1995). The directive motivational force of cultural models that leads to instigation of action comes from the internalization of these same models in which causal relations are made between emotions and appropriate responses.
Developmental Pathways to Honor Psychology and Pastoral Personality

I will argue that there are two distinct developmental pathways that lead to two analytically distinct psychological profiles of honor psychology and pastoral personality as described respectively by Nisbett and Cohen (1996) and by Edgerton and Goldschmidt (Edgerton 1971; Goldschmidt 1971a). One pathway is through socialization into the culture of honor, the other is through socialization as a herder, primarily through participation in everyday herding routines.

Generally herding societies are found in marginal areas where there is no strong state and herders run the constant risk of losing their livelihood in raids from other herding groups or neighboring farmers. Therefore, a stance of aggressiveness and willingness to kill is useful in announcing a herder's determination to defend his animals. Herders will adopt a stance of extreme vigilance toward any action, such as insults, that might imply that they are incapable of defending their herd; subsequently a herder's reputation or honor equals his ability to defend his herd (Blok 1981; Campbell 1964). Children in herding societies are socialized to defend their honor and show their toughness primarily through participation in social routines. Through routine fighting with other children and physical punishment by adults if children fail to defend themselves, children internalize the cultural values and scripts of honor and develop an honor psychology.

My second line of reasoning argues that participation in everyday herding routines and socialization as a herder leads to the development of a pastoral personality. The adaptations to the ecology of herding animals – i.e., controlling the animals, being away from adult supervision, making independent decisions and acting on them – produce a pastoral personality.
These are the two analytically distinct pathways in which children in herding societies with an honor culture are socialized into the culture of honor and the herding economy and develop both an honor psychology and a pastoral personality. However, not all herding societies have an honor culture and not all honor cultures are based on a herding economy. There are herding societies where children develop a pastoral personality but are not socialized in a culture of honor and thus do not develop an honor psychology (e.g., the reindeer herding Saami). There are also many non-herding societies in which children are socialized into a culture of honor and develop an honor psychology but no pastoral personality (e.g., the U.S. South). However, there are many herding societies with a culture of honor in which children acquire both an honor psychology and a pastoral personality (Campbell 1964; Evans-Pritchard 1940; Riesman 1977).

The ecocultural theory of development provides a useful analytical framework to study how children in herding and honor societies are socialized and internalize both the pastoral personality and the honor psychology. I will now discuss the ecocultural development of pastoral FulBe children to illustrate my argument. The FulBe are a good example of a pastoral society with a distinct code of honor called *pulaaku*. Although pulaaku is a general moral code that guides social behavior in public, reflexive honor is part of this code. I will discuss how everyday routines related to herding produce a pastoral personality as well as an honor psychology. I focus my analysis on the socialization of boys rather than girls, since boys mostly take care of the animals.

I will focus my analysis on three levels: the ecocultural context of pastoral FulBe; their cultural models of development; and the everyday activity settings in which children participate (see, Weisner 1997:182). These three levels of analysis are interrelated; what happens in the
everyday routines can only be explained if one considers the cultural models that parents have about development and socialization and the ecocultural context of the activity settings, e.g., subsistence strategies, demography, social institutions, and forms of family organization.

This discussion below is based on my own observations among pastoral FulBe in the Far North of Cameroon in 1993, 1994, 1996, 1999, and 2000-1, as well as ethnographic descriptions of other pastoral FulBe populations (Bocquené and Ndudi 2002; Dupire 1962; Dupire 1970; Hopen 1958; Riesman 1977; Riesman 1992; Stenning 1959). I draw extensively from an article by Lott and Hart (1977) in which they argue that aggressive domination of cattle shape FulBe personality. I have compared these ethnographic descriptions with cross-cultural findings of child development and socialization practices in herding societies (Barry, et al. 1959; Whiting and Whiting 1971; Whiting and Edwards 1988; Whiting, et al. 1975). And although there is considerable cultural variation across these different herding societies, the everyday routines of herding pose challenges that are resolved in remarkably similar ways.

The Ecocultural Context of Pastoral FulBe

The life of pastoral FulBe resolves around livestock husbandry which provides both subsistence and social meaning. The key animal for the FulBe, cattle, provides milk, some of which is traded for millet, while sheep and goats are kept for small expenses and meat. Horses and donkeys are used for transport only. There is a strong sex segregation and division of labor in which men take care of the animals and women take care of domestic tasks of the household; this segregation also extends to the spatial arrangements within the homestead. Mobility of individual households and flexibility in social organization are key adaptations to the drylands of the West African
savannas. Pastoral FulBe move camp about ten to thirty times a year and camps, which range in size from a few to about thirty households, frequently change composition over the course of a year. Camps are loosely organized around one or more patrilineages. Post-marriage residential patterns are patrilocal and male patrilineal kin generally live together. Household size ranges from 3 to 15, with an average of 9 people, and consist of a man and one or more wives who each have their own tent and their respective children (Moritz 2003). Infant mortality rates are relatively high (David and Voas 1981; Podlewski 1966) and the childcare model is best described as pediatric (LeVine, et al. 1994) in that parents’ main goal is the survival of their infants.

**FulBe Cultural Models of Herding and Honor**

There are two main themes in the cultural model of FulBe parents: competence as a herder (*ngaynaaka*) and appropriate social behavior (*pulaaku*). FulBe parents, as most parents, want their children to become competent members who actively and innovatively participate in the activities deemed important and valued by the cultural community (see, Weisner 1997). In the case of pastoral FulBe these activities are concerned with herding and growth of the family herd. From an early age children have to participate in sex appropriate household and subsistence tasks such as herding. Parents give explicit instruction and training in herding – a task that requires great skill, perseverance, and courage – but they also believe that boys learn ngaynaaka, which refers both to mastery of skills and knowledge of herding, primarily through experience.

In addition, FulBe parents want their children to learn how to behave appropriately in public and how to control and master their emotional and physical needs. In other words, they
have to learn to behave like a *Pullo* (singular of FulBe) in different social contexts: with close kin, in joking relationships, and in public (Riesman 1977). Riesman has described the ideal FulBe behavior in public, referred to as pulaaku, as a person without needs, capable of living without eating, drinking, or defecating - a being entirely cultural and independent of nature whose actions are never involuntary (1977:129). If FulBe show a lack of pulaaku, people will accuse them of having no shame. Young FulBe boys still with their mother do not have to act as a FulBe. When they are about five, have developed sense (*hakkiilo*), and spend more time assisting their father in herder tasks, they start following the code of pulaaku.

Although, the cultural code of pulaaku is generally one of reserve and self-control, there are exceptions; in cases of clear provocation a physical retribution is required. De St. Croix, for example, describes FulBe as quick-tempered, very sensitive, and easily take offense when it comes to insults (1945). As in other societies with reflexive honor, pulaaku prescribes attack for many insults that would be minor in other cultures. Insults involving embarrassing body-parts of parents (e.g., *mbasu bammaa*, your father’s penis) are the most intense and humiliating and cause, as the FulBe describe it, soreness in the heart (Eguchi 1974:120-1). In order to remove the soreness from the heart caused by an insult, FulBe believe that it is necessary to confront the person who has made the insult and fight bravely with a stick or knife even if one has to pay one's life (117). Flight is not an option for FulBe (de St. Croix 1945). Eguchi notes that one-third of the prison population in Maroua, the provincial capital of the Far North Province in Cameroon, are in prison for stabbing to death someone who insulted them with the expression *kuttu yaa maa* (your mother’s genitals)(1974:116-7). He describes the FulBe belief that when pride is injured – in other words, when one is shamed – one should recover one's honor and take a knife and destroy the person who made the insult (Eguchi 1974:117-8, 136).
The cultural models of herding and honor are intertwined. Honor is associated with knowing and owning cattle; without cattle one cannot live as a FulBe. Riesman argues that the FulBe not only must defend their cattle but also their right to own them (1975:62). A man's willingness to defend his cattle is therefore the same as defending his honor because cattle are honor; consequently, to lose cattle in a raid is to lose one's honor (Lund 1999). Although I personally have never observed fights among pastoral FulBe over personal honor, I have recorded many cases in which they fought fiercely over minor (as well as serious) threats to their cattle.

Herding Routines from Early Childhood to Adolescence

At different stages along FulBe boys’ developmental and cultural pathway parts of these cultural models of herding and honor are internalized through everyday herding routines and practices. I will focus on three developmental periods: early to middle childhood (age three to five – Bingel ’yaakel); middle to late childhood (age five to eleven – Biddo); and adolescence (age eleven to eighteen – sukaabe). Within these developmental phases I will focus on the following activities: role-play, calf handling, herding instruction, dominating animals, herding alone, and participation in ritual beatings (soro) which marks the transition to manhood. Through everyday participation in herding routines at each stage in their development children develop a pastoral personality and honor psychology, including the associated responses and the appropriate emotions.
Early to Middle Childhood

During early to middle childhood (age three to six) FulBe children are learning culturally appropriate behavior through observation, imitation, role-play, and peripheral participation in adult tasks. During early and middle childhood, children of both sexes are often playing and working together, always in the vicinity of the camps and under the supervision of mothers and older female siblings. At this age both boys and girls sleep with their mother. During the day FulBe children observe their parents and other adults in the camp engaged in activities such as milking, herding, child care, fetching water, cooking, and other domestic tasks. In fact, the script that guides the behavior of the FulBe is, with some exceptions, an open book. Children can often be seen imitating adult activities in make-believe play. Boys start playing being-herder with props of clay cattle and corrals when they are about age three. They can often be seen hitting their clay cattle with small sticks, as they will do later in life with real cattle. While girls can be seen making miniature houses, calabash platforms with miniature calabashes, and pounding millet. Make-believe play provides opportunities for children to imitate, practice adult work skills and habits as well as learn the associated sex-role differentiation, social skills, and cultural meaning (see, Lancy 1996:74, 90). Young boys, age four to nine, are often referred to as sukaayel (little youth). The term expresses the close association of these young boys when they hang around with and are given tasks by their older brothers and cousins (sukaabe) when the latter are in the camp. But when the young boys are left alone, they play freely with girls of their own age (see also, Stenning 1959:156). Imitation of same-sex adult activities makes the shift from play to work rather seamless and at a young age children become increasingly involved in the daily subsistence activities of the family.
In early childhood FulBe children play “herding” with the calves that remain in the camp after the mature animals leave for daily grazing in the bush. Children will use sticks to chase the calves all over camp without a clear sense of direction or purpose. Play gradually becomes work when the day-to-day management of the calves becomes the responsibility of children who to prevent them from rejoining the herd and suckling. Although both boys and girls take care of small stock and calves, boys are being prepared for herding cattle and they are highly motivated. Boys often sneak out of the camp to follow their father herding; he then has to return them to the camp, since they are too young to stay in the bush all day (see also, Bocquené and Ndudi 2002; Hopen 1958). Even at a young age FulBe children already have internalized to some extent the cultural models and are very motivated to participate in the daily activities and settings that constitute these models and minimize the discrepancy between the idealized model and their actual level (see also, Lancy 1996:27).

Tethering calves, lambs, and kids is another twice-daily routine, in which children learn to handle and dominate animals. Calves are attached and released twice each day, in the morning and evening, to prevent them from nursing from their mother. Children help with attaching the calves to the calf-rope when the cattle come back to camp from a day of grazing and releasing them to nurse briefly. After nursing briefly, the calves are tethered to the calf rope until milking in the morning when they are released and tethered again. Calves have to be socialized in dominance-subordination relationships from the moment that they are born. The earliest stages of this socialization are often the first herding responsibility of young children. In this case both species are socialized at once: children are trained to dominate cattle and the calves adapt to the subordinate role (Lott and Hart 1977:181). “At times the boys assigned to the duty of releasing and bringing the calves back to the rope find themselves vigorously struggling against the calves
who are at least equal in weight and strength. The boys do not give in before they prevail and although the calves grow steadily larger and stronger, they become easier to manage” (181).

**Middle to Late Childhood**

The developmental transition from age-five-to-seven involves changes in internal states and competencies of the child. “The transition marks the emergence of increasing capacities for strategic and controlled self-regulation, skills at inhibition, the ability to maintain attention and focus on a complex problem, and planfulness and reflection” (Weisner 1998:76). The five-to-seven transition provides the opportunity for new cultural projects for FulBe children who begin assisting in tasks essential to family survival. During this developmental stage FulBe children continue to learn culturally appropriate behavior but now through participation in adult tasks.¹³

In middle to late childhood (age six until twelve) boys and girls are no longer spending much time together and while girls are working and, to a lesser extent, playing in the vicinity of the camp, boys are playing in the bush while herding away from supervision of mothers and other female care-takers. By this age children become more aware of gender roles and as they grow older their tasks becomes more sex typed (cf., Whiting and Edwards 1988:68). The upbringing of girls continues smoothly when they take on domestic tasks and responsibilities, including the care for younger siblings. Under the supervision of their mother girls fetch water, pound grain, decorate and mend calabashes, and look after and defend their younger siblings.

Boys begin herding cattle at around age six, which involves being away from the camp for the greater part of the day. Herding is regarded as a task for boys; however, if the need arises, for example when a household or family has no boys of suitable age, girls will be assigned
herding tasks. When boys are old enough to herd, around age six to nine, they no longer sleep with their mother but next to the corral to control if necessary the cattle frightened by prowling hyenas and lions. At this age boys also no longer eat with their mother and sisters but with the men (see also, Stenning 1959:156).

Whiting and Edwards have argued that daily companions are an important factor in the socialization of children (1988). In most societies the care of cattle is considered men's work and it is the most important economic activity that leads to early contact between fathers and sons (1988:225). When boys start herding at age five or six, older male relatives become responsible for their socialization. Caring for cattle is one of the few tasks in which young children receive explicit instruction from older experts. FulBe boys begin receiving training from their father or older brothers in the care of livestock as young as age four. They learn through instruction, overhearing, and observation which types of grasses appeal most to cattle; general dietary needs of cattle; the cattle calls; the characters of each animals; the dominance hierarchy in the herd; as well as the genealogy of the herd (see also, Hopen 1958:25).

In comparison to agricultural populations, FulBe boys have more intensive and earlier contact with their father and other male role models; this allows them to form a realistic image of the appropriate male behavior at a relatively young age (Whiting and Edwards 1988:276). Important factors in the process of identification and learning the adult role is that the more important the task, the more severe the punishment for negligence, the more powerful the task assigner seems to the child (Whiting and Whiting 1971:35). The initial instruction and training from father and older brother requires a greater discipline of the young FulBe boys - disobedience is punished with blows from a herder's stick.14
At a relatively young age FulBe boys are responsible for the family herd, which is the entire livelihood of the family; negligence while herding will thus affect the whole family. In their cross-cultural study of child training and subsistence modes, Barry et al. report a strong positive relationship between obedience pressure and pressure for responsibility in herding societies (1959). The Whitings argue that boys learn pro-social dominance through the clear authority hierarchy in herding (1971). Parents have to be respected by children and older children in turn have to be respected by the younger ones. Corporal punishment is used for disrespect and negligence. Parents expect that children will command their younger siblings, yet they are also expected to stand up for and protect their younger siblings when outsiders threaten or abuse them (Whiting and Edwards 1988:214). Through instruction from their father, boys learn to be responsible and dominant. They receive direct commands, are expected to be obedient, and to dominate others in carrying out their responsibility and this in turn affects their personality (Whiting and Whiting 1971). We see the same patterns among pastoral FulBe, whose social organization is strongly hierarchical.

Cross-cultural research has shown that until the age of 5 –7 the only significant sex difference is that boys are more aggressive and dominant than girls are. These differences are probably due to biological dispositions of boys and girls (Draper 1985). These differences in biological disposition between boys and girls might be small, but, in many societies, cultural activities, models, scripts, and pathways chain on to these differences and reinforce these tendencies so that there is an amplification of the initial effect. Among pastoral FulBe the aggressive disposition of boys is reinforced through the everyday routine of herding in which cattle domination amplifies this aggressive disposition (Lott and Hart 1977).
The social structure of cattle herds is such that the dominant animals have significant advantages over subordinate animals regarding access to food and receptive females. Natural selection has favored animals that will frequently challenge those dominant to them and animals that frequently reinforce their dominance. Lott and Hart (1977) argued that FulBe herders’ everyday management of cattle shapes their personality and culture. “The herdsmen can exploit these social properties of cattle by establishing a social relationship in which he is dominant to each. To do so requires much aggressive initiative on his part. His resolve will be most severely tested, and most frequently displayed, in the establishment and maintenance of dominance over adult bulls” (1977:177). FulBe cattle, particularly the bulls, are far from timid, but the FulBe herdsman unquestionably has control over his herd. Evidence of this dominance is the fact that no halters, ropes, or restraint devices are used, save vocal threats and occasional charges. Herdsmen are able to permit grazing to the edge of the unfenced crops with few excursions into the planted fields, is another illustration of the great control that herdsmen have over their cattle. Sometimes bulls try to broadside the herder. FulBe herdsmen recognize the threat and respond immediately by returning the threat with an upraised and flourished herding stick and a yell, often in combination with a brisk charge towards the bull. If the bull does not signal submission or retreat, it is hit by the stick (180). By maintaining his control over the herd, the herdsman becomes part of the hierarchy. Part of the herdsman’s success comes from the tendency to respond with an aggressive threat at first indication of a challenge from a member of the herd (181).

At age five to six boys start herding with their older brothers or fathers and start to display aggressive dominance towards the bulls. Initially the boys are often afraid. Nevertheless they are obliged to discipline the animals by charging them or hitting with herding sticks. Boys
who refuse are considered cowards; they are threatened and even beaten by their fathers. After they become accustomed to discipline cattle, boys no longer need encouragement and even beat cattle when not provoked. The FulBe have strong cultural expectations that FulBe boys will have the courage that the task requires, and courage revealed in interactions with cattle is encouraged (Lott and Hart 1977; Whiting and Edwards 1988:224).

By age seven to nine, when a young FulBe has become a skilled herder, after instruction by his father and older brothers, he is allowed to herd alone or with others. Bolton et al. argue that the pastoral personality of their young subjects in the Andes is not so much the result of dominating and controlling the animals, since sheep and lamoids are quite docile, but rather from the free time spent alone while herding without supervision from adults (1976). "Many children claim to be bored while herding. Independence and self-reliance ought to emerge naturally under these circumstances . . . . freedom from supervision is crucial to formation of the Andean version of the ‘pastoral personality’ " (1976:476-7). Freedom from adult monitoring during herding may also be an important factor in the socialization of young FulBe boys since they have the opportunity to follow their own impulses and explore out of curiosity (Whiting and Edwards 1988:57).

By middle childhood, almost all FulBe children prefer to play with friends from the same sex and most of their tasks have become sex segregated, as in the adult world. In comparison with agricultural populations, boys in herding societies have relatively more same sex contact with peers (Whiting and Edwards 1988). Cross-cultural research has shown that these peer dyads are characterized by a high proportion of both sociability and aggression (Whiting, et al. 1975:158). "In encounters with new, non-family children who are about the same age, dominance struggles are to be expected. It appears that these struggles can take several forms: in
some the conflict is carried out in straightforward attempts to control the behavior of the social partner; in others the conflict takes the form of various types of challenges, coded as insulting, threatening, warning, and seeking competition" (Whiting and Edwards 1988:259). Especially in highly sex-segregated societies such as the pastoral FulBe where the differential status of adult men and women is consciously stressed, there is high proportion of male aggression and peer assaulting behavior among boys. Under these conditions boys seem to have a particular strong need to prove that they are not feminine (Whiting and Edwards 1988:261). When FulBe boys are alone in the bush these dominance struggles and peer assaults are a recurrent event (see also, Bocquené and Ndudi 2002). Among the FulBe this behavior is encouraged by parents (Veillard 1932).

Adolescence

Young FulBe (sukaaBe) continue herding through adolescence (age 12 until 18) with increasing responsibility over the family herds. Increased responsibility is recognized by the gifts of animals from fathers and other family members. Herding is extremely arduous and requires considerable skills, agility, and physical endurance of young herders; they have to learn to endure hunger, thirst, and fatigue, to be restricted to only two meals a day and to the water in their gourd or what they find in the bush (see also, Dupire 1962:83). When young FulBe go on transhumance for several months to dry season pastures (luci), often in unknown territory, their work becomes even more physically demanding. The young herders must lead their animals to good grass and water; protect them from hyenas and lions and thieves, often heavily armed; live on milk and ground peanuts for months at a time; and sleep next to the animals to awaken immediately when
the cattle are frightened or wander off to pasture at night. FulBe youths do not delude themselves that herding is a pleasant task, but they have learned that cattle are a priceless possession that one day will be theirs, with children of their own herding them (see also, Hopen 1958:25).

Peer-peer aggression is frequent during herding. FulBe fight with sticks, knives, and/or bow and arrow. Boys are taught and encouraged from a very early age to fight with sticks and they practice the art regularly among themselves; they challenge each other with insults and spar with their herding sticks (see also, Dupire 1962:83; Lott and Hart 1977:183). When they encounter other young herders during herding, they will challenge them and engage in stick fights (see also, Bocquené and Ndudi 2002). The FulBe expect that the social behavior of young FulBe boys among themselves will manifest the same level of courage as revealed in interactions with cattle. Young boys who are insulted but fail to retaliate may be beat by older family members (Lott and Hart 1977:182). Most FulBe men of twenty-five have been in at least one serious fight and everybody has scars from stick fights. Blows are directed at the head and can be fatal. Men continue to engage regularly in fights until age 30. These practices have given FulBe men a reputation for unrestrained and easily provoked aggression of which they are very proud (Lott and Hart 1977:183). This socialization in stick fights is institutionalized in a rite of passage called soro (Bocquené and Ndudi 2002; Veillard 1932; Webster 1931).18

The everyday fighting routines during herding prepare young FulBe for their participation in the soro, which is a rite of passage that marks their subsequent transition to manhood. Twice a year, at the onset and the end of the rainy season, some nomadic FulBe clans come together for celebrations such as name giving festivals, dances, and the soro. The soro is a test of manhood, courage, and resistance to pain in which a candidate has to show no reaction whatsoever while he is severely beaten with a stick by a tester. The roles of candidate and tester
are reversed in the following soro a couple of months later. FulBe boys are taught from a very early age to expect this contest, to meet its challenge, and to cherish the honor and the scars it brings them (Lott and Hart 1977:183). Through repeated participation over a period of a couple years in the soro a young FulBe becomes a man. FulBe men cannot marry unless they have successfully participated in the soro (Jungraithmayr 1967).

The soro takes place in the afternoon when FulBe gather around the candidates. Girls of marriageable age form the inner ring of the audience circled around the young men, and the rest of the clan in the outer circle. When young candidates come forward they stand motionless, either with their hands clasped over their heads or with a mirror in their hand. The tester, armed with a tough branch of tamarind, then circles around the candidate, feinting at him, until suddenly he lets a blow come home. The candidate must take these blows without so much as the flicker of an eyelid. “In fact, to assure himself that he has not shown any sign of emotion, the individual being beaten holds a mirror to his face throughout the contest” (Lott and Hart 1977:183). The blows can be cruel, leaving great weals, or even open wounds which produce large scars of which the FulBe are very proud. Accidental disembowelment has been known. When candidates fail the test, they are seized by the girls, their kilts torn off and substituted with girls’ kilts, and made to sit with the children (Webster 1931). Failure to successfully participate in the contest leads to humiliation by relatives, social disgrace, and a distinct disadvantage in obtaining wives (de St. Croix 1945). To pass the soro is to establish a reputation of courage and strength which indicates the ability to defend the family herds, which is essential when men marry and start their own family herd. In fact, men that pass the soro are given cattle by their patrilineal kin.
Just as failure to successfully participate in the soro is a disgrace, loss of cattle also implies that a herder is not man and FulBe enough to stand up to his attackers (Riesman 1975:62). The ability to defend the family herd is vital because of the constant threat of violent and often fatal raids by cattle thieves. Many herders are quite successful in fending off thieves with bow and poisoned arrow and their herder stick, and although many pastoral FulBe have died defending their herd they nearly always manage to kill several thieves before they do (Moritz, et al. 2002). Honor and herding are thus intrinsically linked in many different ways in pastoral FulBe society.

Discussion

Everyday routines are the most important factors in a child's psychological development. Among pastoral FulBe, the following psychological dimensions in which there was a significant difference measured between herders and farmers (Bolton, et al. 1976; Edgerton 1971) are developed in everyday herding routines: direct aggression, respect for authority, self-reliance, independence, responsibility, bravery, and self-control. Development of direct aggression begins at an early age when young children struggle to attach calves to the calf rope and is deepened later when they have to dominate the big bulls. Respect for authority is internalized at an early age during herding training and disciplining by the father and/or older siblings. Self-reliance, independence, and responsibility are qualities that are developed when children are old enough to herd all day alone in the bush and during the transhumance when children are responsible for the entire livelihood of their family. Bravery is developed when children dominate the large animals,
I have argued that these psychological dimensions are integrated in two distinct psychological configurations: pastoral personality and honor psychology. The pastoral personality emerges in early childhood among children and arises as a function of the specific task conditions of herding activities (Bolton, et al. 1976). The predictable and repetitive herding routines that pastoral children are assigned at a young age form the pastoral personality configuration in ways predicted by the studies of Edgerton (1971) and Bolton et al. (1976). The routines are part of the cultural complex that is adapted to the ecology of herding animals, and a child’s training is a product of the child’s participation in the adult economy (Whiting and Whiting 1971). Simply by participating in everyday herding routines FulBe boys develop the personality that is required for the job.

Furthermore, there is the cultural expectation that a similar personality will manifest itself in social behavior. FulBe children are socialized into the culture of honor through routines that do not necessarily follow directly from herding animals: peer-peer assaults and aggression, and the soro. Through observation and imitation of adult social behavior, children internalize the cultural model and scripts of honor. Parents play a very active role in this process through correction and corporal punishment if children fail to act according to the cultural scripts, the most salient of these being a failure to fight back when insulted.

The development of honor psychology and pastoral personality occurs through everyday herding routines and socialization practices of pastoral FulBe and it is not entirely possible to fully disentangle these developmental processes. Moreover, when expressed in social contexts, the two psychological profiles may appear very similar. Although one would expect significant
differences in which contexts each is expressed. The honor psychology that FulBe children develop is related to and provoked in specific cultural scripts and contexts; adults fighting without a clear provocation are frowned upon in the FulBe culture of reserve and self-control. The configuration of honor psychology is limited to specific scripts or scenarios: one responds with aggression only in social contexts in which one’s honor is challenged. The pastoral personality, on the other hand, is the result of adaptation to the exigencies of herding and is developed through participation in a wide variety of everyday routines over a long period of time (from age four on). One would expect, therefore, that the pastoral personality is a more general and integrated psychological configuration that is expressed across a wider range of social contexts. However, it remains unclear what psychological profile is responsible for what kind of observable behavior as psychologists have not yet been able to find a direct causal relation between observable behavior and particular psychological profiles (see, Triandis and Suh 2002). Similarly, it is extremely difficult to link culture and psychology (see, Fiske 2002).

What are the implications of my theoretical outline that makes a distinction between psychological profiles and shows how they are developed in everyday routines? I have argued that the pastoral personality is an adaptation to the ecology and exigencies of herding, while the culture of honor is a specific adaptation to an environment that is characterized by insecurity in which men have to rely on themselves to protect their people and property. The FulBe have a strong culture of honor because they herd cattle in an insecure environment. But there are herding societies without a culture of honor. One could test this hypothesis among the reindeer herding Saami in northern Scandinavia who have a pastoral personality but no honor psychology because of the absence of reindeer raids (Paine 1964; 1994). Although the routines and tasks are rather different for reindeer herders, the demands are comparable and require a similar
pastoral personality (Paine 1994; Spooner 1973). Similarly, there are non-herding honor societies (e.g., Anderson 1999; Keiser 1991). U.S. Southerners are not living in a herding economy and the question is whether a substantial number of their ancestors ever lived in a herding economy as Nisbett and Cohen suggest (cf., Chu, et al. 2000). The honor psychology of U.S. Southerners is thus not a psychocultural adaptation to the ecology and insecurities of herding as in the case of the FulBe, but may be an adaptation to frontier conditions. The implication is that honor and herding are not inseparable. However, since many herding people live in insecure areas where there is a significant risk of raids, most herding societies are also honor cultures. And because pastoral personality and honor psychology appear very similar Nisbett and Cohen (1996) have conflated herding and honor societies. I have argued that pastoral personality and honor psychology are analytically distinct and that honor and herding societies are not synonymous and caution against labeling herding societies as honor societies (and vice versa).

Finally, I argue that, in addition to connecting psychologies with ecologies, one has to study everyday routines and other socialization practices to see how these particular psychologies are developed in everyday routines and socialization practices in order to further disentangle the psychological adaptations to simply herding animals or herding animals in an insecure environment.  
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1 Although there has been considerable critique on their thesis, there has also been praise for their multi-method approach to study culture and psychology (e.g., Fiske 2002).

2 Not all societies with reflexive honor require a violent response. Among the Bedouin of the Sinai Peninsula where honor plays a major role in customary law, challenges to honor are resolved peacefully in court (Stewart 1994:140).

3 The problem with this line of reasoning is the tenuous link between reputation and raids, i.e., the question whether an individual’s reputation within society is known by outside raiders. It thus remains an empirical question whether “honor” reduces the risks of raids.

4 D’Andrade (n.d.) acknowledges that Nisbett and Cohen (1996) measured real psychological differences between southern and northern Michigan students, but he argues that other cultural models, like “tough guy” or “wise guy” (Elster 1989), maybe responsible for the differences they measured.
Nisbett and Cohen (1996) do not explain adequately how children socialized in honor cultures acquire an honor psychology. Although, they discuss a few anecdotes from the old south (2,86-7).

The difference with Margaret Mead’s and Ruth Benedict’s Culture and Personality studies is that Goldschmidt grounds his study in the functionalist theory of cultural ecology and pursues a comparative analysis to study the relationship between ecology, culture, and personality. The study of ecology, culture, and personality remains a vibrant field of inquiry (for a review see, Triandis and Suh 2002).

Figueroedo et al. (2004) argue that it is particularly salient that herders were characterized by “direct aggression” and farmers were characterized by “indirect aggression” (like witchcraft), because in honor cultures “defending one’s reputation as a reliable retaliator implies the threat of direct action” (338-9). They therefore also conflate pastoral personality with honor psychology.

Moreover, many of the herder variables are regularly expressed as values, in contrast to the farmer variables (Goldschmidt 1971). Farmers do not say (or believe) that they ought to be anxious. Herders, on the other hand, value direct aggression and self-control.

Only in three categories, pastoral children were significantly different from agricultural children: Independence, self-reliance, and responsibility. However, these categories represent important key pastoral traits. Furthermore, the directional predictions were all confirmed, but one, obedience, which in itself confirms the hypothesis, according to the authors (Bolton, et al. 1976). However, the authors do not make clear how children were assigned to different tasks. It may be that they were already predisposed to a certain personality and therefore chosen or there may be something related to the birth order of these children (pers. comm. Barbara Rogoff).
The concept of pulaaku is widespread among FulBe across West and Central Africa, although the meaning differs by geographical area and by clan (Breedveld and Bruin 1996). In Mali, for example, pulaaku refers to the community of the FulBe people (de Bruin and van Dijk 1995), while in Cameroon it refers to the moral code of the FulBe (Labatut 1973). Some FulBe groups do not use the concept of pulaaku, but descriptions of norms that prescribe proper behavior are very similar to those associated with pulaaku in other societies (Bocquené 1981; Bonfiglioli 1988; Dupire 1962).

The typical reserved FulBe behavior is appropriate in public and for relationships with in-laws and the older generation (F, M, FB, FZ, MZ and in particular MB), but not within the family compound with other close kin or with joking relationships (grandparents, MB's and MZ's children).

Pastoral FulBe culture of honor is not as much associated with control of female sexuality as in other honor cultures (Riesman 1971). Whereas in some Mediterranean cultures, a man's pride and family honor is based on the virtue of its women (Schneider 1971), among pastoral FulBe this is less so the case.

Whiting et al. have found that performing economic tasks and domestic chores that contribute to family welfare are intrinsically rewarding, springing not only from the feeling of competence but also from identification with the parents (1975:179-180).

The Whittings found in their cross-cultural study that physical punishment (defined as slapping, beating, or switching) is reported more frequently in herding societies than in non-herding societies (Whiting and Whiting 1971:42).
On the other hand, a FulBe boy may well feel that he is a contributor to the economic welfare of his family and if he does his job well, he has a sense of competence and personal pride (cf., Whiting and Whiting 1971:36).

Other ecological distinctions between cattle herders as the FulBe and Andean lama shepherds might be the disposition of the animals herded and the number of animals herded. I will examine the effects of these ecological variables on pastoral personality in future comparative studies.

In some herding societies boys learn to participate in raiding and animal theft activities at this age: In Sardinia, shepherd boys of nine or ten that have not yet stolen an animal are called sissies, while Bedouin boys participate in raids around age twelve (Schneider 1971).

Not all pastoral FulBe groups practice the soro; the ritual is prevalent among certain FulBe clans in Niger, Nigeria, and Cameroon. Moreover, the ritual of the soro differs from clan to clan (Veillard 1932). In the Far North of Cameroon, the soro is not a rite of initiation for young men but for a newly-wed couple (Dalil 1991).

Though Ingold mentions that some men recently have made a fortune by appropriating, legally and extra- legally, unbranded calves [mavericks] that are the result from the transition from pastoralism to ranching in northern Finland (1990:462). Chuckchi reindeer herders in northeastern Siberia are living under the threat of raids and seem to have an honor culture (Bogoras 1904-1909; Leeds 1965; Odoluk 1934; Spooner 1973).

Nisbett and Cohen argue that the southern preference for violence stems from the fact that much of the South was a lawless, frontier region settled by people whose economy was originally based on herding (1996:4). Whether the honor culture in the U.S. South is an adaptation to past or current conditions or why it persists are questions beyond the scope of this paper.
This is not something that Nisbett and Cohen (1996) do convincingly in their study, even though they attempt to do this by citing anecdotes from novels and historical studies.