

CHAPTER 17

Cultural Pathways through Human Development

PATRICIA M. GREENFIELD, LALITA K. SUZUKI, and CARRIE ROTHSTEIN-FISCH

CULTURAL PATHWAYS TO INDEPENDENCE AND INTERDEPENDENCE	656
PLAN OF THE CHAPTER	656
THREE THEORETICAL APPROACHES TO CULTURE AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT	656
The Cultural Values Approach	656
The Ecocultural Approach	657
The Sociohistorical Approach	658
CRITICISMS OF INDEPENDENCE/INDIVIDUALISM AND INTERDEPENDENCE/COLLECTIVISM AS CULTURAL PARADIGMS OF HUMAN DEVELOPMENT	658
CULTURAL PATHWAYS: CONFLICT, INVISIBILITY, AND IMPLICATIONS FOR PRACTITIONERS	659
INFANT CARE, SOCIALIZATION, AND DEVELOPMENT	659
What Are Parents' Goals for Their Infants?	659
How Are Sleeping and Feeding Arrangements Affected by Parental Goals?	660
The Relationship of Sleep to Feeding, Holding, Carrying, and Nursing	661
What Can We Learn from a Cross-Cultural Perspective on Infant Care Practices? Implications for Parents, Pediatricians, and Other Practitioners	662
Issues for Pediatricians and Parents to Consider	662
Differences, Not Deficits	663
How Are Attachment Behaviors Affected by Parental Goals?	663
Implications of Cross-Cultural Differences in Attachment for Practice	664
How Are Communication Behaviors Affected by Parental Goals?	665
INTERVENING TO REDUCE CROSS-CULTURAL VALUE CONFLICT AND MISUNDERSTANDING	669
PARENT-CHILD RELATIONS	671
Children's Behavior toward Parents	671
Parents' Behavior toward Children	672
Cultural Models of Parent-Child Relations: Developmental Goals over the Life Span	676
Cultural Coherence	676
Ecological Factors and Social Change	676
IMPLICATIONS FOR PRACTICE: WHAT CAN WE LEARN FROM A CROSS-CULTURAL PERSPECTIVE ON PARENTING STYLES?	677
For Researchers: You Can't Take It with You	677
For Parents, Educators, Social Workers, and Other Clinicians	677
The Problem of Differential Acculturation of Parents and Children	678
BRIDGING CULTURES IN PARENT WORKSHOPS	678
PEER RELATIONS	679
Self-Presentation	679
Helping Behavior	680
Play: Cooperation and Competition	680
Conflict Resolution	682
Implications for Practice	683
Summary	684
STUDYING AND INTERVENING IN CROSS-CULTURAL PEER RELATIONS: THE CASE OF MULTIETHNIC HIGH SCHOOL SPORTS TEAMS	684
HOME-SCHOOL RELATIONS	686
Bringing a Collectivistic Model of Development to School: The Potential for Home-School Conflict	686
Summary	689
EXAMPLE OF A HOME-SCHOOL INTERVENTION: BRIDGING CULTURES FOR TEACHERS	689
Changes in Classroom Management and Assessment	690
Cross-Cultural Exchange: Parents and Teachers	690
CONCLUSION	691
Cultural History and Multiculturalism	691
REFERENCES	692

CULTURAL PATHWAYS TO INDEPENDENCE AND INTERDEPENDENCE

Our foundational theme is that many children in the United States (and other immigrant-receiving countries) are raised in home cultures that place a higher relative value on interdependence as a goal of development than does the dominant surrounding culture, where independence is more highly valued. This situation derives from differences between the dominant cultural orientation of society at large and the cultural value system of families' ancestral cultures, often Latin American, Asian, African, Native American, or Native Hawaiian (Greenfield & Cocking, 1994). A cultural orientation of independence yields one pathway through universal developmental issues; a cultural orientation of interdependence yields a different one (Greenfield, Keller, Fuligni, & Maynard, 2003). In North America, Australia, Canada, and many parts of Europe, these diverging pathways can cause children and families with a more interdependent home culture to be caught in a conflicting cross-current of socializing influences. Because of the large number of immigrant and Native families in the United States, such conflict constitutes a significant social problem.

This chapter is an extensive revision of a chapter in this *Handbook's* fifth edition, "Culture and Human Development: Implications for Parenting, Education, Pediatrics, and Mental Health," by Greenfield and Suzuki (1998). The sections titled "Three Approaches to Culture and Human Development" and "Criticisms of Independence/Individualism and Interdependence/Collectivism as Basic Cultural Paradigms" were adapted from "Cultural Pathways through Universal Development" by Greenfield, Keller, et al. (2003). For the first edition of this chapter, the authors would like to express special appreciation to Helen Davis for insightful comments on early drafts, for editing, and for help with manuscript preparation. We also thank Ashley Maynard for reading and commenting on the first draft. And we remember with appreciation the very constructive review of the late Rodney R. Cocking. For the revised chapter, we thank the FPR-UCLA Center for Culture, Brain, and Development for providing a stimulating atmosphere in which to discuss and learn about the issues of culture and human development. We also thank HopeLab for their support of the revision. This revision was completed while the first author was a Fellow at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, Stanford, California.

PLAN OF THE CHAPTER

We first review research from around the world demonstrating these two developmental pathways, each with its distinctive socialization goals and practices. We organize this review into four sections according to age periods and agents of socialization: early socialization at home, later socialization at home, socialization by peers, and socialization by the school. After reviewing the relevant research in each section, we discuss implications for practice. At the end of each section, we also present an intervention designed to alleviate conflicting socialization pressures between home and the outside community and the cross-cultural misunderstandings that arise from them.

THREE THEORETICAL APPROACHES TO CULTURE AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

Our conception of cultural pathways draws on three major types of theory: the *ecocultural*, *sociohistorical*, and *values* perspectives. Philosophically, the *ecocultural* approach emphasizes the causal influence of material conditions in the environment. The *values* approach, in contrast, emphasizes the causal influence of ideals or meanings inside the psyche. The *sociohistorical* approach emphasizes the causal influence of social factors: the interactional processes and symbolic tools used in cultural learning; these processes and tools develop over historical time. We begin with the *values* approach, the most central to our model of cultural pathways through human development.

The Cultural Values Approach

On the side of social development, the distinction between independent and interdependent pathways of development originates in cross-cultural comparative research identifying altruism and egoism as outcomes of different socialization practices under different environmental conditions (J. W. M. Whiting & B. B. Whiting, 1973/1994). On the side of cognitive development, the distinction between a collectivistic and an individualistic worldview originates in Greenfield's (1966) research in Senegal in which she found an assumption of greater unity between self and world, both social and physical, in the indigenous Wolof culture. This contrasted with greater metacognitive self-awareness—a cognitive sepa-

ration of self and world—as a result of the Western institution of formal schooling (Greenfield & Bruner, 1966).

Out of these historical beginnings has grown a conception of alternative pathways of development. In an independent developmental pathway, social obligations are individually negotiated; opportunities to select social relationships (personal choice) and to act freely in those relationships (individual rights) are maximized (Raeff, Greenfield, & Quiroz, 2000). In an interdependent developmental pathway, in contrast, social obligations and responsibilities are given greater priority, and individual choice is much less important. An independent pathway prioritizes individuation as a developmental goal; an interdependent pathway, by contrast, prioritizes conforming to established social norms as a developmental goal (Kitayama, Markus, & Lieberman, 1995; Nsamenang & Lamb, 1994; Weisner, 2000).

Culturally relevant developmental goals are represented in the form of implicit ethnotheories of development, that is, systems of beliefs and ideas concerning the nature of the ideal child and the socialization practices necessary to achieve this ideal (Goodnow, 1988; Harkness & Super, 1996; McGillicuddy-DeLisi & Sigel, 1995). These ethnotheories are shared (and negotiated) among members of cultural communities. Values concerning preferred developmental goals can be expressed explicitly, as in parental ethnotheories, or implicitly, as in cultural practices, particularly discourse practices (Keller, Voelker, & Yovsi, 2002; Ochs & Schieffelin, 1984; Sigel, McGillicuddy-DeLisi, & Goodnow, 1992). The growing emphasis on indigenous conceptualizations of parenting goals (Chao, 1994; Gutierrez & Sameroff, 1990; Yovsi & Keller, 2003) has unraveled independence and interdependence as core dimensions, applicable to all developmental domains.

Participants from non-Western cultural communities, such as Chinese (Chao, 1994), Japanese (Rothbaum, Weisz, Pott, Miyake, & Morelli, 2000), Indians (Keller, Voelker, et al., 2002; Saraswathi, 1999), West Africans (Ogunnaike & Houser, 2002, for Nigeria; Nsamenang, 1992, and Yovsi, 2001, for Cameroon), and Puerto Ricans (Harwood, Schoelmerich, Ventura-Cook, Schulze, & Wilson, 1996), subscribe to the cultural ideal of interdependence: Their ethnotheories stress closeness, decency (social responsibility, honesty) and proper demeanor (politeness, respect for elders, loyalty to family) for various developmental domains (Harwood, 1992).

Participants from Western industrialized cultural communities, such as Germans (Keller, Zach, & Abels,

2002), European Americans (Harwood et al., 1996), and Dutch (Harkness, Super, & van Tijen, 2000), subscribe to the cultural ideal of independence: Their ethnotheories stress self-maximization and independence (creativity, curiosity, assertiveness, self-esteem). These particular parental goals and practices socialize children to operate effectively in an individualistic society such as the United States. “So basic is the concept of individualism to American society,” it has been said, “that every major issue which faces us as a nation invariably poses itself in these terms” (Gross & Osterman, 1971, p. xi). Socialization practices that function to actualize the ethnotheoretical framework within cultural communities begin at birth or even before.

The Ecocultural Approach

The ecocultural approach, pioneered by anthropologists Beatrice Whiting and John Whiting (1975; see also D’Andrade, 1994), sees the child’s behavioral development and the acquisition of culture as resulting from the interaction between human biological potentialities and environmental conditions. In short, the ecocultural approach emphasizes development as an adaptation to different environmental conditions and constraints (Berry, 1976; LeVine, 1977; Munroe & Munroe, 1994; Super & Harkness, 1986; Weisner, 1984; B. B. Whiting & Edwards, 1988; B. B. Whiting & J. W. M. Whiting, 1975).

From the ecocultural perspective, particular economic and environmental conditions create different social structures that favor different developmental pathways (cf. Berry, 1994). The pathways therefore arise as adaptations to these physical and economic conditions. Thus, the interdependent pathway appears to be an adaptive response to small face-to-face communities and a subsistence economy; these communities value tradition and therefore change slowly. The independent pathway, in contrast, appears to be an adaptive response to large, anonymous communities and a commercial economy (Greenfield, 2000, 2004; Greenfield, Maynard, & Childs, 2003; Keller, Zach, et al., 2002); these communities value innovation and therefore change more rapidly. In slow-changing, subsistence-based ecologies, ethnotheories are transmitted vertically from generation to generation, maximizing historical continuity. In complex and fast-changing societies, on the other hand, parental ideas are negotiated horizontally within generations, relying on public discourse (media) and experts (e.g., pediatricians), with

substantial differences among generations (Hewlett & Lamb, 2002; Keller, Miranda, & Gauda, 1984).

Correlatively, high socioeconomic status (SES) and formal education are associated with a more individualistic orientation (Keller, Zach, et al., 2002; Palacios & Moreno, 1996; Tapia Uribe, LeVine, & LeVine, 1994). Nonetheless, these cultural orientations persist across various socioeconomic and educational backgrounds (Harwood et al., 1996; Keller, Zach, et al., 2002).

The Sociohistorical Approach

The sociohistorical approach emphasizes processes of social construction, particularly cultural apprenticeship, cultural practices and artifacts, and the historical dimension of these processes (Cole, 1996; Lave & Wenger, 1991; Rogoff, 1990; Saxe, 1991; Scribner, 1985; Scribner & Cole, 1973, 1981; Vygotsky, 1962; Wertsch, 1985; Zukow, 1989). Social construction is seen as a set of situation-specific activities.

The sociohistorical perspective is crucial to the model of cultural pathways through human development. According to this model, each pathway results from a value orientation that generates the social construction (often called co-construction to reflect the active involvement of the child) of socializing practices and behaviors in particular situations. These social construction processes include apprenticeship from cultural "experts" in the adult generation, as well as peer interaction (Greenfield & Lave, 1982; Maynard, 2002). The interactional routines and artifacts that are utilized in cultural learning have a key role in socializing a child to proceed on a developmental pathway (Greenfield, 2000; Mistry & Rogoff, 1994; Rogoff, 1990; Saxe, 1991). Construction processes become particularly salient in bicultural people, where one or the other value system can become prominent in a particular situation (Garcia Coll, Meyer, & Brillon, 1995).

CRITICISMS OF INDEPENDENCE/INDIVIDUALISM AND INTERDEPENDENCE/COLLECTIVISM AS CULTURAL PARADIGMS OF HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

One common criticism of this approach is that it is too simplistic and reductionistic; the dichotomous binary quality of independence/individualism and interdepen-

dence/collectivism is seen as problematical (Killen & Wainryb, 2000; Rogoff, 2003). However, we do not see these concepts as dichotomous. They are not all or none, but rather exist to different degrees in different individuals in different cultures at different times in different domains (Greenfield, Maynard, & Childs, 2003; Morelli, Rogoff, Oppenheim, & Goldsmith, 1992; Raeff et al., 2000). They also vary with geography, SES, and formal education (Hofstede, 2001; Tapia Uribe et al., 1994). In addition, they are seen as developing through dynamic processes of socialization, which are themselves an important object of study (Greenfield, Maynard, et al., 2003).

The notion of independent and interdependent concerns coexisting in the same culture is put forth as another criticism of the framework (Killen & Wainryb, 2000). In response, we register our agreement, but note that individual enterprise (independence) and social relationships (interdependence) each have distinctive modes of expression in the two cultural frameworks. For example, freely chosen relationships are valued in the independent framework, whereas implicit social obligations are a more valued relationship premise in the interdependent framework (Raeff et al., 2000).

As a closely related response to this same criticism, a given behavior may be valued in both types of culture, but its relative priority may be different. For example, sharing with siblings is valued by parents in mainstream U.S. culture, but sharing is considered a matter of personal choice. Among Mexican immigrants to Los Angeles, by contrast, sharing has a much higher priority; it is simply expected (Raeff et al., 2000). Prioritizing one value over another may involve setting boundary conditions for the exercise of the preferred value (Wainryb, 1995). Boundary conditions may also reflect intergroup contact and cultural change processes. For example, the collectivistic Druze community studied by Wainryb is surrounded by the greater individualism of mainstream Israeli culture. Under these circumstances, the development in Druze children of boundaries on the rightful exercise of authority and the obligation to obey may, among other things, reflect contact with the surrounding national culture.

The existence of individual differences in the same culture is also seen as a criticism of the independence/interdependence framework. For example, Wainryb and Turiel (1994) found more orientation toward autonomy among males than females in collectivistic Druze culture. However, this criticism treats cultural characteris-

tics as independent (*sic!*) traits and fails to take into account the systemic nature of cultures. In response to their example, we see female respect for male authority, a relational feature of collectivistic cultures, as the root of such differential autonomy.

Sometimes the between-culture variability among collectivistic or individualistic cultures is taken as a criticism of the paradigm (Harkness et al., 2000). Qualitative and quantitative variability has been found in both systems (Harkness et al., 2000; Hofstede, 1991). The two value systems are merely ideal paradigms that get instantiated in a multiplicity of concrete and historically differentiated cultural contexts.

CULTURAL PATHWAYS: CONFLICT, INVISIBILITY, AND IMPLICATIONS FOR PRACTITIONERS

When home culture and societal culture differ for any particular family, interesting and, at times, vexing situations arise. Children may be faced with conflicting messages from home and from the outside world (particularly from school) as to the proper values, attitudes, and behaviors they should follow. Parents are also in the position of having to reassess their cultural framework in a new setting where many of their own values may be in direct conflict with those of society at large. Choices will need to be made as to which values in what contexts should be used in raising their children.

The difficulty of such choices is all the greater because cultures are "invisible" (Philips, 1972). That is, they are interpretive lenses that are taken for granted by the wearers. Like the air we breathe, under ordinary conditions, these value frameworks do not rise to conscious awareness. This lack of awareness exacerbates the potential for both personal conflict and interpersonal misunderstanding in multicultural environments. People tend to experience the other pathway's response to a particular situation as "wrong" rather than as simply reflecting a different cultural orientation.

Because they have the task of assessing the behaviors of parents and children who come from diverse cultural backgrounds, counselors, social workers, educators, and health care professionals who work with families must be aware of these intercultural dynamics. Behaviors that may appear strange and perhaps dysfunctional in one cultural context could in fact be seen as normal in others. The professional community that comes into contact

with families of differing backgrounds has the challenge of understanding the values and child developmental goals behind cultural differences. Otherwise, they cannot hope to correctly diagnose the source of any problems that arise.

Perhaps even more important, an understanding of diverse cultural values and associated rearing practices reveals the strengths of socialization and child care practices used in diverse cultural groups. Equally important is the awareness of the losses that come from giving up one's ancestral culture in the process of assimilating to the dominant cultural surround.

This is the background for considering cultural pathways in infancy, children's relations with parents, peer relations, and school-home relations. We begin with infancy.

INFANT CARE, SOCIALIZATION, AND DEVELOPMENT

Culture inundates us with information on what is "appropriate" infant rearing. A great degree of variation exists even within middle-class American methods of infant rearing; when we look cross-culturally, we see an even greater variance in child-rearing practices and goals.

What Are Parents' Goals for Their Infants?

In general, parents' goals for their infants include some combination of the following: infant survival and health, the acquisition of economic capabilities, and the attainment of culturally appropriate values (LeVine, 1988). Culturally defined parental goals are crucial in parental behavior toward infants and in the child's eventual socialization process. Normative parental goals both reflect and affect the structure and functioning of society as a whole.

In the United States, parents have many different goals for their children, but one of the most basic and general is the desire to have their babies grow up to be independent and individuated adults. For example, guiding children to learn to make their own decisions and establish their separate, individual existence was found to be one of the most important parental goals mentioned by mothers of infants in Boston (Richman, Miller, & Johnson Solomon, 1988). In infancy, others' contingent responses to babies' autonomous signals support the development of their independent agency (Keller, 2002).

In contrast, parents in Japan showed a different trend in parental goals. Rather than focusing on independence, in Japan, mothers were more likely to perceive themselves as being "one" with their infants. For example, Kawakami (1987, p. 5, quoted in Morelli et al., 1992) claimed, "An American mother-infant relationship consists of two individuals . . . on the other hand a Japanese mother-infant relationship consists of only one individual; that is, mother and infant are not divided." Furthermore, an immediate or even anticipatory reaction to infants' distress signals minimizes the self-other distinction in Japan (Rothbaum et al., 2000), as in Cameroon (Yovsi & Keller, 2000), India (Saraswathi & Pai, 1997), and Mexico (Brazelton, Robey, & Collier, 1969).

This value of extreme closeness between mother and infant is another indication of the interdependent goals of traditional Japanese parenting and is manifested in patterns of interaction, such as in *amae* behavior (variously translated as "dependence" or "interdependence"), that children express toward their mothers (Kim & Choi, 1994; Lebra, 1994). Just as the United States is an example of a society in which individualism is both valued and institutionalized, Japan has been a society in which collectivism—an emphasis on strong, cohesive in-groups (Hofstede, 1991)—has been both valued and institutionalized. However, this may be changing, as we note later in the section on culture change.

How Are Sleeping and Feeding Arrangements Affected by Parental Goals?

One readily observable dimension of cultural difference in the first 2 years of life is the organization of infant sleeping arrangements. In this section we argue that the cultural structuring of parental goals can play a part in determining infant sleeping arrangements.

Where Do Infants Sleep Worldwide?

In the United States and Germany, most infants sleep alone in a separate crib, most often in a separate room from their parents (Keller, Voelker, & Yovsi, 2002; Morelli et al., 1992). However, in many cultures around the world (particularly in Africa, Asia, and Latin America), cosleeping is the predominant sleeping arrangement (Konner & Worthman, 1980). In fact, in a survey taken of sleeping practices around the world, it was found that mothers in approximately two-thirds of cultures surveyed slept with their infant in their bed, and this portion was much higher if mothers sleeping with

their baby in the same room were included (Barry & Paxson, 1971; Burton & Whiting, 1961).

Examples of cosleeping cultures include Japan, where children traditionally have slept with their parents until 5 or 6 years of age (Caudill & Plath, 1966). This cosleeping is often referred to as *kawa*, or "river," in which the parents form the symbolic riverbanks for the children sleeping in their own futons between them (Brazelton, 1990). People from many other cultures share similar cosleeping arrangements with their children.

Although the dominant culture in the United States adheres to separate sleeping practices, many minority and immigrant groups still hold onto cosleeping practices from their ancestral cultures. Many people in the United States have immigrated from countries in which infant-mother cosleeping is customary. For example, Schachter, Fuchs, Bijur, and Stone (1989) found that 20% of Hispanic families in Harlem slept with their children at least 3 times a week. This was in contrast to the 6% of European American families that did so. Lozoff, Wolf, and Davis (1984) found a similar pattern, with more African American than European American infants and toddlers regularly cosleeping with their parent or parents. Although African Americans have been in the United States for many generations, it may be that their original incorporation by slavery provided separation from the broader society and therefore less assimilation to its norms.

What Preferences and Constraints Do Sleeping Arrangements Reflect in the Dominant U.S. Culture?

In the dominant culture of the United States, there is a distinct pressure on parents to push their infants to sleep alone (Brazelton, 1990). In fact, middle-class families who practice cosleeping realize they are going against cultural norms (Hanks & Rebelsky, 1977). According to Morelli et al. (1992), since the early 1900s, American folk wisdom has considered early nighttime separation to be crucial for healthy infant development.

A stress on independence training is an important factor connected to separate sleeping among middle-class parents in the United States (Munroe, Munroe, & Whiting, 1981). Parents have goals of training infants to be independent and self-reliant from the first few months of life, before an undesirable habit of cosleeping may be established that can be difficult to break (Morelli et al., 1992).

Another side of the coin may be parents' need for independence. Adults from the dominant U.S. culture con-

stitute the developmental end point of independence training. A dependent infant threatens parents' own autonomy; therefore, an important motive for separate sleeping arrangements in infancy must be the parents' need to maintain their own independence. Research on the interrelations between parents' goals for themselves and their children is very much needed.

Loss of privacy associated with parental intimacy is another reason for the disapproval of cosleeping (Shweder, Jensen, & Goldstein, 1995). The privileging of marital ties is typical of cultures that stress autonomy or independence as a developmental goal. In contrast, the privileging of intergenerational ties, such as that between mother and child, is typical of cultures that stress interdependence as a developmental goal (Lebra, 1994; Shweder et al., 1995).

Survival as a reason for separate sleeping arrangements has also been cited by parents in the United States. This includes reducing risks such as smothering or catching a contagious illness (Ball, Hooker, & Kelly, 2000; Bundesen, 1944; Holt, 1957; Morelli et al., 1992). Other reasons include psychoanalytic Oedipal issues and fear of incestuous sexual abuse (Brazelton, 1990; Shweder et al., 1995). These rationales have led many middle-class European American women (and others who are part of the dominant U.S. culture) to adhere to sleeping separately from their infants.

Pediatricians, and even the federal government, reinforce this practice. Lozoff et al. (1984) cite sources from pediatric advice books (e.g., Spock, 1976) to government publications that advise parents not to take their children into their bed for any reason. When parents read such advice, however, the authors are viewed as "well respected professionals" (Smaldino, 1995), rather than bearers of folk wisdom or carriers of culture-specific ethnotheories of development.

What Preferences and Constraints Does Cosleeping Reflect?

In many cultures, cosleeping is considered a desirable practice. In fact, separate infant sleeping arrangements are often met with shock. For example, Brahmins in India believe that it is wrong to let young children sleep alone in a separate room in case the child awakens in the middle of the night. They believe that it is the parents' obligation to protect their children from fear and distress at night (Shweder, Mahapatra, & Miller, 1990). Maya Indians and Japanese also express shock and pity when first learning of the American practice of having

infants sleep apart from parents (Brazelton, 1990; Morelli et al., 1992). On learning that American infants sleep in a separate room from their parents, one shocked Maya mother remarked, "But there's someone else with them there, isn't there?" (Morelli et al., 1992, p. 608).

It has been suggested that resource constraints such as lack of space may also be a factor in cosleeping (Brazelton, 1990; Shweder et al., 1995). For example, in many cultures, homes have fewer beds or fewer rooms allotted for sleeping purposes than is common in the United States. Resource constraints, however, may play a relatively small role. For example, the shock and sadness that Maya mothers express when learning of the North American practice of separate sleeping arrangements is an indication that cosleeping is not merely a practical concern. Rather, it constitutes a commitment to a special kind of relationship with the infant (Morelli et al., 1992). Indeed, in large parts of Africa, Asia, and South America infants sleep with their mother because separation of the infant from the mother is beyond imagination (Morelli et al., 1992; Shweder et al., 1998; Yovsi, 2001).

Indeed, in their study of cultural variability in the United States, Lozoff et al. (1984) found that there was no significant relationship between space constraints (number of sleeping rooms available, household size, or the ratio of household size to sleeping rooms) and sleeping arrangements during infancy and toddlerhood. Instead of resource constraints, there seem to be reasons related to cultural values and goals that affect even the seemingly simplest of practices, such as infant sleeping arrangements.

However, other kinds of ecological factors can play a role in moderating the enactment of a culturally specified developmental goal such as independence. For example, in Lozoff et al.'s (1984) study, there was evidence that European American babies were accepted in their parents' bed under constraining conditions, such as when there was familial stress (such as a move or marital tension) or infant illness, or when the baby was old enough to get out of bed by himself or herself and walk into the parents' bedroom or bed.

The Relationship of Sleep to Feeding, Holding, Carrying, and Nursing

Parents in Asia, Africa, and indigenous America put their babies to sleep by nursing and holding (e.g.,

Brazelton et al., 1969; Hewlett, Lamb, Shannon, Leyendecker, & Schölmerich, 1998; LeVine et al., 1994; Miyake, Chen, & Campos, 1985; Morelli et al., 1992; Super & Harkness, 1982). This practice is part of a pattern of almost continual holding, carrying, and nursing (e.g., Brazelton et al., 1969; Miyake et al., 1985; Super & Harkness, 1982).

In cultural communities that value interdependence, the early relational matrix is founded in the ethnotheory of a continuously close mother-child relationship entailing close body contact during the day (holding and carrying) and at night (cosleeping). One Cameroonian Nso mother said in an ethnographic interview that a baby needs to be bonded to the mother's body (Keller, Voelker, & Yovsi, 2002).

From a neurological perspective, Restak's (1979, p. 122) research shows that "physical holding and carrying of the infant turns out to be the most important factor responsible for the infant's normal mental and social development." Hence, we must strongly consider the possibility, suggested by Konner (1982), that sleep problems are a major cultural problem in infant care in the United States precisely because professional advice and the culturally dominant practice are fighting the biology of the human infant that has evolved over hundreds of thousands of years.

What Can We Learn from a Cross-Cultural Perspective on Infant Care Practices? Implications for Parents, Pediatricians, and Other Practitioners

Cultural views and goals may make it difficult for people to realize and incorporate different modes of behavior. Indeed, there can be unintended consequences of changing one piece of a complex, interrelated cultural system. Nonetheless, there are cases in which much can be gained by observing and understanding the practices of other cultures.

Sleep Problems

Many have claimed that in North America, sleep disturbance is one of the most common concerns among parents of young infants today (Brazelton, 1990; Dawes, 1989; Nugent, 1994). In fact, children in the United States who slept alone were more engaged in complex bedtime routines and had longer-standing and stronger attachments to sleep aids and security objects than did

cosleepers (Hayes, Roberts, & Stowe, 1996). Yet sleep problems are less common or even nonexistent in a number of other cultures. For example, Nugent reports that "sleep problems or night waking are less commonly reported as clinical concerns in Japanese settings" (p. 6). Similarly, Super and Harkness (1982) noted that sleep problems were nonexistent among the Kipsigis in Kenya.

Cross-Cultural Exchange

It is clear that there is much to be learned from infant-rearing techniques practiced in different cultures. In terms of the superordinate goal of infant survival, cosleeping may play a part in fostering the development of optimal sleeping patterns in infants (McKenna et al., 1993). This may be because cosleeping permits the sleeping infant to take tactile and rhythmic cues from his or her parent, and these cues help regulate an immature breathing system. This interactive process, in turn, may decrease the risk of sudden infant death syndrome (SIDS; McKenna, 1986). Indeed, in many countries worldwide, cosleeping is associated with low rates of SIDS (McKenna & Mosko, 1994).

The Cultural Relativity of Risk

Perhaps Japanese parents, who traditionally put their babies to sleep by nursing and holding, would agree with the U.S. experts that this practice encourages dependence. However, the Japanese interpretation of dependence would be quite different. Certainly, the Japanese would be in profound disagreement with the "experts'" negative evaluation of dependence as a "risk" factor that could "impair" a child's development. In this way, the notion of developmental risk is clearly culture-bound (Nugent, 1994).

Issues for Pediatricians and Parents to Consider

Thus, many issues surround infant care practices such as sleeping arrangements. Of import are the child's physical well-being (e.g., reducing the risk of SIDS), emotional well-being (e.g., nighttime comforting), parental sleep patterns (e.g., parental privacy, nighttime feeding issues), practical constraints (e.g., housing situation), adult needs (e.g., for autonomy), and cultural goals (e.g., independence versus interdependence). These are issues to consider for parents and pediatricians alike.

Pediatricians have traditionally concluded that infant-parent cosleeping is a risk factor for healthy development. However, have they considered infant sleeping

arrangements from all of the relevant angles: physiological, psychological, and cultural? As Nugent (1994) points out, cross-cultural studies demonstrate that the notion of risk is a cultural construction. Pediatricians must be cautious before imposing their own cultural construction on members of various ethnic or social groups with whom they do not share a common culture or common ecocultural niche for infant development.

Differences, Not Deficits

Clearly, there are many ethnic and immigrant groups in the United States (and other industrialized nations) for whom ancestral heritage of infant care practices are apparent. Being aware and accepting of these cultural differences is, in itself, important and beneficial. Because multicultural societies such as the United States contain a variety of ethnic groups and family contexts with a variety of sleeping practices, parents deviating from the dominant norm should not be made to feel they are doing something harmful to their child.

For example, understanding that sleeping alone and cosleeping are two different cultural modes, each with its own set of risks and benefits, will lead to pride in rather than shame for diverse cultural heritages. For members of the dominant majority, such understanding leads to respect for rather than denigration of "nonstandard" practices such as cosleeping. Similarly, understanding the reasons behind alternative practices can also help immigrants understand the cultural norms in their new cultural surround. The dissemination of information on such practices among pediatricians and parents can help in developing this kind of mutual respect.

How Are Attachment Behaviors Affected by Parental Goals?

While the role of cultural goals is readily observed in infant sleeping practices, cross-cultural differences in parental goals are also manifest in attachment behaviors. Harwood, Miller, and Lucca Irizarry (1995) begin their book, *Culture and Attachment*, with Bowlby's (1969) classic definition of "attachment as 'the bond that ties' the child to his or her primary caretaker" (p. 4) and attachment behaviors as "those behaviors that allow the infant to seek and maintain proximity to his primary attachment figure" (p. 4). Nonetheless, the classic attach-

ment assessment procedure, the Strange Situation presented by Ainsworth and Wittig in 1969, uses reactions to brief separations rather than opportunities for proximity maintenance as the foundation for measuring infant attachment.

Infant Responses to the Strange Situation

In the Strange Situation paradigm, *securely* attached children are differentiated from *insecurely* attached children in a laboratory test involving leaving an infant alone with various combinations of mother, stranger, both, or neither. From observations of infant behavior in these situations, infants can be assigned into the categories of avoidant attachment (Group A), secure attachment (Group B), and resistant attachment (Group C). The Group B behavior pattern in the Strange Situation has long been seen as an indicator of such things as healthy mother-infant interaction and emotional growth (Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters, & Wall, 1978).

The role of the mother, particularly maternal sensitivity, is also seen as important in infant attachment. For example, it has been proposed that mothers of future Group A babies express anger and rejection of their babies, mothers of Group C babies are insensitive and inept, and mothers of Group B babies are more affectionate and effective in soothing their babies (Ainsworth, 1979; Campos, Barrett, Lamb, Goldsmith, & Stenberg, 1983; Main & Weston, 1982).

These generalizations, however, do not take into consideration the cultural reasons an infant may behave in a particular way and how a mother might interpret that behavior. Because mothers are the carriers of culture to the next generation, especially during their child's infancy, it is important to consider cultural reasons for the mother's behavior. Some have argued that attachment behaviors in different countries are so different that indigenous theories of attachment are needed to fully describe attachment in different cultures (Rothbaum, Weisz, Pott, Miyake, & Morelli, 2000, 2001); others conclude that attachment is a valuable framework for examining general questions about mothering, biology, and culture in development (Chao, 2001b; Posada & Jacobs, 2001). Whatever the case may be, it is clear that mother-infant attachment is an important phenomenon to consider in studies of culture and development.

In Japan, compared to the United States, more C or resistant babies have been identified from the Strange Situation assessment. In contrast, A or avoidant babies

are common in the United States, but rare or absent in Japan (Miyake et al., 1985; Takahashi, 1990; van IJzendoorn & Kroonenberg, 1988). Why this difference in the way cultures deviate from the "norm"? Cultural differences in parental goals may be the reason. Traditional Japanese mothers, with parental goals such as having the parent and child "become one" (Kawakami, 1987), rarely leave their babies in the care of strangers such as babysitters. Thus, the various separations that take place in the Strange Situation paradigm cause extreme and unusual stress to the infants (Miyake et al., 1985; Takahashi, 1990).

Supporting this hypothesis, a study of working Japanese mothers found the same distribution of attachment patterns as in the United States (Durrett, Otaki, & Richards, 1984); there were avoidant as well as resistant and secure attachments. Clearly, such babies would have had experience with temporary separations from their mother. Confirming this point, studies in the United States by Lamb and colleagues (Lamb & Sternberg, 1990; Roopnarine & Lamb, 1978, 1980) show that unaccustomed separations from the mother, as when a baby begins day care, can raise anxiety about separation that is revealed in Strange Situation behavior, but that habituation to temporary separations removes the behavioral manifestations of this anxiety.

As Takahashi (1990) proposed, the separation history of the child affects responses to the Strange Situation; this separation history is conditioned both by cross-cultural variability in value orientations and by ecological factors within a culture, such as day care. The higher proportion of resistant babies found in Japan could therefore be due to different modal patterns of separation that take place in the daily interactions of Japanese and U.S. mother-child dyads.

In another study, German babies were found to be more likely to be categorized as Group A, or avoidant, and less likely to be labeled as Group C, or resistant, when compared to children in both Japan and the United States (Grossmann, Grossmann, Spangler, Suess, & Unzner, 1985; van IJzendoorn & Kroonenberg, 1988). Like the Japanese and U.S. patterns, this pattern can also be attributed to culture-specific parental goals for their children. In Germany, for example, parents desire their children to be nonclingy and independent (Grossmann et al., 1985). Therefore, the greater proportion of A infants in Germany may be a culturally desired outcome of German parental goals and strategies (Campos et al., 1983).

The United States falls between Japan and Germany in the frequency of both avoidant, independent (Group A) and dependent, resistant (Group C) babies (van IJzendoorn & Kroonenberg, 1988). If we think of the independence value as having originated in Germany and other parts of northern Europe, this pattern makes sense. The value would have attenuated in its travels to the United States, where it came into contact with people from all over the world, including indigenous Americans, most of whom valued interdependence in their ancestral cultures (Greenfield & Cocking, 1994).

In line with this explanation, Grossman et al. (1985) observe that in Germany,

as soon as infants become mobile, most mothers feel that they should now be weaned from close bodily contact. To carry a baby who can move on its own or to respond to its every cry by picking it up would be considered as spoiling. (p. 253)

LeVine (1994) notes that German infants not only sleep alone, they are also left alone in the morning for an hour after waking up. In addition, mothers leave babies alone to shop, and German babies are left alone in the evening after 1 year of age. These methods of fostering independence seems more extreme than those used by mothers in the United States. Hence, it is logical for the United States to be between Germany and Japan in both avoidant, independent A babies and resistant, dependent C babies.

However, within the United States, it has been suggested that day care is also associated with more avoidant attachments (Belsky, 1989). This is an ecological factor that could push the value of independence farther than would otherwise be the case. Clarke-Stewart (1989) has suggested that, "although children who are accustomed to brief separations by virtue of repeated day care experiences may behave 'avoidantly,' their behavior might actually reflect a developmentally precocious pattern of independence and confidence rather than insecurity" (quoted by Lamb & Sternberg, 1990, p. 360).

Implications of Cross-Cultural Differences in Attachment for Practice

What, in a multicultural society, is the adaptive significance of minority interpretations of attachment that differ from those of the majority? This is an important

question for practice that has not been explored in research. Are minority infants at risk for later maladaptation to the majority culture because their mothers have a different interpretation of the attachment relationship? Psychologists and practitioners concerned with issues of attachment should keep this issue in mind; in understanding attachment for clinical purposes, it may be necessary to go beyond attachment behaviors to understand the culture-specific meaning of those behaviors for the mother-child dyad.

Implications for Measuring Attachment across Cultures and across Subcultures

The stress level engendered by the Strange Situation in Japan raises the question of whether the measuring instrument itself is too culture-specific for cross-cultural research. Indeed, it was originally developed as a culture-specific instrument for the dominant culture of the United States (Clarke-Stewart, Goossens, & Allhusen, 2001). Because it is based on reactions to separation from mother and reactions to strangers, is it a valid measure of attachment in cultures characterized by almost continuous mother-infant contact and the absence of contact with strangers?

On the other side of the coin, the Strange Situation is based on the assumption that brief separations from the mother will provoke mild to moderate stress. Clarke-Stewart, Goossens, and Allhusen (2001) therefore note that the Strange Situation may not be valid for cultural settings (such as day care) in which an infant becomes accustomed to frequent brief separations from the mother and, therefore, is not stressed at all. Clarke-Stewart and her colleagues, in response to these problems with the cross-cultural (and cross-subcultural) use of the Strange Situation, have developed a new attachment measure, the California Attachment Procedure, that does not involve separation from mother and is therefore not affected by experience (or the lack thereof) with brief separations from mother. In line with Bowlby's (1969) evolution-based notion of attachment, their measure operationalizes attachment as the use of a close relationship for a safe haven when danger is sensed. Moderate stressors (such as a loud noise) are presented to the baby in the presence of the mother, and the baby's use of the mother (the safe haven) to cope with fearful reactions to these stressors is then noted. Because it is not affected by specific experience with maternal separation, a measure based on this type of universalistic definition of attachment is much more likely to have cross-cultural validity than the Strange Situation.

How Are Communication Behaviors Affected by Parental Goals?

In this section, we provide evidence that parental goals for child development are also realized through parents' communication strategies with their infants. In some cultures, these strategies are more geared to fostering technological intelligence; in others, they are more geared to fostering social intelligence.

The Content of Communication

Fernald and Morikawa (1993) observed American and Japanese mother-infant dyads playing with toys. The differences found in conversational topics was striking: American mothers tended to focus on calling attention to the object names of the toys. An example given of a typical American interaction is, "That's a car. See the car? You like it? It's got wheels" (p. 653). In contrast, Japanese mothers were less interested in object labeling; instead, they focused more of their attention on verbalizing polite social exchanges. An example of such an interaction is translated as "Here! It's a vroom vroom. I give it to you. Now give it to me. Give me. Yes! Thank you" (p. 653).

Japanese mothers were also more likely to engage in routines that arouse empathy with the object, encouraging positive feelings toward the toy by saying things like "Here! It's a doggy. Give it love. Love love love while patting the toy" (Fernald & Morikawa, 1993, p. 653). In sharp contrast, many U.S. mothers explained that their goals in the interaction were to attract their child's attention and to teach him or her new words. Here, a distinct value is placed on cognitive development. In contrast, Japanese mothers explained that their goals were to talk gently and to use sounds that the infant could easily imitate. The Japanese concern for explicit teaching of cultural norms for politeness in speech was also expressed (Clancy, 1986; Fernald & Morikawa, 1993).

These differences are an operational demonstration of different parental goals. Mundy-Castle (1974) conceptualizes the European-based (Western) way of socializing children as geared to the goal of technological intelligence (intelligence that is related to manipulation of the physical world), and the African way as geared to the goal of social intelligence (intelligence related to the knowledge of others). Clearly, the Japanese mother quoted earlier is also emphasizing the development of social intelligence.

The role of adult-infant communication in actualizing the parental goal of social intelligence is seen in the following interpretation of Bakeman, Adamson, Konner, and Barr's (1990) research among the !Kung, African hunter-gatherers in Botswana. In this culture of intimate social bonds and minimal property, objects are valued as things to be shared, not as personal possessions (Berk, 1993, p. 30).

In !Kung society, no toys are made for infants. Instead, natural objects, such as twigs, grass, stones, and nutshells, are always available, along with cooking implements. However, adults do not encourage babies to play with these objects. In fact, adults are unlikely to interact with infants while they are exploring objects independently. But when a baby offers an object to another person, adults become highly responsive, encouraging and vocalizing much more than at other times. Thus, the !Kung cultural emphasis on the interpersonal rather than physical aspects of existence is reflected in how adults use objects in their interactions with the very youngest members of their community (Berk, 1993, p. 30).

Similar to the !Kung's emphasis on social rather than technological intelligence, the communication of West Africans in Africa and West African immigrants in Paris focuses on integrating the infant into a social group (Rabain, 1979; Rabain-Jamin, 1994; Zempleni-Rabain, 1973). African mothers manifest this emphasis by using verbalizations that relate their infant to a third party, either real (e.g., telling the baby to share some food with brothers or sisters) or imaginary (e.g., "Grandma told you," said by the mother of a family that has immigrated to France, leaving the grandmother in Africa). They also respond more frequently to child-initiated social activity than French mothers do.

European mothers (e.g., French, German, Greek), in contrast, focus on the child-centered mother-child dyad (e.g., face-to-face communication) and on their infants' technological competence (e.g., object manipulation; Keller et al., 2003; Rabain, 1979; Rabain-Jamin, 1994; Zempleni-Rabain, 1973). For example, in comparison with the African mothers, French mothers manifest this focus by more frequent reference to the child's speech (e.g., "What are you saying to your mommy?"; "Is that all you've got to say?"), by less frequently relating the child to a third party, and by responding more frequently to child-initiated object manipulation (Rabain, 1979; Rabain-Jamin, 1994; Zempleni-Rabain, 1973).

One conclusion is that there may be a connection between an independent orientation and technological intelligence. An early orientation to the nonsocial world of things and objects stresses independence from social relationships, for example, in Germany (Keller, Zach, & Abels, 2002) and in France (Rabain-Jamin & Sabeau-Jouannet, 1997). An absence of emphasis on social relationships seems correlated with the presence of an emphasis on the physical world. Although our earlier discussion of sleeping arrangements focused on whether an infant was alone or with a parent, there is another aspect of this difference: When infants are left alone in a crib or playpen, they are usually given toys (e.g., mobiles, rattles) to amuse themselves with. Because toys provide early cognitive socialization for technological intelligence, there is a connection between the socialization of independence and the socialization of technological intelligence. The child left alone with toys is both learning to be alone and learning to interact with the physical world of objects. In contrast, people are more important than the object world in the development of an interdependent orientation or social intelligence.

The Process of Communication

Dyadic communication is the norm in an individualistic value system. However, multiparty communication is the norm in a collectivistic framework (Quiroz, Greenfield, & Altchech, 1999). This leads to differences in the deployment of attention by caregivers and their toddlers in the process of communication. In a Maya community in Guatemala, where interdependence is an important developmental goal, mothers and their toddlers often kept two simultaneous and continuous lines of attention and communication going when there were two competing sources of attentional demand (e.g., an older sib makes a bid to play with a toddler, who is already interacting with his or her mother). In Salt Lake City, Utah, an individualistic setting, mothers and toddlers more often carried on one dyadic interaction at a time when there were two competing bids for attention (e.g., both a toddler and an older sibling want the mother's attention; Chavajay & Rogoff, 2002). In other words, the process of communication between parent and toddler, itself a socializing force in development, reflected the two respective models of human development.

Cultural Coherence and Individual Differences

The different customs and practices of infant care are not random. They are motivated by underlying cultural

TABLE 17.1 Contrasting Cultural Models of Infant Development and Socialization

Developmental Goals	Independence	Interdependence
Valued intelligence	Technological	Social
Socialization practices	Infant sleeps alone; more use of devices (baby seats, strollers, cribs, playpens) that allow separation of awake infant; objects to explore and amuse	Parent-child cosleeping, more holding and carrying, objects to mediate social relationships
Attachment behaviors	More avoidant behavior in response to the Strange Situation	More resistant behavior in response to the Strange Situation

models with overarching socialization goals that provide continuity from one developmental domain to another. How infants are viewed, the developmental goals of the parents for the child, and parental behavior toward the child are all inextricably intertwined with the cultural background of the parents and the child. The coherence, on a cultural level, of developmental goals, socialization practices, child outcomes, and adult interpretations is illustrated in Table 17.1, which serves as a kind of summary of this section.

Philosophical Differences in Child Rearing between Individualistic and Collectivistic Cultures

The two models presented in Table 17.1 must be taken as two idealized systems of cultural norms. Within each ideal type, different societies and cultures will exemplify different varieties of both individualism and collectivism (Kim & Choi, 1994).

Because individual differences are central to U.S. culture and to psychology as a discipline, it is important to point out that, within every culture, there will always be important individual variation around each cultural norm. In other words, cultural typologies do not eradicate or minimize individual differences; they simply point to the norms around which individual differences range. Nonetheless, we must also point out that the scientific and popular concern with individual differences reflects a cultural orientation in which individuation is a primary emphasis (Greenfield, 2004).

Culture Contact and Culture Change

In addition, there will be conflict and compromise between the two idealized models presented in Table 17.1 in situations of culture contact or culture change. Culture contact is particularly important in multicultural societies (e.g., Raeff et al., 2000). Culture change is particularly important in societies undergoing processes of technological or commercial development (Greenfield, 2004; Greenfield, Maynare, & Childs, 2003).

Japan and China, for example, have been undergoing processes of rapid culture change over the past generation. For example, a recent study in Taiwan and the United States did not find more collectivistic child-rearing values in Taiwan (Wang & Tamis-LeMonda, 2003).

Earlier we mentioned that a study of working Japanese mothers found the same distribution of attachment patterns in that subgroup as in the United States (Durrett et al., 1984); we have interpreted this finding as reflecting the greater independence of babies who experience regular brief separations from their mother. But in the period since that study was published in 1984, a much greater proportion of Japanese mothers have gone to work outside the home. We would therefore expect that overall patterns of attachment in the Japanese population as a whole would have become more like the pattern in the United States. We would also expect the cultural ideology about attachment to shift accordingly, adapting to new conditions. Indeed, the most recent studies in Japan that we could find showed no differences between Japanese and U.S. mothers in their preferences about interactions, physical proximity, and contact with their infant (Posada & Jacobs, 2001).

It is also known that the ecologies of wealth (e.g., Georgas, van de Vijver, & Berry, 2004), formal education (e.g., Tapia Uribe et al., 1994), and urban environments (e.g., Fuligni & Zhang, 2004) favor more individualistic adaptations. Germany is a country that has become wealthier, more urban, and more highly educated over the past generation. The first historical study of these issues, by Keller and Lamm (in press), has found that infant care practices in Germany have also moved toward greater socialization for independence of infants. Present-day mothers and fathers of 3-month-old infants display significantly more face-to-face contact and object play and significantly less body contact and body stimulation during free play interactions than parents in similar life conditions 25 years earlier.

Cultural Frameworks and Ethnocentrism

It is an all too natural response to criticize the attitudes and practices generated by a cultural model different from one's own, with no understanding of the model behind the overt behaviors. LeVine et al. (1994) provide a wonderful example of ethnocentric criticism in their comparative look at the Gusii in Kenya and the middle class in the United States:

The Gusii would be shocked at the slow or casual responsiveness of American mothers to the crying of young infants. . . . This signals incompetent caregiving from their perspective. They would be similarly appalled by the practice of putting babies to sleep in separate beds or rooms, where they cannot be closely monitored at night, rather than with the mother. (pp. 255-256)

According to LeVine et al., the Gusii would think American toddlers unruly and disobedient as well, largely due to the excessive praise they receive and the maternal solicitations of their preferences.

Likewise, LeVine et al. (1994) believe that Americans would also find problems with the way the Gusii choose to raise their infants. For example, leaving an infant under the supervision of a 5- or 6-year-old child, a common practice among the Gusii, would be viewed as neglect in the United States.

However, a 5- or 6-year-old Gusii infant caregiver probably has much more know-how about taking care of babies than a typical U.S. child of the same age would have. Sib caregivers observe and practice caregiving under the watchful eye of the mother in many parts of the world (Ochs & Schieffelin, 1984). They develop sophisticated skills that aid them in carrying out this responsibility (Rabain-Jamin, Maynard, & Greenfield, 2003).

LeVine et al. (1994) also believe that:

[Americans] would be appalled that Gusii mothers often do not look at their babies when breastfeeding them . . . and that praise is more or less prohibited in the Gusii script of maternal response. . . . They would see the Gusii mothers as unacceptably authoritarian and punitive with children. (pp. 255-256)

In this way, infant care practices that are viewed as moral and pragmatic in one cultural context can be viewed as "misguided, ineffective, and even immoral" (p. 256) in others.

In a multicultural society, ethnocentric criticism has disastrous practical and social consequences. Instead, it

is necessary to understand how each model has made sense in its historical context. This means that assessments of pathology or deviance by parents, pediatricians, teachers, and clinicians must always be based on an understanding of the cultural meaning that particular behaviors have for the participants in a social system.

For example, Schroen (1995) explores how a lack of cultural understanding can lead to misinterpretations by social workers. She documents how negative judgments by social workers of cultural practices they do not understand, using criteria from their own culture, can lead to tragedy. For instance, social workers can misinterpret sibling care (a practice in many cultures worldwide) as child neglect, leading to children being taken away from loving parents who may have been following a different cultural model of competent parenting and child development.

One can imagine other situations in which cultural practices may be misinterpreted as forms of neglect or abuse. For example, cosleeping or cobathing practices (acceptable in many cultures, such as in Japan) may be misinterpreted as sexual in nature. Social workers, like other clinicians, must therefore be trained to recognize differences between cultural variations in practice and truly abusive situations.

Teachers and day care workers must also be made aware of these differences in infant rearing practices. For example, the crying (or lack thereof) of children when they are dropped off at school in the morning may be partially attributable to cultural differences in the strangeness of separation. Through a better understanding of these differences, infant care professionals can become more understanding and helpful to the child's transition between home and day care.

Costs and Benefits of Different Cultural Models

Each cultural model has its own set of benefits and costs (LeVine et al., 1994). These can still be seen throughout the life span. For example, the mother-child bond remains strong throughout life in Japan, but the husband-wife tie is of a less romantic and close nature than in the United States (Lebra, 1994).

The costs and benefits of each cultural model are perceptible by the participants and a culturally sensitive outside observer. For example, although European American mothers generally subscribe to the benefits of autonomy as a developmental goal, its cost to them can be seen as the "empty nest syndrome." In this culture, adult children are often gone physically, as well as emotionally.

Different patterns of costs and benefits provide opportunities for useful cross-cultural exchange. From the perspective of both insider and outsider, each cultural model has its strengths and weaknesses, its costs and benefits, and its pathological extremes. For this reason, cross-cultural exchange of values and practices can sometimes serve as a corrective force to counteract the weaknesses, costs, and pathologies of any given cultural system. For example, McKenna and Mosko's (1994) experimental research documents the potential physiological benefits of cosleeping for infants in a society (the United States) with a relatively high rate of SIDS. This practice, which many of the study's participants have brought with them from Mexico and Central America, have direct relevance to pediatric advice on sleeping arrangements.

However, recommendations for cross-cultural exchange of infant care practices must be tempered by the finding of Weisner, Bausano, and Kornfein (1983) that there are strong ecological and cultural constraints on cross-cultural exchange in this domain. An example of such a constraint is the fact that parent-infant cosleeping, while decreasing the risk of SIDS, also decreases husband-wife intimacy, so valued in the United States. Consequently, ecologically valid research on the benefits and costs of adapting infant care practices from a variety of cultures is needed. Cultures are not isolated practices, but coherent wholes. So cross-cultural borrowing must be done with caution: A change in one element may have unwanted repercussions in other domains or at later developmental points. Nonetheless, parents, pediatricians, clinicians, and day care workers are often not fully aware of the range of options available to them in terms of infant caregiving practices.

Culture Conflict

When infants and toddlers from a more collectivistic home culture enter their first mainstream educational institution, the day care center, they often find an institution where individualistic values are simply taken for granted. Janet Gonzalez-Mena (2001) reports the following conflict scene:

"I just can't do what you want," says the caregiver. "I don't have time with all these other children to care for. Besides," she adds hesitantly, "I don't believe in toilet training a 1-year-old."

"But she's already trained!" the mother says emphatically. "All you have to do is put her on the potty."

"She's not trained—you're trained." The caregiver's voice is still calm and steady, but a red flush is beginning to creep up her neck toward her face.

"You just don't understand!" The mother picks up her daughter and diaper bag and sweeps out the door.

"No, *you're* the one who doesn't understand," mutters the caregiver, busying herself with a pile of dirty dishes precariously stacked on the counter. (pp. 34–35)

Gonzalez-Mena (2001) analyzes this conflict as a conflict between the cultural scripts of independence and interdependence:

If the caregiver defines toilet training as teaching or encouraging the child independently to take care of his or her own toileting needs and her goal is to accomplish this as quickly and painlessly as possible, she'll regard 12 months as too early to start. Children of 12 months need adult help. However, if toilet training is regarded as a reduction of diapers and the method is to form a partnership with the child to do just that, you'll start as soon as you can read the children's signals and "catch them in time." In the first case, the focus is on independence; in the second, it is on interdependence or mutual dependence. (p. 34)

INTERVENING TO REDUCE CROSS-CULTURAL VALUE CONFLICT AND MISUNDERSTANDING

The intervention we present here, as in the rest of the chapter, is from a series of Bridging Cultures projects (e.g., Trumbull, Rothstein-Fisch, & Greenfield, 1999). These are interventions designed to reduce the confusion and conflict, both internal and external, that come from the incompatibilities between collectivistic and individualistic developmental norms in a multicultural society. The intervention we describe here was designed to handle conflicts like the toilet training conflict just presented. Janet Gonzalez-Mena was part of the intervention team; her ethnographic observations, such as the one just presented, were the research base for the intervention itself.

According to the National Association for the Education of Young Children (2005) responding to cultural differences is an important part of developmentally appropriate care. However, as we have seen, appropriateness is determined by cultural beliefs and values. The "Guidelines for Developmentally Appropriate Practice" (Bredekamp & Copple, 1997, p. 12) acknowledge that

"every culture structures and interprets children's behavior and development" but conclude that "children are capable of learning to function in more than one cultural context simultaneously." Thus, the default assumption is that, although cultures may vary, infants can be expected to negotiate eating and sleeping arrangements different from what they experience at home. Caregivers might mistake this to mean that because babies can adapt, family routines at home (and implicitly the values and beliefs that underlie them) are not really an issue for them to take on. This is an alternative viewpoint to the one on which we have based our Bridging Cultures intervention.

The following scenario is based on a composite of experiences and observations. It provides another example of how culturally based developmental goals of independence and interdependence can lead to cross-cultural misunderstanding and conflict concerning standards of early care. Most important for present purposes, we describe how this kind of ethnographic knowledge can be used in an intervention to produce more culturally sensitive caregiving attitudes and practices. This particular incident is drawn from the *Bridging Cultures in Early Care and Education Module* (Zepeda, Gonzalez-Mena, Rothstein-Fisch, & Trumbull, in press). The Bridging Cultures project was developed to make caregivers more aware of the individualistic assumptions of professional practice and the more collectivistic assumptions of immigrant and other families from nonmainstream cultures.

The home visitor sits in a small living room near a mother holding a baby. The visitor knows that the baby has some physical challenges and is at risk for developmental delays. While the mother talks to the visitor about some issues going on in her life, the visitor is wiggling a toy in front of the baby. The mother turns the baby around and holds him close so he can't see or reach the toy. When she hears a noise in the other room, she gets up to check on her older children. The home visitor holds out her arms to take the baby. The mother hands him to her.

The home visitor sits on the floor and holds the baby so he can easily reach any one of several toys she has arranged on a blanket. When the mother returns, the home visitor has the baby lying on the blanket, and she is bent over talking to the baby, who is clutching a soft ball and waving it in the air. "Oh you like that ball! It's soft," she says. The mother picks the baby up off the blanket, and the ball falls from his hand. She ignores the ball and takes him back to her chair. As she sits down, the baby reaches for an empty plastic glass on the table beside the chair. The mother puts it out of his reach. She goes back to cuddling

the baby in her arms. The home visitor looks discouraged, and the mother looks puzzled at the expression on the other woman's face. (Zepeda et al., in press)

In this scenario, the mother remains in close physical contact with her baby and communicates nonverbally with him by holding. She also puts him in a relationship of physical closeness with the visitor. She is communicating the importance of social relationships. In contrast, the home visitor lays the baby down on his back and engages him with verbal labeling around the topic of the toy; she also encourages his manipulation of the toy. The visitor creates a physical separation with the baby and communicates about an object, while encouraging the baby's agency in relation to the physical world. When the mother reenters the room, she is surprised to see the baby on the floor, perhaps perceived as distancing, and picks him up immediately, with no apparent regard for the ball. Yet it was the baby's interaction with the object that seemed most important to the home visitor.

This incident provides a further example of cross-cultural value conflict between accepted standards of infant care in the dominant culture and accepted standards of infant care in immigrant cultures. The conflict is potent and fundamental because the home visitor is probably thinking about the baby's need to interact with objects in order to achieve physical and cognitive goals, whereas the mother may be more concerned about social interactions.

This incident is used as part of the Bridging Cultures curriculum. Participants in the training discuss what they perceive as the goals of the mother and the home visitor. The discussion is intended to lead them to acknowledge the importance of both social relationships (developing social intelligence) and knowledge of objects (developing technological intelligence) and the potential for discussion between the mother and the visitor about their goals. However, if the underlying reasons for the differing developmental goals are not made apparent, each adult may simply disapprove of the other's behavior, thus undermining an important partnership between parents and caregivers. Through cross-cultural exchange, both styles of communication could be used to socialize children for both technological and social intelligence.

The early childhood Bridging Cultures workshops are based on an extensive body of ethnographic research (e.g., Gonzalez-Mena, 2001). However, the workshops themselves are new, and very little research on their ef-

fects has yet been carried out. One promising indication is that, after a 90-minute workshop, 93% of the participants ($N = 51$) indicated they would change the way they worked with children as a result of their new understanding (Rothstein-Fisch, 2004). When practitioners are open to learning about different cultural values and behavioral options, a new appreciation, and perhaps even successful implementation, of a broader range of practices may be attained.

PARENT-CHILD RELATIONS

Parent-child relations are an important aspect of both child development and child socialization; parents embody and represent the broader cultural context as children learn to become members of their culture. Parents and children become a sort of family microculture with specific norms, customs, and values that reflect a variety of cultural and ethnic norms. In this section, we examine cross-cultural variation in parents' behavior and attitudes toward their children and children's behavior and attitudes toward their parents. The latter is an understudied perspective.

Children's Behavior toward Parents

Consider the following scenario:

A week ago, you went shopping with your mother, and at the register, she realized that she was short \$10. You lent her the money, and after a week, she gives no indication of remembering the loan. What would you do? Why?

In responses to scenarios like this, Suzuki and Greenfield (2002) found an interesting effect. Asian American students, particularly those closer to Asian culture in their acculturative levels and activity preferences, were significantly more likely than European American students to sacrifice certain personal goals for their parents. This finding seems to reflect the collectivistic emphasis on filial piety and respect for parents found in the Confucian worldview of East Asia.

The Confucian value of filial piety deeply influences the desired behavior of children toward their parents. According to Tseng (1973, p. 199), "[Confucius] viewed the parent-child relationship as the foundation from which interpersonal love and trust would grow, and thus interpreted filial piety as the virtue for every person to

follow." Some of the tenets of filial piety are obeying and honoring one's parents, providing for the material and mental well-being of one's aged parents, performing the ceremonial duties of ancestral worship, taking care to avoid harm to one's body, ensuring the continuity of the family line, and in general conducting oneself so as to bring honor and not disgrace to the family name (Ho, 1994, p. 287).

This multidimensional concept of filial piety is believed to be a virtue that everyone must practice, as "the love and affection of a child for his parents, particularly the mother, is the prototype of goodness in interpersonal relationships" (Tseng, 1973, p. 195). From a very young age, children are introduced to these concepts and ideals, and by the time they are teenagers, the extent of filial piety felt among Asians is such that it is not uncommon for Chinese teenagers to hand over entire paychecks to their parents for family use (B. L. Sung, 1985). More recently, researchers have differentiated between different forms of filial piety. For example, filial piety traits can be categorized as authoritarian (suppressing one's wishes and complying with parents' wishes), or reciprocal (emotionally attending to parents out of gratitude), with the former decreasing and the latter increasing in relevance in Chinese society (Yeh & Bedford, 2003).

In the United States, Asian American adolescents also have stronger values and feelings of expectation about assisting, respecting, and supporting their families than do European Americans (Fuligni, Tseng, & Lam, 1999). Greater feelings of family obligation are felt by Latino teens as well (Fuligni et al., 1999). These feelings are strengthened even more during young adulthood (Fuligni & Pedersen, 2002). Suzuki (2000) found that Asian Americans from fifth grade through college, as well as parents of fifth and sixth graders, spoke more favorably about the various components of filial piety—respect, obedience, and eventual care of parents—than did comparable European-American groups.

This pattern is consonant with the fact that traditional European American values are affected by different cultural influences and reflect the importance of individual goals and personal property prominent in the dominant North American worldview. Implicit in this view is a certain personal distance between parent and child; this is consonant with a view of human development that emphasizes the achievement of autonomy by late adolescence. It is also consonant with the predominantly Protestant religious background of the United

States, which stresses each individual's relationship with God rather than family ties and obligations.

In sum, contrasting responses to the scenario manifest and highlight differing models of children's relationships with their parents, models that have deep cultural roots. Given that assimilation to U.S. culture reduced self-sacrifice in Asian Americans in Suzuki and Greenfield's (2002) study, we would expect an even stronger pattern of difference when comparing Asians in Asia with European Americans in the United States.

Many Asian countries (e.g., Japan, China, and Korea) have similar emphases on children's lifelong duties toward their parents (J. S. Choi, 1970; Osako & Liu, 1986; K.-T. Sung, 1990). Some parallel differences emerged when Miller and Bersoff (1995, p. 274) gave subjects in India and the United States the following scenario: "Because of his job, a married son had to live in a city that was a four hour drive from his parents' home. The son made a point of keeping in touch with his parents by either visiting, calling or writing them on a regular basis." The authors note that a typical subject in the United States evaluated "the son's behavior as satisfying in that it enabled him to enhance his relationship with his parents, while still retaining a sense of individual autonomy" (p. 275). A typical Indian subject, in contrast, "focused on the satisfaction associated with fulfilling the obligations of care toward one's parents and of knowing that their welfare needs are being met" (p. 275).

The contrast is, in both scenarios, between a response that values children's obligations to their parents versus one that emphasizes children's autonomy and personal choices concerning their relationship to their parents. In both cases, the dominant cultural response in the United States is for autonomy and choice. Relative to that response, less acculturated Asian Americans emphasized self-sacrifice for parents, while Indians in India emphasized children's obligations to their parents as a positive value.

Parents' Behavior toward Children

In this section, we discuss the other side of the coin, parents' behavior toward their children. Our point is to show that the same two cultural pathways guide parents' behavior toward their children, as they guide children's behavior toward their parents. We will make this point with respect to parental style (discipline), communication, teaching, and patterns of reinforcement. We extrapolate the cultural structuring of parent-

ing through the life span, pointing once again to cultural coherence. Throughout, we explore the impact of cultural dynamics—historical change in demographics or cross-cultural value conflict—on the cultural structuring of parenting behavior.

Styles of Parenting

Baumrind (1967, 1971) offered a now classical formulation of three styles: authoritarian, authoritative, and permissive. Each one defines a core relationship between parents and children; the children that have been studied range from preschool (Baumrind, 1967) to high school age (Dornbusch, Ritter, Leiderman, Roberts, & Fraleigh, 1987). The *authoritative* parent is controlling, demanding, warm, rational, and receptive to the child's communication. The *authoritarian* parent is detached and controlling without exhibiting warmth. The *permissive* parent is noncontrolling, nondemanding, and relatively warm (Baumrind, 1983).

How does parenting style relate to European American parents' goals for their children? Although not generally acknowledged in the developmental literature, Baumrind's typology is closely tied to the normative goals for child development in North America. Authoritative parenting is considered to be the most adaptive style because it is associated with children who are "self-reliant, self-controlled, explorative, and content" (Baumrind, 1983, p. 121). These are the qualities of the independent individual so valued in the cultural model of individualism in countries such as the United States. In the United States, authoritative parenting and relationship closeness are also associated with better school performance among European Americans (Leung, Lau, & Lam, 1998). Interestingly, this is not the case for first-generation Chinese Americans (Chao, 2001a). Thus, authoritative parenting may not be the best model for all cultural contexts.

Cross-Cultural Variability in Styles of Parenting.

Authoritative parenting is not the norm in every group. Different ethnic groups within the United States and many Eastern and developing countries have been found to utilize an authoritarian parenting style to a greater degree than do middle-class European American parents in the United States. Authoritarian parenting is more common, for example, in East Asia (Ho, 1994; Kim & Choi, 1994), Africa (Nsamenang & Lamb, 1994; Levine et al., 1994), and Mexico (Delgado-Gaitan, 1994), as well as in ethnic groups derived from these an-

cestral cultures: Asian Americans (Chao, 1994, 2000, 2001a; Leung et al., 1998), African Americans (Baumrind, 1972), Mexican Americans (Cardona, Nicholson, & Fox, 2000; Delgado-Gaitan, 1994; Reese, Balzano, Gallimore, & Goldenberg, 1995), and Egyptian Canadians (Rudy & Grusec, 2001). (Baumrind's third style, permissive parenting, has not been found to be normative in any identifiable cultural group.)

How does cross-cultural variability in parenting style relate to child behavior and parental goals? Most important in considering cross-cultural variation in parenting styles is the fact that different parental goals can give different meanings and a different emotional context to the same behaviors. Notably, the social and emotional accompaniments of classical authoritarian parenting behavior such as the usage of imperatives may be quite different where the culture has an interdependence-oriented developmental script (Greenfield, 1994). Chao (1994), for example, points out the inadequacy of the notion of authoritarian parenting to describe the Chinese ethnotheory of child socialization. She invokes indigenous Chinese child-rearing ideologies reflected in the concepts of *chiao shun* (training children in the appropriate or expected behaviors) and *guan* (to govern).

For the European American mothers in this study, the word "training" often evoked associations such as "militaristic," "regimented," or "strict" that were interpreted as being very negative aspects of authoritarian parenting. However, although authoritarian parenting was associated with negative effects and images in the United States, the Chinese versions of authoritarianism, *chiao shun* and *guan*, were perceived in a more positive light from within the culture, emphasizing harmonious relations and parental concern (Chao, 1994). Chinese *chiao shun* and *guan* were seen not as punitive or emotionally unsupportive, but rather as associated with rigorous and responsible teaching, high involvement, and physical closeness (Chao, 1994). In fact, in China (and in India), authoritarian parenting styles are associated with maternal valuing of filial piety and academic achievement (Leung et al., 1998; Rao, McHale, & Pearson, 2003).

Another interesting finding indicative of qualitatively different cultural patterning was that, although Chinese American parents were higher on authoritarian parenting than European American parents, they did not differ on the measure of authoritative parenting. In other words, Chinese parents more often subscribed to authoritarian items (sample authoritarian item: "I do not allow my child to question my decisions"); however,

there was no difference between the groups in subscribing to authoritative items (sample authoritative item: "I talk it over and reason with my child when he misbehaves"). In this group, authoritarianism and aspects of authoritativeness such as affection and rational guidance (illustrated in the example) were complementary, not contradictory.

This finding was mirrored by another study of Chinese American parents, which found that they were more directive than but equally as warm as European American parents in their child-rearing behaviors (Jose, Huntsinger, Huntsinger, & Liaw, 2000). A similar result was found in a study of Egyptian Canadians and Anglo-Canadians; Egyptian Canadian parents scored higher on authoritarian parenting, but they did not differ from Anglo-Canadian parents in overall levels of warmth (Rudy & Grusec, 2001).

Besides Chinese Americans, there are other groups in the United States for whom authoritarian parenting is not always associated with the negative child development outcomes (such as discontent, withdrawal, distrust, and lack of instrumental competence) it has for European American children. For example, Baumrind (1972) found that, in lower middle-class African American families, authoritarian parenting was more frequent and seemed to produce different effects on child development than in European American families. Rather than negative outcomes, authoritarian parenting by African Americans was associated with self-assertive, independent behavior in preschool girls. (Baumrind did not have enough information to carry out the same kind of analysis with African American preschool boys.)

This difference in the frequency and effects of authoritarian parenting may be related to different ecological demands of the African American environment. The fact that African Americans have traditionally been on the bottom of society's power and economic hierarchy may have led them to develop obedience in their children through authoritarian directives. Authoritarian parenting can be essential when children live in potentially hazardous conditions where safety is assured only if parental instructions are followed immediately.

A second possibility is that the relative social isolation of African American communities because of slavery, segregation, and discrimination led to more long-term retention of African culture than was the case for voluntary (in Ogbu's, 1994, sense) immigrants. Indeed, according to Sudarkasa (1988, cited in Harrison, Wilson, Pine, Chan, & Buriel, 1990, p. 354),

"Research has documented the persistence of some African cultural patterns among contemporary African American families." One relevant pattern would be the emphasis on obedience and respect as most important in African child development (LeVine et al., 1994; Nsamenang & Lamb, 1994). On the side of socialization, this pattern is achieved by strictness (Nsamenang & Lamb, 1994) and the use of parental commands as a communication strategy (LeVine et al., 1994). Such a socialization pattern would fit into the rubric of Baumrind's authoritarian parenting.

Similarly, poor immigrant Latino families bring from Mexico and Central America the developmental goal of respect and the socialization mode of authoritarian parenting to achieve parental respect (Reese et al., 1995; Valdes, 1997).

Parent-Child Communication

Another important aspect of parent-child relations is the styles that parents employ in communicating with their children. Although parents everywhere utilize an array of styles, the emphasis is quite different from culture to culture. Here, we take up several dimensions of this variability, relating each style to parental goals (Sigel, 1985; Sigel et al., 1992) and cultural models of human development.

Nonverbal Communication or Verbalization? The Cultural Role of Empathy, Observation, and Participation. Azuma (1994) notes that Japanese mothers (and nursery school teachers) rely more on empathy and nonverbal communication, whereas mothers in the United States rely more on verbal communication with their children. He sees a connection between the physical closeness of the Japanese mother-child pair (discussed in the infancy section of this chapter) and the development of empathy as a mode of communication.

Azuma (1994) points out that verbalization is necessary when there is greater physical and psychological distance between parent and child. The development of empathy paves the way for learning by osmosis, in which the mother does not need to teach directly; she simply prepares a learning environment and makes suggestions. In turn, the child's empathy for the mother motivates learning. This tradition survives in the families of third-generation Japanese American immigrants (Schneider, Hieshima, Lee, & Plank, 1994).

Closely related to empathy and learning by osmosis are the use of observation and participation as forms of

parent-child communication and socialization. Whereas verbal instruction is particularly important in school-based learning, observation and coparticipation of learner and teacher are central to the apprentice-style learning that is common in many cultures (Rogoff, 1990, 2003; Rogoff, Paradise, Arauz, Correa-Chavez, & Angelillo, 2003). Often, master and apprentice are parent and child, as in Childs and Greenfield's (1980; Greenfield, 2004; Greenfield, Maynard, et al., 2003) study of informal learning of weaving in a Maya community of highland Chiapas, Mexico.

Both learning by observation and coparticipation with a parent imply a kind of closeness and empathy between parent and child. For example, in Zinacantan weaving apprenticeship in Chiapas, Mexico, the teacher would sometimes sit behind the learner, positioned so that the two bodies, the learner's and the teacher's, were functioning as one at the loom (Maynard, Greenfield, & Childs, 1999; Greenfield, 2004). Verbal communication and instruction, in contrast, imply using words to bridge the distance through explicitness, thus reducing the need for empathetic communication.

A discourse study by S. H. Choi (1992) reveals a similar pattern of differences between Korean and Canadian mothers interacting with their young children. Comparing middle-class mothers in Korea and Canada, Choi found that Korean mothers and their children manifest a communicative pattern that is relationally attuned to one another in a "fused" state, "where the mothers freely enter their children's reality and speak for them, merging themselves with the children" (Kagitçibasi, 1996, p. 69). Canadian mothers, in contrast, "withdraw themselves from the children's reality, so that the child's reality can remain autonomous" (S. H. Choi, 1992, pp. 119-120).

Effects of Social Change. With an ecological transition from agriculture and subsistence to money and commerce, apprenticeship learning becomes more independent and less under the control of parents. Greenfield and colleagues (Greenfield, 2004; Greenfield, Maynard, et al., 2003) demonstrated this when they studied weaving apprenticeship in a Maya community across two generations. In response to participation in commercial activities, they found a historical shift from reliance on observation of adult models and careful guidance by adult experts (usually the mother) in the generation studied in 1970 to more involvement of the peers in the apprenticeship process, lessened reliance on observation of others weaving, a reduction in teacher

guidance, and more learner independence and initiative in the generation studied in the early 1990s.

Development of Comprehension versus Self-Expression. Authoritarian parenting brings with it an associated style of parent-to-child communication: frequent use of directives and imperatives, with encouragement of obedience and respect (Greenfield, Brazelton, & Childs, 1989; Harkness, 1988; Kagitçibasi, 1996). This style is used where the primary goal of child communication development is comprehension rather than speaking (e.g., Harkness & Super, 1982). An important aspect of the imperative style is the fact that it elicits action rather than verbalization from the child. This style is found in cultures in Africa (Harkness & Super, 1982) and Mexico (Tapia Uribe et al., 1994) and in Latino populations in the United States (Delgado-Gaitan, 1994).

The comprehension skill developed by an imperative style is particularly functional in agrarian societies in which the obedient learning of chores and household skills is a very important socializing experience (e.g., Childs & Greenfield, 1980), with the ultimate goal of developing obedient, respectful, and socially responsible children (Harkness & Super, 1982; Kagitçibasi, 1996; LeVine et al., 1994). This style of interaction is also useful for apprenticeship learning of manual skills, but it is not so functional for school, where verbal expression is much more important than nonverbal action.

On the other hand, more democratic parenting brings with it a communication style in which self-expression and autonomy are encouraged in the child. This parenting style often features a high rate of questions from the parent, particularly "test questions," in which the answer is already known to the parent (Duranti & Ochs, 1986), as well as parent-child negotiation (cf. Delgado-Gaitan, 1994). Child-initiated questions are also encouraged and accepted. This style is intrinsic to the process of formal education in which the teacher, paradigmatically, asks questions to which he or she already knows the answer and tests children on their verbal expression. An important aspect of the interrogative style is the fact that it elicits verbalization from the child. Such verbal expression is an important part of becoming a formally educated person and is particularly functional and common in commercial and technological societies where academic achievement, autonomy, and creativity are important child development goals. This style is the cultural norm in North America and northern Europe.

Teaching and Learning: The Role of Reinforcement. In societies that put an emphasis on commands in parental communication, there also tends to be little praise used in parent-child communication (e.g., Chen et al., 2000; Childs & Greenfield, 1980). Where schooling comes into play, praise and positive reinforcement take on importance. Duranti and Ochs (1986, p. 229) make the following observation of Samoan children who go to school:

In their primary socialization [home], they learn not to expect praises and compliments for carrying out directed tasks. Children are expected to carry out these tasks for their elders and family. In their secondary socialization [school], they learn to expect recognition and positive assessments, given successful accomplishment of a task. In their primary socialization, Samoan children learn to consider tasks as co-operatively accomplished, as social products. In their secondary socialization, they learn to consider tasks as an individual's work and accomplishment.

Thus, there is a connection between more individualistic child development goals and the use of praise and other positive reinforcers.

Correlatively, there is a connection between a tighter primary in-group and the absence of praise and compliments. Where role-appropriate behavior is expected rather than chosen, positive reinforcement does not make sense. Miller (1995) has described how people do not say "thank you" in India; once you are part of the group, you are completely accepted and expected to fulfill your social roles and obligations. B. B. Whiting and Whiting (1975) noted the lesser need for positive reinforcement where the intrinsic worth of the work is evident, as it is in household tasks and chores.

Teaching and Learning: The Nature of Collaborative Problem Solving. Chavajay and Rogoff (2002) identified two modes of collaborative problem solving between a mother and three related children between 6 and 12 years old (at least two being her own) in a Maya community in Guatemala. One of these modes was shared multiparty engagement, where all four parties simultaneously focused on a single aspect of the task (in this case, a construction task). The other mode was division of labor, in which participants worked on separate aspects of the task. The researchers found that, with increasing maternal schooling, there was a shift from shared engagement in a single aspect of the task to division of labor. In other words, the indigenous mode, consistent with the

community's traditional interdependent orientation (Morelli et al., 1992), involved more interdependent interaction, whereas division of labor, fostered by formal schooling, an influence foreign to Maya culture and an individualizer (Tapia Uribe et al., 1994; Trumbull et al., 1999), involved greater independence of the various members of the cooperating family group.

Cultural Models of Parent-Child Relations: Developmental Goals over the Life Span

There are basically two different cultural models describing parent-child relations over the life span. Without considering both models, we cannot adequately encompass cross-cultural variability in child development, parental behavior, and parent-child relations.

In one model, children are viewed as starting life as dependent on their parents and as achieving increasing independence as they grow older (Greenfield, 1994). In the other model, children are viewed as starting life as asocial creatures and as achieving a concept and practice of social responsibility and interdependence as they grow older (e.g., Ochs & Schieffelin, 1984). Under this model, infants are often indulged, whereas older children are socialized to comprehend, follow, and internalize directives from elders, particularly parents. The developmental outcome of the first model is the independent, individuated self; the developmental outcome of the second model is the interdependent and socially responsible self (Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Raeff et al., 2000).

In the interdependent model found in Japan, the mother-child relationship lasts a lifetime and is seen as the model for all human relationships throughout life (Lebra, 1994). The importance of continued respect up the generational ladder is seen in other cultures that subscribe to this model, such as in Mexico, among Mex-

ican Americans (Delgado-Gaitan, 1994), and in Korea (Kim, 1996).

In contrast, the independent model of family relations is distinguished by the "separateness of the generations and both emotional and material investments channeled toward the child, rather than to the older generation" (Kagitçibasi, 1996, p. 84). As Lebra (1994) points out, in this model, characteristic of the United States, the paradigmatic model of parent-child relations is the rebellious adolescent son who is breaking away from his family of origin.

Cultural Coherence

Again, we find evidence of cultural coherence. This coherence has developmental continuity as well. The two cultural models of infant development and socialization (Table 17.1) continue to be expressed in the parent-child relations of children (Table 17.2).

Ecological Factors and Social Change

The interdependence model is particularly adaptive in poor rural/agrarian societies, where it utilizes a "functionally extended family" to carry out subsistence tasks, including child care (Kagitçibasi, 1996). Due to the high poverty level and agricultural lifestyle, such shared work is highly adaptive for survival (Kagitçibasi, 1996). Indeed, in contemporary China, rural adolescents have a greater sense of family obligation than do urban adolescents (Fuligni & Zhang, 2004).

The interdependence between generations, with the younger ultimately responsible for the security of the older, is particularly adaptive in societies lacking old-age pensions and social security systems (Kagitçibasi, 1996). Conversely, the independence model of family relations is particularly adaptive in industrial, technologi-

TABLE 17.2 Contrasting Cultural Models of Parent-Child Relations

Developmental Goals	Independence	Interdependence
Developmental trajectory	From dependent to independent self	From asocial to socially responsible self
Communication	Verbal emphasis Autonomous self-expression by child Frequent parental questions to child Frequent praise Child negotiation	Nonverbal emphasis (empathy, observation, participation) Child comprehension, mother speaks for child Frequent parental directives to child Infrequent praise Frequent parental directives
Collaborative problem solving	Division of labor	Shared multiparty engagement
Parents helping children	A matter of personal choice except under extreme need	A moral obligation under all circumstances

cal societies, where the unit of economic employment is the individual, not the family. Furthermore, independence and self-reliance are valued in a sociocultural-economic context where intergenerational material dependencies are minimal, and children's loyalty to their elderly parents is not required to support parents in their old age (Kagitçibasi, 1996). With increasing affluence and education, the interdependence model tends to wane as the independence model waxes (Kagitçibasi, 1996).

But the world as a whole is becoming more affluent and formally educated; these are global trends. A cross-cultural Value of Children survey conducted in 1975 and repeated again a generation later indicated a worldwide decline in parents regarding children for their old-age security value and a worldwide increase in parents focusing on their children's development and achievement for its own sake (Kagitçibasi, & Ataca, 2005; Trommsdorff & Nauck, 2005).

IMPLICATIONS FOR PRACTICE: WHAT CAN WE LEARN FROM A CROSS-CULTURAL PERSPECTIVE ON PARENTING STYLES?

In this section, we will draw out implications of the previous section for the practice of developmental researchers, parents, educators, social workers, and clinicians in a multicultural society.

For Researchers: You Can't Take It with You

There is an important methodological lesson here: It is not valid to take the same measuring instrument from one culture to another, with the goal of making a direct cross-cultural comparison. The same behavior may have a different meaning and therefore a different outcome in different cultures (Greenfield, 1997). This is clearly true when looking at the different styles of parental interaction and discipline used by different cultural groups. For example, taking a measure of authoritarian parenting developed in the United States and using it to study parenting styles in China would provide an inaccurate and incomplete perspective on parenting practices there. It is therefore important to explore different methods of research that utilize the ideas and opinions of people native to the society under study.

One way to do this is to encourage the indigenous psychologies approach when studying culture. Kim and

Berry (1993, p. 2) define this approach as "the scientific study of human behavior (or the mind) that is native, that is not transported from other regions, and that is designed for its people." In other words, instead of taking concepts, methods, and measures from one culture and forcing it into the framework of another, it may be more appropriate and more fruitful to work from within the culture to form concepts, methods, and measures that are designed specifically for that environment. If this is done, indigenous concepts (e.g., *chiao shun* and *guan*) can be discovered and investigated from a more culturally salient perspective.

For Parents, Educators, Social Workers, and Other Clinicians

Multicultural understanding has direct implications for clinical work with families. Consider the following case (Carolyn McCarty, personal communication, June 1996): A child in an African American family is punished when a younger sibling, under her care, falls off the bed. The older child feels the punishment is unfair and complains of having too much responsibility in the family. The family seeks family therapy for these issues. In this case, armed with unconscious cultural assumptions about the developmental goal and value of independence, the first reaction of the therapist is to blame the parents for "parentifying" the older child; in this framework, parentification is considered pathological. Parentification of a child compromises the autonomy and opportunities for self-actualization that are implicit developmental goals in psychotherapy, itself an outgrowth of an individualistic framework.

However, after some training concerning the two cultural models described earlier, the clinician understood another possibility: that the parents could be developing familial responsibility in the older child by having her take care of the younger child. In accordance with this value system, the older child's punishment makes sense; it helps socialize the child to carry out the familial responsibility associated with child care. Having understood this perspective, the clinician is in a position to explore the issue of culture conflict. Is this situation, in fact, simply a conflict between an older child who has internalized the individualistic notion of fairness and responsibility for self and parents who hold dear the value of familial responsibility? If so, the clinician can now mediate between the two cultures represented by the two generations within the family.

Another implication of the preceding is that professionals (e.g., social workers, counselors, clinical psychologists, pediatricians, and educators) who advise parents on discipline and other parenting practices need to bear in mind that any advice must be relative to a particular set of developmental goals. Often, they may not realize that a particular set of child development goals is implicit in a particular piece of advice on an issue such as discipline. Insofar as members of many ethnic groups in a multicultural society will not share the socially dominant developmental model of the clinician or teacher, practitioners may need to think twice about whether it is appropriate either to ignore or change the parents' developmental goals for their children.

The Problem of Differential Acculturation of Parents and Children

Because parents often acculturate more slowly than children to a host culture (Kim & Choi, 1994), there is a great potential for parent-child conflict when families immigrate from a collectivistic to an individualistic society. Parents may expect respect, but their children have been taught to argue and negotiate (Delgado-Gaitan, 1994). Parents may see strictness as a sign of caring; adolescents may see it as robbing them of autonomy and self-direction (Rohner & Pettengill, 1985). Acculturation differences between parents and adolescents can be related to family conflict; in one study of Indian Americans, adolescents reported less frequent and less intense conflicts within the family if there was no acculturation difference between themselves and their parents (Farver, Narang, & Bhadha, 2002).

Sometimes immigrant parents bring their children, particularly teenagers, to mental health clinics for problem behaviors, such as rebelliousness, that are considered normal for adolescents in the dominant U.S. society (V. Chavira, personal communication, June 1996). When this happens, a clinician may easily assume the perspective of the dominant culture and simply take the side of the child. However, this approach denigrates the parents without understanding the value perspective that has generated their attitudes and behavior. It should be much more helpful if the clinician could accurately diagnose the parent-child problem as a problem of cross-cultural value conflict and differential acculturation. In this way, the perspectives of both parent and child are validated and understood, and a way is opened for compromise and mutual understanding.

BRIDGING CULTURES IN PARENT WORKSHOPS

Parents can also feel alienated from their children as a result of differential acculturation, specifically, the school's success with its individualistic socialization (Raef et al., 2000). A Bridging Cultures parent workshop process was developed to address this problem. In a true experiment with random assignment, The Bridging Cultures team compared two kinds of six-session parent education workshops with immigrant Latino parents in a large urban elementary school (Esau, Greenfield, Daley, & Tynes, 2004). Parents of children in grades 1 through 4 were randomly assigned to either the district-based "standard" workshop group concentrating on techniques to improve student achievement and school policies or a second kind of workshop group called Bridging Cultures. The Bridging Cultures workshops were designed to make explicit the differences between individualistic culture (the culture of the school) and collectivistic culture (the culture of many immigrant Latinos, as in Table 17.2). We hoped that this process would help Latino immigrants gain a better understanding of their children and the socialization process they were undergoing at school.

After analyzing the group process in the course of the videotaped workshops, we found that we had made an impact in this arena. The parents discovered ways to improve their relationships with their children. They noted an increased awareness of how cultural differences influence their children's development, including the knowledge that the culture of the United States would play a large role in their children's lives. The parents retained the collectivistic values of sharing and helping, while also coming to accept independence, the importance of self-expression in school, respect for children's decisions and choices, and the value of praise and affection. One mother said (translated from Spanish), "When in school they receive merits, then too [I should] tell them, 'Oh my delight, I am so proud of you!'" (Chang, 2003, p. 24).

Parents' own child-rearing methods were validated in the workshops, as they reflected on how they themselves were raised, as well as how they were helping to foster their children's development and learning. They were also encouraged to speak to their children about the different expectations at home and school. Longitudinal research is needed to see whether this kind of cross-cultural understanding can prevent the alienation

between parents and children that often occurs as the schools, representing the dominant culture, become a stronger socializing force than the family, especially as children move into secondary education (Trumbull, Rothstein-Fisch, & Hernandez, 2003).

PEER RELATIONS

Peer relations are the child's first opportunity to take the cultural values and practices learned at home and go forth into a wider world of people who may or may not share these values and practices. This section starts with an overview of different cultural elements that can come into play during peer interaction. We will make inferences from cross-cultural variability in peer behavior in culturally homogenous peer groups to potential intergroup conflict when interacting peers belong to *different* cultural groups. We analyze cultural differences and intergroup peer conflict in a number of different behavioral areas: self-presentation, helping behaviors, competition/cooperation, and conflict resolution.

In several cases, we use adult social-psychological literature to establish developmental end points for peer behavior in different cultures and developmental literature (where available) to see how peer relations develop toward these cultural endpoints. In other words, a cross-cultural perspective on adult behavior is important because adults provide the goals used for child socialization. As a consequence, child behavior grows toward the developmental end points expressed in adult behavior.

Self-Presentation

In many individualistic societies, it is established that people like to perceive themselves as the origin of good effects but not of bad effects (Greenwald, 1980), and the confident attribution of successes to personal ability is commonly practiced (e.g., Mullen & Riordan, 1988). Consequently, self-esteem is a highly desirable quality in these societies. For example, it was found that in the United States, people who scored highest on self-esteem tests (by saying nice things about themselves) also tended to say nice things about themselves when explaining their successes and failures (R. Levine & Uleman, 1979). It appears that self-esteem is somehow correlated with a positive representation of the self.

In collectivistic societies, this tendency to present oneself in a positive light is not as highly valued (Markus

& Kitayama, 1991). Research has shown that Americans tend to self-enhancement, whereas Japanese tend to self-deprecation (Heine, Kitayama, & Lehman, 2001; Heine & Lehman, 1997; Kitayama, Markus, Matsumoto, & Norasakkunkit, 1995, 1997). The effect of self-deprecation among Japanese participants was robust, and carried through to their evaluations of their universities and even family members (Heine & Lehman, 1997). The effect of culture in molding self-presentation, and therefore peer relations, is indeed far-reaching.

This cultural difference in peer relations begins in childhood. In a study conducted on the opinions of second, third, and fifth graders in Japan, students were asked to evaluate a hypothetical peer who was either modest and self-restrained or self-enhancing in commenting on his or her athletic performance (Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Yoshida, Kojo, & Kaku, 1982). Yoshida et al. found that, at all ages, the personality of the person giving the modest comment was perceived much more positively than that of the person giving the self-enhancing comment. A developmental trend was also found: Second graders believed the self-enhancing comment of the hypothetical peer to be true, whereas fifth graders did not. In other words, whereas second graders believed that the self-enhancing peer was truly superb in athletics, fifth graders believed that the modest peer was more competent. Therefore, although the cultural value of restraint and modesty was understood as early as second grade, this value expanded with age to incorporate positive attributes of ability and competence (Markus & Kitayama, 1991). Indeed, behaviors such as the verbal devaluation of oneself and even of one's family members is a norm in many East Asian cultures (Toupin, 1980). Not surprisingly, self-effacing values are also stronger in Asian American than European American youth (Akimoto & Sanbonmatsu, 1999).

Implications for Intergroup Peer Relations

Both modes of self-presentation conform perfectly to their respective cultural goals, but one can see how people from one culture can misinterpret and even decry the preferred self-presentation styles of other cultures. The Asian American tendency to present oneself in a self-effacing manner can be evaluated unfavorably by others (Akimoto & Sanbonmatsu, 1999). In college interview situations, for example, Asian American students can be viewed as uninteresting applicants because of their modesty and desire to fit in rather than stand out. On

the other side, self-enhancing tendencies of European American youth can be seen as undesirable self-aggrandizement (Suzuki, Davis, & Greenfield, in press).

Helping Behavior

The desirability of helping others appears to be universal. However, people's perceptions of helping behaviors and when they are appropriate can vary drastically from culture to culture. Some societies view helping as a personal choice; others view this as a moral obligation. For example, children in the United States feel that it is a matter of personal choice, not moral responsibility, to help a friend in moderate or minor need, whereas it is a matter of moral responsibility to help a friend in extreme need or to uphold justice (Miller, Bersoff, & Harwood, 1990). Caring and interpersonal responsiveness are seen as a matter of personal choice based on various factors, such as how much one likes the person needing help (Higgins, Power, & Kohlberg, 1984; Miller & Bersoff, 1992, 1998; Nunner-Winkler, 1984). This value of personal choice is highlighted in individualistic societies, such as the United States, where Miller and colleagues found this pattern of results from second grade to college age.

In societies that value group harmony and cooperation, however, helping behaviors can be perceived at a different level of urgency and obligation. This is particularly true in India, where helping is seen not as a personal choice, but as a moral necessity (Miller, 1994; Miller & Bersoff, 1992; Miller et al., 1990). Virtually all Indians from second grade to college age felt that it was legitimate to punish a person who failed to help a friend, even in minor need. Whether or not the helper liked the person in need had no impact on Indian participants' perceptions of moral responsibility to help others (Miller & Bersoff, 1998).

In another study, Miller (1995) found that most U.S. college students would not inconvenience themselves to help their best friend if he or she had not helped them or others in the past. Although Indian college students agreed with U.S. college students that not helping in the past was undesirable behavior, this history would not deter them from helping their best friend.

Choosing not to help others may be met with harsh disapproval in cultures that value the preservation of group interests. In Cameroon, for example, asserting individual rights and interests over those of the community would cause the Cameroonian to be acting "at the

expense of his or her peace of mind and at great risk of losing the psychological comfort of a feeling of belonging" (Nsamenang, 1987, p. 279). Such a person would be considered deviant under traditional African thinking (Nsamenang, 1987). In the United States, Latinos viewed helping others as more obligatory and personally desirable than did European Americans (Janoff-Bulman & Leggatt, 2002; Raeff et al., 2000). Given these differences, one can imagine how an Indian, Nigerian, or Latino child may be confused and even shocked when a child from another culture may choose not to help a group member in a time of need.

Ecological Factors

J. W. M. Whiting and Whiting (1973/1994, p. 279) put forth the hypothesis that complex societies must suppress altruistic or helping behavior to friends (as well as to family) to maintain the economic order, "a system of open and achievable occupational statuses." Complex technological society requires the egoistic behaviors of self-development; the essence of obtaining a position in the economic system is individual merit, not social or family connections. Based partly on their cross-cultural child observation data in nontechnological small-scale cultures, Whiting and Whiting view the United States, a complex technological society, as occupying an extreme position on the egoistic side of the egoism/altruism dimension.

Play: Cooperation and Competition

Peer games can bring up important cross-cultural differences in the tendency to emphasize cooperation versus competition and in the ways rewards are allocated. These differences can then create difficulties in peer relations in a culturally diverse society.

In Western societies, both cooperation and competition are valued, and children often learn to interact with one another utilizing both concepts. However, children in the United States, for example, are often placed in situations where competition is more likely to be utilized and even encouraged. In the United States, this tendency to be competitive with one another increases with age (Kagan & Madsen, 1972). This developmental trend was clearly depicted in a study by Madsen (1971) that utilized an interpersonal game in which children could either cooperate with one another (and be more likely to receive a prize) or compete with one another (and be less likely to receive a prize). The result showed a

striking effect. In the United States, it was found that younger children (4 to 5 years) were more successful than older children (7 to 8, 10 to 11) in restraining their motivation to compete in order to receive a prize. In older children, the motivation to compete was so strong that it overcame the tendency to act out of mutual self-interest, even when they had the intellectual capacity to act otherwise (Madsen, 1971). In contrast, Mexican children from a small agricultural community behaved cooperatively at the older ages. Small population size may be important because of its role in leading to within-group cohesion.

It is important to note, however, that in-group cooperation is often associated with out-group competition. This was the case for highly cooperative kibbutz children from Israel (Shapira & Madsen, 1969). Israeli kibbutzim are small, collectivistic, agricultural communities with strong in-group ties. Using a game to examine cooperation and competition in peer relations, Shapira and Madsen found that kibbutz children's tendency to cooperate in a game overshadowed their competitive tendencies under different reward conditions. In contrast, Israeli city children would cooperate when there was a group reward, but as soon as rewards were distributed on an individual basis, competition took over.

In kibbutzim, children are prepared from an early age to cooperate and work as a group, and competition is not seen as a socially desirable norm (Shapira & Madsen, 1969). At the time this study was done, kibbutz teachers reported that anticompetitive attitudes are so strong that children sometimes felt ashamed for being consistently at the top of their class (Shapira & Madsen, 1969). Under such cultural norms, it is of no surprise that children in kibbutz communities are much more likely to cooperate than compete with one another in gaming situations. A high level of within-group cooperation was associated with a desire to do better than other groups who had played the game before.

Insofar as an emphasis on cooperation is part of a collectivistic value orientation, it may be that greater differentiation of relations with in-group and out-group members may characterize collectivistic cultures, in comparison with individualistic ones (Triandis, Bondtempo, Villareal, Asai, & Lucca, 1988). In a study comparing Japanese and American students in conflict situations against differing opponents, researchers found that the Japanese participants showed a greater behavioral difference between their interactions with

in-group members and their interactions with out-group members.

Thus, it is too simplistic to say that children from collectivistic cultures are, on average, more cooperative than children from individualistic cultures. Instead, children from more collectivistic cultures are more cooperative with in-groups and more competitive with out-groups. Also, the cross-cultural mean differences are far from absolute. For example, children from more individualistic environments will cooperate when competition is dysfunctional and there are very strong cues for cooperating, for example, group reward (Shapira & Madsen, 1969).

Ecological Factors and Social Change

As with helping behavior, cooperative behavior appears to be more functional and encouraged in small, simple, nontechnological groups with low levels of formal education, and less functional in large, complex, technological groups with high levels of formal education (Graves & Graves, 1978). Therefore, when members of a small, simple, nontechnological group come into contact with members of a large, complex, technological group, competitiveness in peer relations increases, as Madsen and Lancy (1981) found in New Guinea.

The effects of urbanization are confirmed by studies comparing two ecologies in one country. In one such study, Madsen (1967) found that urban Mexican children were much more competitive and less cooperative than rural children from a small, agricultural community in Mexico. This pattern of findings points to the conclusion that the greater cooperation of Mexican immigrants to the United States may be, to a great extent, a function of their rural, agricultural background.

However, urbanization may play its role in reducing cooperation and increasing competition by loosening the strength of in-group ties in an ethnically diverse milieu. This was the conclusion of Madsen and Lancy (1981), who, in a study of 10 sites in New Guinea, found that, when primary group identification could be separated from rural residence, it was by far the most important factor in children's choice between a cooperative and a competitive strategy in a peer game situation. Children who came from ethnic groups that had retained their tribal coherence were more cooperative, even when exposed to urban centers, than were rural children whose groups had less stability and whose traditional way of life had largely disappeared.

Implications for Intergroup Peer Relations

With this in mind, it is apparent that children (as well as adults) with differing cultural backgrounds can easily have differing ideas concerning cooperation and competition. Without proper awareness of such differentiation in viewpoints, one can imagine the possible confusion and misunderstanding that might occur when one child's assumptions about cooperation, competition, and reward allocation fundamentally differs from that of a playmate. This difference can indeed be yet another source of cross-cultural conflict that can occur among children, particularly following immigration from a collectivistic milieu to an individualistic one.

Conflict Resolution

Conflicts among children are inevitable within any culture. It is clear from the earlier descriptions that the potential for conflict (especially culturally based conflict) is even greater between children of differing backgrounds. However, it is ironic to note that acceptable and preferred measures of conflict resolution also differ from culture to culture.

Cultural Bases of Conflict Resolution

In the United States, success, freedom, and justice are "central strands" of culture (Bellah, Madsen, Sullivan, Swindler, & Tipton, 1985). These values are considered individual rights and are treasured concepts, written into the Constitution and worthy of fighting wars for. Under the precepts of these rights and the resulting economic system of capitalism, competition among people is seen as healthy, necessary, and even desirable. Thus, resolution of conflict may be competitive and confrontational, based on the concept that the individual, rather than the collective, has rights that should be actively pursued.

In other societies, however, behavioral ideals lead to different types of desired behavior. For example, Chinese people were found to prefer nonconfrontational approaches to conflict resolution more than Westerners did (Leung, 1988). In fact, there appears to be a strong inverse relationship between the presence of Chinese values and the degree of competitiveness used in handling conflicts (Chiu & Kosinski, 1994), suggesting a strong tie between cultural values and conflict behavior. In general, Toupin (1980) suggests that East Asian cultures share certain norms, including that of deference to

others, absence of verbal aggression, and avoidance of confrontation.

Conflict resolution in West Africa also emphasizes the importance of group harmony. According to Nsamenang (1987, p. 279), West Africans emphasize reconciliation as a means of handling disputes and domestic conflicts in order to "reinforce the spirit of communal life." The preservation of group harmony during conflict resolution is once again crucial in this cultural context. Similarly, college students in Mexico were more likely than students in the United States to prefer conflict resolution styles that emphasize accommodation, collaboration, and concern for the outcome of others (Gabrielidis, Stephan, Ybarra, Pearson, & Villareal, 1997).

Indeed, both the means as well as the goals of conflict resolution vary according to the aspired values and ideals of each culture. We would expect these cultural modes of adult conflict resolution to furnish the developmental goals for the socialization of conflict resolution in children.

Children's Methods of Conflict Resolution Reflect Their Cultural Foundations

In every society, cultural ideals are manifest in the conflict resolution tactics that are encouraged by the adults. According to B. Whiting and Edwards (1988, p. 189), "The manner in which socializers handle children's disputes is one of the ways in which the former transmit their values concerning the legitimate power ascribed to gender and age." That is, through adult intervention, cultural and societal ideals and values are transmitted to the children.

Take, for example, the case of the United States. In American preschools, a child is generally encouraged to use words to "defend oneself from accusations and to seek redress when one feels wronged" (Tobin, Wu, & Davidson, 1989, p. 167). American parents also encourage children to use words to "negotiate disputes or label their emotions" (B. Whiting & Edwards, 1988) when having conflicts with their peers. In a culture that highly values equality, individual rights, and justice, expressing one's personal point of view is very important. By doing so, the hope is that justice can emerge out of learning about each child's individual perspective. Note that the emphasis on verbal dispute resolution reflects the emphasis of European American parents on verbalization.

Individualized attention given to misbehaving children, heralded as an appropriate and effective means of child management in this particular cultural context,

would appear strange in others. In the United States, it is quite common and even desirable for teachers, parents, and children to use negotiation, lobbying, voting, pleading, litigation, encouraging, arbitration, and a variety of other means to resolve conflicts in a "just" or "fair" manner (Tobin et al., 1989). However, such individualized attention given to misbehaving children may not be approved of in more collectivistic cultures.

In the same observational field study, Tobin et al. (1989) observed preschool activities in Japan. Here, teachers were described as being "careful not to isolate a disruptive child from the group by singling him out for punishment or censure or excluding him from a group activity" (p. 43). In a society where group interactions and collectivism are highly valued, such a punishment for misbehavior would be seen as extreme. Given this cultural framework, the Japanese teachers would choose instead to take a more unintrusive approach to conflict resolution. When Hiroki, a misbehaving child, causes a stir among his classmates, the Japanese teacher's response is not to single him out but rather to instruct other children to take care of the problem themselves. This technique is in stark contrast to the American tactic of immediate adult intervention and arbitration.

The philosophy behind this mode of conflict resolution is closely linked to cultural beliefs. In Japan, group interactions are highly salient, and teachers therefore believe that "children learn best to control their behavior when the impetus to change comes spontaneously through interactions with their peers rather than from above" (Lewis, 1984, quoted in Tobin et al., 1989, p. 28). In an interview, the Japanese teacher said that she believed that other classmates' disapproval would have a greater effect on misbehaving children, perhaps more so than would any form of adult intervention. Here we see peer pressure as an effective means of conflict control.

In the United States, in contrast, peer pressure is usually seen not as a means of controlling behavior in a positive way, but as a negative form of conformity and lack of personal freedom. In this context, having children work things out on their own without intervention and assessment by others would be unusual indeed.

Cultural differences in children's conflict resolution have been found between other countries as well. For example, preschoolers in Andalusia, Spain, are more likely to resolve conflicts by reaching an agreement or compromise, whereas Dutch children are more likely to give priority to their individual objectives even at the risk of disrupting the activity (Sanchez Medina, Lozano, &

Goudena, 2001). Perhaps the Andalusian tendency to be more harmonious during conflict is related to the Spanish/Latin American notion of *simpatia*, or "pro-active socioemotional orientation and concern with the social well-being of others" (R. V. Levine, Norenzayan, & Philbrick, 2001, p. 546).

Implications for Intergroup Peer Relations

Conflict is unavoidable in any cultural context. However, the modes of dealing with conflict can differ greatly. Conflict resolution is difficult enough in a homogeneous society where children ascribe to the same cultural scripts and norms. When children from differing backgrounds attempt to reconcile their differences, their task is even further exacerbated by an incongruity between the children's conflict resolution styles. Thus, events such as minor playground altercations can lead to greater schisms in children's perceptions of people from other backgrounds and beliefs.

Implications for Practice

In this section, we deal with the implications of culturally heterogeneous peer groups for educators, counselors, and other clinical practitioners.

Education

Teachers are in the position of interacting with large groups of children of differing backgrounds where cultural differences in interactive style are constantly exposed. When interethnic misunderstandings occur, Quiroz (personal communication, January 1996) observed that the injured party often attributes the behavior of the other group to prejudice and discrimination. This might be especially true when the injured party belongs to a minority ethnicity. An understanding of the cultural reasons for peer behavior has the power to decrease attributions of prejudice and discrimination, thus contributing to improved intergroup peer relations.

How teachers resolve conflicts is often determined by the dominant culture. For example, in their book *Conflict Resolution in the Schools*, Girard and Koch (1996, p. 138) emphasize that teachers should develop their students' negotiation skills so that students can "educate one another about their needs and interests." Another strategy recommended is for teachers to teach students to use "I" messages, such as "I feel _____ when _____ because _____, and I need _____"

(p. 138). These kinds of conflict skills may be appropriate for students from individualistic cultures, where the emphasis is on getting one's own needs met. This is a different style of conflict resolution from consensus building, which is built on "an integrative solution . . . a synthesis and blending of solutions" (p. 137). Consensus building, where points are discussed until the group decides on a common decision, reflects a much more collectivistic orientation (Suina & Smolkin, 1994).

Counselors and Other Clinicians

Child counselors and clinicians should likewise be informed and educated on the effects of culture on child behavior and peer interaction. In this way, they can be better prepared to recognize and accommodate culture in their counseling sessions and diagnoses when children from multicultural environments present with difficulties in peer relations.

School counselors are in a strategic position to help students, teachers, and parents understand culture. In one study, middle school counselors were given a three-session Bridging Cultures training similar to that described earlier. The counselors were able to find many examples of the collectivistic home culture among their largely Latino student population. One counselor noted:

Just today, a female student shared many of her problems that her family has. Problems include poverty, lack of adult supervision and nurturance. She suspects that her mother may be a prostitute. Due to her collectivistic belief she spends all day thinking about ways to possibly solve or improve her home situation for herself and her brothers. That leaves her with no time, energy or motivation to study. (quoted in Geary, 2001, p. 66)

Summary

Differences in peer relations in the areas of self-presentation, helping behavior, play, and conflict resolution organize themselves around what has become a familiar dimension: an idealized cultural model of independent or interdependent functioning. When interacting peers come from home cultures that have different models concerning this dimension, the potential for problematic peer relations arises.

An important source of perceived prejudice and discrimination is failure to understand the cultural values that generate the behavior of others. One can see how differences in cultural value systems have the potential

to cause deep misunderstanding and conflict between children from different cultural backgrounds. Interaction between children is never completely conflict-free, but when children play with other children who share their cultural values, peer interaction can often be smoother, based on similar assumptions of what constitutes fair play, proper methods of conflict resolution, and ideal interactive behaviors.

In a multicultural society such as the United States, children from various cultural backgrounds are given the opportunity to interact with one another. However, interaction alone does not breed awareness of other value systems. There is a tendency for each interactant to see the other's behavior through the implicit lens of his or her own value system. It is therefore important for educators and clinicians to be aware of the potential differences between children to help each child to better understand that children may have different perspectives on proper peer interaction, and that these differences can be acknowledged, respected, and even appreciated.

STUDYING AND INTERVENING IN CROSS-CULTURAL PEER RELATIONS: THE CASE OF MULTIETHNIC HIGH SCHOOL SPORTS TEAMS

In a study of cross-cultural conflict among girls volleyball team members in Los Angeles, players' journals, in combination with ethnographic observation at practices and games, unearthed many instances of peer conflict in which one party assumed an individualistic perspective while the other assumed a collectivistic one (Greenfield, Davis, Suzuki, & Boutakidis, 2002). For example, in a "water bottle incident," a Latina girl drank from a water bottle of a European-American girl, and the latter became quite angry (Kernan & Greenfield, 2005). Journal entries relating to this type of conflict indicated that the girl who drinks from the bottle of another assumes the interdependent value of sharing, whereas the owner of the water bottle assumes the value of personal property, bolstered by a desire not to spread germs (an appeal to the physical world). In a later observation of another team composed entirely of Hispanics and Native Americans in Santa Fe, New Mexico, Greenfield (unpublished field note, 2000) observed that a water bottle was passed around the whole team during a team huddle.

de. Here, in a more homogeneous group in which everyone comes from a collectivistic culture (either New Mexico Hispanic or Pueblo Indian), a subsequent interview indicated that sharing water by the whole team was simply taken for granted. However, given the heterogeneous nature of high school sports teams in Los Angeles, an intervention research project was designed.

The goal of the intervention was to promote greater cross-cultural harmony: If teens could learn about the cultural values of both individualism and collectivism, would it increase their tolerance and understanding of each other? The intervention tried to affect peer-group relations in two multiethnic high school girls varsity basketball teams. The two teams were selected because each one represented a mix of ethnicities: European American, Asian American, Latino American, African American, Native American, and mixed ethnicity. The first analysis examined teams over two seasons. During the first season, baseline data concerning the sources of conflict were obtained (Engle & Greenfield, 2005).

During the second season, three workshops were presented to each team to promote tolerance and understanding of cultural value differences within the framework of independence (individualism) and interdependence (collectivism). The workshops included discussions in large and small groups about individualism and collectivism. The girls also developed skits about conflicts in sports from the perspective of both value systems, with the goal of making implicit values explicit and communicating the notion that each value orientation has its own strengths and weaknesses (Engle & Greenfield, 2005). Pre- and postworkshop questionnaires each included eight action scenarios; four were sports team situations and the other four were home and school situations. Each scenario presented a social dilemma that could be resolved in either a more collectivistic or a more individualistic manner. In addition to choosing their own (collectivistic or individualistic) resolution for the dilemma, respondents were asked if they could imagine someone making the other choice and why. This was meant as a measure of understanding the other cultural perspective. We hypothesized that our intervention would increase this type of cross-cultural understanding. However, we did not find the hoped-for effect.

Instead, we found that the values of individualism and collectivism were situational. The sports team scenarios prompted significantly more collectivistic value choices than did home and school scenarios. In the context of sports-based scenarios, the girls did respond to questions

indicating that they would work together for the good of the team, demonstrating the development of a superordinate group identity that is important for adolescents.

Equally important was the development over time of a team culture. Questionnaire responses were more collectivistic at the end than at the beginning of the season; playing as a team increased collectivism (Engle & Greenfield, 2005).

In sum, the effective intervention was not the workshops, but the experience of playing on a team. Even here, the effect was not what we expected—a greater understanding of another cultural value system—but rather a push toward a collectivistic perspective. The authors conclude that a dynamic model of cultural values systems exists, adapting to contexts over time.

The second analysis examined how young women begin to think of themselves as a team: negotiating problems and creating shared team values (Kernan & Greenfield, 2005). Besides questionnaires, players kept journals throughout the season. The journals supported the questionnaire results: Whatever the starting value orientation expressed in their journals, almost all of the players became more collectivistic during the basketball season. However, there were differences in the rationale depending on value starting point. Over the course of the season, players starting with both value orientations increasingly valued “showing up” for practices and games, but for different reasons. Showing up was valued by the more individualistic team members because of an agreement or contract to do so. In a sense, this perspective emphasizes a task orientation and an explicit contract, features of a more individualistic orientation. This perspective is in contrast to a more collectivistic approach centering on implicit social obligation as a reason to show up. The personal journals supported the questionnaires in showing that cultural values are not static: Family culture interacts with ecological circumstances to create specific cultural practices in specific contexts. However, they also demonstrated that the value starting point, the result of prior socialization, has an impact as well.

In short, the experience of playing together over time made the group more of a team. This recognition of a superordinate peer group—the team—has great potential for bringing peers from different ethnicities and different cultures together for a common goal (Allport, 1958; Gaertner, Dovidio, Nier, Wsard, & Banker, 1999).

This is an example of a failed intervention. However, the integration of qualitative and quantitative methodology enabled the researchers to understand

other important interpersonal dynamics. At the same time, on a theoretical level, much was learned about the power of the situation to shape a value orientation. This process of shaping values through specific experience indicates the adaptive quality and, by extension, the adaptive origin of cultural value systems.

HOME-SCHOOL RELATIONS

Cultural models of human development and socialization are embodied in infant care practices and parent-child relations (both discussed earlier). These practices and relations then influence the cultural models and behaviors that children bring into their peer relations (previous section). One important institution in which peer relations are forged is the school. Schooling involves more than just peer relations, however. It also involves relations between children and teachers and between parents and teachers. These relationships are the focus of the present section.

By the age of 4 or 5 years, most children venture from their home to enter a brand new environment: school. In a culturally homogeneous situation, this shift between home culture and the culture of the school is a relatively smooth transition, based on shared goals and assumptions (Raeff et al., 2000). In a multicultural situation, the problems are different. Cultural diversity, while being colorful and joyous, can also lead to potential misunderstandings and value conflicts between school personnel and parents. Some of these misunderstandings occur in the context of peer relations at school; here the analysis of the previous section is relevant. Still others occur between parents and teachers or between children and teachers. Such culture-based misunderstandings are the central issue of this section.

In the cross-cultural peer conflicts we analyzed in the preceding section, contrasting cultural values were considered to be on an equal footing. However, in school, this is actually not the case. The power belongs to the dominant culture that is part and parcel of formal education in the United States or any other country.

Bringing a Collectivistic Model of Development to School: The Potential for Home-School Conflict

Raeff et al. (2000) studied conceptions of relationships and areas of cross-cultural value conflict among Euro-

pean American and Latino children, their parents, and their teachers. The study was conducted in two different elementary schools in the Los Angeles area: School 1 served a primarily European American population, and School 2 served a primarily immigrant Latino population. Eight open-ended hypothetical scenarios were constructed based on reported experiences of immigrant families. Four scenarios depicted home-based dilemmas and four were school-based (these scenarios were also used in the sports study discussed in the preceding section). The scenarios were presented to all participants on an individual basis. For example: "It is the end of the school day, and the class is cleaning up. Denise isn't feeling well, and she asks Jasmine to help her with her job for the day, which is cleaning the blackboard. Jasmine isn't sure she will have time to do both jobs. What do you think the teacher should do?" (p. 66).

The results indicate that the overwhelming majority of the responses fell into two categories:

1. Find a third person who will volunteer and will not endanger the helper's own task completion; this was considered an individualistic mode of response.
2. Simply help the sick child with her job; this was considered a collectivistic mode of response.

The teachers (multiethnic in both schools) overwhelmingly made the individualistic choice. European American parents and their children were in tune with the teachers' individualistic model of development. However, the overwhelming majority of immigrant Latino parents made the collectivistic choice: Jasmine should help no matter what. This response was shown to be part of a more general model of development: Across four diverse scenarios, Latino immigrant parents overwhelmingly constructed responses that reflected an underlying collectivistic model of development. As would be expected from this choice, Latino immigrant parents were significantly more collectivistic than their children's teachers; this pattern indicated that the children were being subjected to two different socialization influences, a more collectivistic one at home and a more individualistic one at school.

From the point of view of home-school relations, the Latino parents seemed out of tune with the school's value system, and the teachers were equally out of tune with the Latino parents' value system. This is in sharp contrast to the picture of home-school value harmony

that exists for European American families (Raeff, Greenfield, & Quiroz, 2000).

Children Caught between Home Culture and School Culture

As a consequence of value harmony between their parents and their teachers, European American children are receiving consistent socialization messages at home and at school. The children of Latino immigrants are not. The results reflect these dynamics: Whereas there are no significant differences in the responses of European American children and their parents, there are significant differences between Latino children and their immigrant parents (Raeff et al., 2000).

Indeed, the Latino children are, overall, significantly more individualistic than their parents and significantly more collectivistic than their teachers (Raeff et al., 2000). That is, they are different from both their major socializing agents. Little is known about whether such children have successfully integrated two cultures or are caught in the middle. Although this research was done with a particular population, it is potentially applicable to the children of other collectivistic minorities in the United States.

Schools often reflect aspects of individualism that highlight independence as a goal of development. For example, classroom interactions and activities emphasize individual achievement, children's autonomous choice and initiative, and the development of logic/rational rather than social skills (Delgado-Gaitan, 1993, 1994; Reese et al., 1995).

Academic activities are also intrinsically individualistic insofar as evaluations are generally made on the basis of independent work accomplished by individual students (J. W. M. Whiting & B. B. Whiting, 1975/1994) rather than on the basis of group endeavors. This focus on individual achievement and evaluation is a predominant theme in academic settings; indeed, individual achievement and evaluation are the foundation on which most schools are built (Farr & Trumbull, 1997; Trumbull, 2000).

These aspects of school culture often come into direct conflict with the collectivistic orientation toward education favored not only by Latinos, but by many minority and immigrant cultures that emphasize values such as cherishing interpersonal relationships, respecting elders and native traditions, responsibility for others, and cooperation (Blake, 1993, 1994; Delgado-Gaitan, 1993,

1994; Ho, 1994; Kim & Choi, 1994; Suina & Smolkin, 1994). This perspective is antithetical to the school's emphasis on individual achievement.

Individual Achievement from a Collectivistic Perspective

Encouraging children's individual achievements can be seen in some cultures (e.g., Nigeria) as devaluing cooperation (Oloko, 1993, 1994) or group harmony. Research on conferences between immigrant Latino parents and their children's elementary school teachers revealed incidents when the teacher's praise of an individual child's outstanding achievement made a parent feel distinctly uncomfortable (Greenfield, Quiroz, & Raeff, 2000).

These parents seemed to feel most comfortable with a child's school achievement if the academic skill in question could be applied to helping other family members. For example, in one parent-teacher conference, a Latino mother (with a first-grade education) created common ground with the teacher when she responded to a question about her daughter's home reading by telling the teacher that her daughter had been reading to a younger family member.

Written Knowledge from a Collectivistic Perspective

The reliance on textbooks used in many school settings may also be cause for conflict. In some cultures, knowledge is seen as something that is gleaned not from impersonal texts, but from the wisdom and knowledge of relevant others. In the Pueblo Indian worldview, parents and grandparents are seen as the repositories of knowledge, and this fact provides a social connection between the older and younger generations. In cultures such as these, when objects rather than people become the authorities of knowledge, the introduction of resources such as encyclopedias, reference books, and the like is seen to undermine "the very fiber of the connectedness" (Suina, 1991, p. 153) between people. Given this perspective, the school's emphasis on learning through written material may appear to be an impersonal and even undesirable way of acquiring knowledge.

Valdés (1996) in an ethnographic study of 10 immigrant families from Mexico, found that a mother's communication with her son's elementary school teacher "confirmed the school's lack of interest and caring." In this case, the mother had concerns that her

son Saul was eating fish at school, a problem because he was allergic to fish and became sick after eating it, causing him to miss school. She instructed Saul's older brother, 8-year-old Juan, to tell his teacher about this problem. Either the older child failed to deliver the message or the "teacher did not consider it to be her role to pass on the information to the appropriate school personnel" (p. 156). As a result, Saul continued to eat fish and miss school. Valdés concludes that if the mother "had sent a note instead of a message, it might have been that she would have received some response from the teacher or another individual" (p. 156). However, the mother had no way of knowing the greater value of written communication in this instance and assumed that the school had little interest in her child's health.

As this example demonstrates, the problems of home-school communication transcend translation issues. The system of an older child being a knowledgeable, trusted, and responsible care provider of a younger sibling is consistent with the values of collectivistic families. In contrast, the teacher may have believed the older sibling's remarks were unsubstantiated by a formal note and thus discounted entirely. If it were true that the older sibling did not communicate his mother's message to the teacher, then it is possible he had already shifted from his home cultural values to those of the school.

Object Knowledge from a Collectivistic Perspective

Children whose cultural background has emphasized social relations and social knowledge may not understand the privileged position of decontextualized object knowledge in the culture of the school. The following is an example of culture conflict that can occur between teachers and children:

In a Los Angeles prekindergarten class mostly comprised of Hispanic children, the teacher was showing the class a real chicken egg that would be hatching soon. She was explaining the physical properties of the egg, and she asked the children to describe eggs by thinking about the times they had cooked and eaten eggs. One of the children tried three times to talk about how she cooked eggs with her grandmother, but the teacher disregarded these comments in favor of a child who explained how eggs are white and yellow when they are cracked. (Greenfield, Raeff, & Quiroz, 1996, p. 44)

From the Latino point of view, the first child's answer was typical of the associations encouraged in her invisible home culture of interdependence. That is, objects are most meaningful when they mediate social interactions. The child therefore acted on this value of interpersonal relations in answering the teacher's question. The teacher, however, did not recognize this effort and considered the social descriptions of the time the child had eaten eggs as irrelevant; only physical descriptions of these occasions were valued (Greenfield et al., 1996). The teacher did not even see the invisible culture that generated a description of cooking eggs with one's grandmother; the teacher devalued the child's contribution and, implicitly, the value orientation it reflected. Because she did not understand the collectivistic value orientation, she was also unaware that her question was ambiguous in the following way: Children who shared her value orientation would assume that she was interested in the physical properties of the eggs, even though she did not make this point explicit; those children who did not share the teacher's value orientation would make different assumptions.

Assertiveness from a Collectivistic Perspective

In many collectivistic cultures, the value placed on respecting authority may go as far as to undermine the more individualistic styles of learning that require children to articulate and even argue their views with teachers and other elders on a relatively egalitarian basis (Delgado-Gaitan, 1993, 1994; Valdez, 1997). Consider the following cultural ideal for child communicative behavior for many people of Mexican background. According to Delgado-Gaitan (1994, p. 64): "Children are expected to politely greet their elders; they are not supposed to argue with them. In the company of adults, children are to be good listeners and participate in a conversation only when solicited. To raise questions is to be rebellious."

Valdés (1996) found respect to be so central to the families in her ethnographic study that she titled her book *Con respeto*. "*Respeto* for the mother's role was very much in evidence. . . . When a directive was given, it was followed promptly. If a younger child did not do so, an older sibling soon made certain that the youngster did what he had been told" (p. 120).

A similar view of questioning is found in Japan (Muto, Kubo, & Oshima-Takane, 1980). Given this cultural ideal in child communication, one can imagine the scenario in a U.S. school in which a teacher might falsely

interpret a Mexican American child's culturally defined polite compliance or a Japanese child's absence of questioning as a lack of motivation or intellectual curiosity.

As we saw in the section on parent-child relations, many children from different ethnic groups are raised with the notion of respecting and accepting the opinions of elders without question, and this value may be carried with the children to the school setting. The school's emphasis on rational argumentation can be seen to undermine respect for elders. However, when children with respect for authority are not vocal and adept at logic-rational modes of argumentation, they can be subjected to criticism by teachers, who focus on fostering individual assertiveness and opinions.

For example, in a study of fall conferences between immigrant Latino parents and their children's elementary school teachers, we showed that the teacher criticized every single child for not sufficiently expressing his or her views in class (Greenfield, Quiroz, & Raeff, 2000). The teacher was unaware that such behavior would be contrary to the Latino parents' goals for their own children's development.

Implications for Educational Practice

In many collectivistic societies, schools have found ways of integrating indigenous cultural values into the school system. In Japanese and Chinese classrooms, for example, classroom practices that focus the attention of teaching on the class as a whole rather than promoting attention to individual students are common and widely accepted (Stigler & Perry, 1988). This technique might be useful in U.S. classrooms that are homogeneous in the sense of containing only children who come from collectivistic backgrounds. Classrooms for immigrants would be one such example.

Implications for Counseling and Clinical Practice

Conflicts between children's experiences at home versus school could cause some degree of distress to children who are too young to realize that their feeling "different" may be due to culture. Cultural differences can be manifested in a variety of areas (religious restrictions, differences in social interaction, differing customs, foods, and beliefs, unusual parenting styles, etc.), and at an age when children want to fit in with their schoolmates, there is a potential for anxiety when home-school conflict occurs. Counselors and therapists who come into contact with school-age children should be aware of cultural conflicts and their potential to af-

fect children's emotional and psychological well-being. Furthermore, they should be properly trained to deal with these issues.

Summary

By and large, the educational implications of cross-cultural research revolve around a single major theme: the need to recognize that patterns and norms of development and education previously thought to be universal are often specific to European American culture and the culture of the schools. More specifically, immigrant and Native American families often come from collectivistic cultures but must put their children into the highly individualistic institution of the school. On the other hand, members of the dominant culture find relative harmony between their individualistic value framework and that of the school.

The major educational implication of cross-cultural value conflict is for teachers first to acquire an awareness and understanding of the individualistic and collectivistic frameworks and then to encourage mutual understanding and accommodation between the two value frameworks in both children and their parents. This was the foundation of our Bridging Cultures teacher-training intervention, to which we next turn.

EXAMPLE OF A HOME-SCHOOL INTERVENTION: BRIDGING CULTURES FOR TEACHERS

As part of a longitudinal action research project called Bridging Cultures, seven bilingual elementary school teachers serving homogeneous immigrant Latino populations were introduced to the concepts of individualism and collectivism (Rothstein-Fisch, Greenfield, & Trumbull, 1999; Trumbull, Diaz-Meza, Hasan, & Rothstein-Fisch, 2000; Trumbull et al., 1999; Trumbull, Rothstein-Fisch, Greenfield, & Quiroz, 2001). Teachers were selected because they had an interest in multicultural education and they represented all grades from kindergarten through grade 5 in the greater Los Angeles area. Four teachers identified themselves as Latino and three as European American. Teachers attended three workshops designed to acquaint them with the cultural value systems of individualism and collectivism. The teachers completed pre- and postassessments to determine if their problem-solving strategies of home- and

school-based dilemmas (see Raeff et al., 2000) changed as a result of the training. The teachers shifted from a decidedly strong individualistic orientation (independent of ethnicity) to a culturally open perspective that included a mix of individualistic and collectivistic responses (Rothstein-Fisch Trumbull, Quiroz, & Greenfield, 1997).

After the initial training, the teachers met bimonthly along with the researchers to discuss what kinds of changes they were making to their classrooms. They were introduced to ethnographic research methods and were encouraged to become both observers and change agents in their own classrooms. It is important to keep in mind that these changes were always teacher-generated and the researchers were not prescriptive about what changes to make. In addition to these meetings, over a period of 5 years, several classroom observations were made of each teacher and in-depth interviews occurred several times over the course of the project.

Changes in Classroom Management and Assessment

As a result of the training, teachers began using new classroom management strategies (Rothstein-Fisch, Trumbull, & Greenfield, in press). Building on their sense of shared responsibility for the group (akin to that of siblings discussed earlier), the students began to control each other's behavior, and very few incidents of poor discipline were ever observed in the classrooms. The teachers allowed students to share resources rather than insisting on personal property (Rothstein-Fisch, Trumbull, Daley, Mercado, & Perez, 2003).

But sharing can be problematic when testing occurs; in a test, helping is called cheating (J. W. M. Whiting & B. B. Whiting, 1994/1973). Therefore, Bridging Cultures teachers created ways to incorporate the cultural tendency for Latino children from immigrant families to want to help and share in the service of test preparation, without compromising individual test taking. In one classroom, children worked together to answer practice test questions, while learning that they would have to take the test individually; in another, they took the test individually but debriefed it in a group. In a third-grade class that was struggling with timed math facts, the teacher brought out a popular motivating device: a star chart to indicate the level of facts mastered by individual students. However, these students were not motivated by individual rewards. They saw the chart as representative

of the whole group, and they decided that the goal was to fill in a whole block of stars. Their idea was to have math buddies to help one another succeed. When it was time for the individual test and a child was successful at the next level of math facts, he or she would ring a bell. This signaled the class to stop and clap for the student who had, through his or her individual achievement, added to the collective class chart (Rothstein-Fisch, Trumbull, Isaac, Daley, & Perez, 2003).

Cross-Cultural Exchange: Parents and Teachers

Drawing from the Bridging Cultures project data, another area of dramatic teacher change centered on teachers' relationship with parents (Trumbull, Rothstein-Fisch, & Hernandez, 2003). These changes revolved around three interrelated themes. First, the teachers increased their psychological proximity to families because of their ability to take parents' perspectives. They also increased their contact through use of a personal and informal style, while still maintaining appropriate roles. Second, the teachers designed new classroom practices that demonstrated their understanding of parents' cultural values; they initiated group parent conferences, successfully increased the number of parent volunteers, and changed their schedules to accommodate family needs. Finally, they explored new roles. As mentioned earlier, they became ethnographers in their own classrooms, allowing them an openness to understanding families; they became more effective advocates for students and families; they explained school culture to parents more explicitly; and they supported parents in taking on new roles at school.

Parents in the Bridging Cultures parent training, described at the end of the section on parent-child relations, also learned to increase harmony with the school. They came to understand teacher behavior better and increased their contact with their children's teachers. The parents in the standard workshops did not increase their contact with their children's teachers.

The standard workshop sessions also resulted in benefits, but these revolved around help with homework and knowledge of school policies. Within the framework of school policies, parents learned about the importance of communicating with school personnel. An example of these two approaches can be seen from the third workshop, when a parent felt disrespected by a teacher. The Bridging Cultures parents viewed the situation through

the lens of cultural differences, resulting in diminished frustration. On the other hand, the standard workshop participants suggested becoming outspoken advocates, talking with the superintendent, writing letters, and even threatening removing the children from the school.

The cultural approach introduces integration and mutual understanding of cultural values into conflict situations, without forcing one side to confront to the other. The "standard" approach assumes that everyone holds similar values for child development and that parents should adopt the schools' methods. In resolving a conflict, the cultural approach completely reconstructs a road of understanding that allows for real reconciliation rather than patching over rough spots. (Chang, 2003, p. 40)

CONCLUSION

Every generalization obscures some things while illuminating others. Cultural variability is no exception. It calls attention to normative cultural patterns at the expense of individual differences. However, individual differences always occur around a culturally defined norm, which also serves as the starting point for historical change. Without knowledge of the norm, individual differences become uninterpretable. In addition, individuation and consequent magnification of individual differences is itself a characteristic of individualistic cultures (Greenfield, 2004). In any case, the primary goal of this chapter has been to contribute to a deeper understanding of culturally variable norms around which individual differences can range. A second goal was to contribute to an understanding of the dynamics of intercultural conflict as these affect development and socialization. A third goal has been to present and evaluate practices and interventions that can alleviate such conflict. Research relevant to the second and third goals is in its infancy. Its social importance provides a motive for much further investigation.

The analysis of cultural variability calls attention to cultures at one point in time, thereby obscuring historical change. We have therefore also tried to show that culture is not static; rather, it is constantly reinventing itself through the addition of new ethnic groups to multicultural societies, through changes in educational practices, through widening effects of the mass media, and through transformations in economy and technology. These sociohistorical changes produce constantly

evolving cultural modes of socialization and human development (Greenfield, 2004; Greenfield, Maynard, et al., 2003; Keller & Lamm, 2005). The dynamics of cultural change and its impact on socialization and development is an area that has been seriously understudied up to now. As cultural change accelerates, it is ripe for research attack.

Cultural History and Multiculturalism

In a diverse society such as the United States, cross-cultural conflict is unavoidable, manifesting itself in interpersonal misunderstandings and altercations. Individuals in every culture must find their own compromise between functioning as an individual and as a member of a group, between independence and interdependence. Some cultures stress one, some the other. Interpersonal differences in this tendency are present in every culture; every culture also has an ideal model of which is more important. Differences in these models and emphases generate cross-cultural differences in many domains of child development. In this chapter, we define domains mainly in terms of socializing influences and social development. They can also be defined in terms of developmental issues, including cognitive development (Greenfield, 2005; Greenfield, Keller, et al., 2003).

Throughout this chapter, cultural models have connected what would otherwise appear to be unrelated cross-cultural differences and, more important, provided an explanation for these differences. The diverse ethnicities that compose the United States and other multicultural societies have their ancestral roots in cultures that have different positions in the cultural complexes of individualism and collectivism. Prior research (Greenfield & Cocking, 1994) has shown that these constructs also generate a historical understanding of the nature of cultural diversity in child development and socialization in diverse societies like the United States.

Although it is clear that such cross-cultural conflicts do exist, it is not enough to simply acknowledge their existence. By educating parents, children, teachers, clinicians, and health care professionals to recognize and deal with cross-cultural difference and conflict, through targeted interventions, children's social, psychological, and educational needs can be better served. It is hoped that in this increasingly multicultural society, children will learn to prepare for and to appreciate the cultural differences that they will inevitably encounter between

themselves and others. Future research will tell us whether and how this has been accomplished.

One of our main messages for the application of a cultural perspective on human development is the opportunity for cross-cultural exchange in socialization strategies. Cultural differences are a resource for pediatricians, educators, and mental health professionals who work with parents and children. At the same time, there is an important secondary effect of such cross-cultural exchange: No ethnic group feels that they are parenting the "wrong" way; parents from all ethnocultural backgrounds can receive the message that they have something to contribute to the raising of children in a multicultural society. At the same time, the message can go out to members of the dominant culture that, in a changing world, they have much to learn from other cultural modes of socialization and human development. This intercultural learning process is also a ripe domain for future research.

REFERENCES

- Ainsworth, M. D. S. (1979). Infant-mother attachment. *Clinical Psychologist*, 38(2), 27-29.
- Ainsworth, M. D. S., Blehar, M. C., Waters, E., & Wall, S. (1978). *Patterns of attachment*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Ainsworth, M. D. S., & Wittig, B. A. (1969). Attachment and the exploratory behavior of 1-year-olds in a strange situation. In B. M. Foss (Ed.), *Determinants of infant behavior* (Vol. 4, pp. 113-136). London: Methuen.
- Akimoto, S. A., & Sanbonmatsu, D. M. (1999). Differences in self-effacing behavior between European and Japanese Americans: Effect on competence evaluations. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 30(2), 159-177.
- Allport, G. (1958). *The nature of prejudice* (Abridged version). New York: Doubleday Anchor.
- Azuma, H. (1994). Two modes of cognitive socialization in Japan and the United States. In P. M. Greenfield & R. R. Cocking (Eds.), *Cross-cultural roots of minority child development* (pp. 275-284). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Bakeman, R., Adamson, L. B., Konner, M., & Barr, R. G. (1990). !Kung infancy: The social context of object exploration. *Child Development*, 61, 794-809.
- Ball, H. L., Hooker, E., & Kelly, P. J. (2000). Parent-infant co-sleeping: Fathers' roles and perspectives. *Infant and Child Development*, 9, 67-74.
- Barry, H., III, & Paxson, L. M. (1971). Infancy and early childhood: Cross-cultural codes. *Ethology*, 10, 466-508.
- Baumrind, D. (1967). Child care practices antedating three patterns of preschool behavior. *Genetic Psychology Monographs*, 75, 43-88.
- Baumrind, D. (1971). Current patterns of parental authority. *Developmental Psychology Monographs*, 4(1, Pt. 2).
- Baumrind, D. (1972). An exploratory study of socialization effects on Black children: Some Black-White comparisons. *Child Development*, 43, 261-267.
- Baumrind, D. (1983). Socialization and instrumental competence in young children. In W. Damon (Ed.), *Social and personality development: Essays on the growth of the child* (pp. 121-138). New York: Norton.
- Bellah, R. N., Madsen, R., Sullivan, W. M., Swindler, A., & Tipton, S. M. (1985). *Habits of the heart*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Belsky, J. (1989). Infant-parent attachment and daycare. In defense of the Strange Situation. In J. Lande, S. Scarr, & N. Gunzenhauser (Eds.), *Caring for children: Challenge to America* (pp. 23-48). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Berk, L. (1993). *Infants, children, and adolescents*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Berry, J. W. (1976). *Human ecology and cognitive style: Comparative studies in cultural and psychological adaptation*. New York: Sage.
- Berry, J. W. (1994). Ecology of individualism and collectivism. In U. Kim, H. C. Triandis, C. Kagitcibasi, S.-C. Choi, & G. Yoon (Eds.), *Individualism and collectivism: Theory, method, and applications* (pp. 77-84). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Blake, I. K. (1993). Learning language in context: The social-emotional orientation of African-American mother-child communication. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 16, 443-464.
- Blake, I. K. (1994). Language development and socialization in young African-American children. In P. M. G. Greenfield & R. R. Cocking (Eds.), *Cross-cultural roots of minority child development* (pp. 167-196). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Bowlby, J. (1969). *Attachment and loss: Vol. 1. Attachment*. New York: Basic Books.
- Brazelton, T., Robey, J., & Collier, G. (1969). Infant development in the Zinacanteco Indians of southern Mexico. *Pediatrics*, 44, 274-283.
- Brazelton, T. B. (1990). Commentary: Parent-infant co-sleeping revisited. *Ab Initio*, 2(1), 1-7.
- Bredenkamp, S., & Copple, C. (Eds.). (1997). *Developmentally appropriate practice in early childhood programs* (Rev. ed.). Washington, DC: National Association for the Education of Young Children.
- Bundesden, H. (1944). *The baby manual*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Burton, R. V., & Whiting, J. W. M. (1961). The absent father and cross-sex identity. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 7, 85-95.
- Campos, J. J., Barrett, K. C., Lamb, M. E., Goldsmith, H. H., & Stenberg, C. (1983). Socioemotional development. In P. H. Mussen (Series Ed.) & M. M. Haith & J. J. Campos (Vol. Eds.), *Handbook of child psychology: Vol. 2. Infancy and developmental psychobiology* (pp. 783-915). New York: Wiley.
- Cardona, P. G., Nicholson, B. C., & Fox, R. A. (2000). Parenting among Hispanic and Anglo-American mothers with young children. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 140(3), 357-365.
- Caudill, W., & Plath, D. (1966). Who sleeps by whom? Parent-child involvement in urban Japanese families. *Psychiatry*, 29, 344-366.
- Chang, P. (2003). *Bridging cultures parent workshop: Developing cross-cultural harmony in minority school communities*. Unpublished honors thesis, UCLA Department of Psychology.
- Chao, R. (1994). Beyond parental control and authoritarian parenting style: Understanding Chinese parenting through the cultural notion of training. *Child Development*, 65, 1111-1119.
- Chao, R. (2000). The parenting of immigrant Chinese and European American mothers: Relations between parenting styles, socialization goals, and parental practices. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 21, 233-248.

- Chao, R. (2001a). Extending research on the consequences of parenting style for Chinese Americans and European Americans. *Child Development*, 72(6), 1832-1843.
- Chao, R. (2001b). Integrating culture and attachment. *American Psychologist*, 56(10), 822-823.
- Chavajay, P., & Rogoff, B. (2002). Schooling and traditional collaborative social organization of problem solving by Mayan mothers and children. *Developmental Psychology*, 38, 55-66.
- Chen, X., Liu, M., Li, B., Cen, G., Chen, H., & Wang, L. (2000). Maternal authoritative and authoritarian attitudes and mother-child interactions and relationships in urban China. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 24(1), 119-126.
- Childs, C. P., & Greenfield, P. M. (1980). Informal modes of learning and teaching: The case of Zinacanteco weaving. In N. Warren (Ed.), *Studies in cross-cultural psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 269-316). London: Academic Press.
- Chiu, R. K., & Kosinski, F. A. (1994). Is Chinese conflict-handling behavior influenced by Chinese values? *Social Behavior and Personality*, 22(1), 81-90.
- Choi, J. S. (1970). Comparative study on the traditional families in Korea, Japan, and China. In R. H. Hill & R. Koenig (Eds.), *Families in East and West* (pp. 202-210). Paris: Mouton.
- Choi, S. H. (1992). Communicative socialization processes: Korea and Canada. In S. Iwawaki, Y. Kashima, & K. Leung (Eds.), *Innovations in cross-cultural psychology* (pp. 103-121). Lisse, The Netherlands: Swets & Zeitlinger.
- Clancy, P. M. (1986). The acquisition of communicative style in Japanese. In B. B. Schieffelin & E. Ochs (Eds.), *Language socialization across cultures* (pp. 213-250). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Clarke-Stewart, K. A. (1989). Infant day care: Maligned or malignant? *American Psychologist*, 44, 266-273.
- Clarke-Stewart, K. A., Goossens, F. A., & Allhusen, V. D. (2001). Measuring infant attachment: Is the Strange Situation enough? *Social Development*, 10, 143-169.
- Cole, M. (1996). *Cultural psychology: A once and future discipline*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- D'Andrade, R. (1994). Introduction: John Whiting and anthropology. In E. H. Chasdi (Ed.), *Culture and human development: The selected papers of John Whiting* (pp. 1-13). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Dawes, D. (1989). *Through the night: Helping parents and sleepless infants*. London: Free Association Books.
- Delgado-Gaitan, C. (1993). Socializing young children in Mexican American families: An intergenerational perspective. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 16, 409-427.
- Delgado-Gaitan, C. (1994). Socializing young children in Mexican American families: An intergenerational perspective. In P. M. Greenfield & R. R. Cocking (Eds.), *Cross-cultural roots of minority child development* (pp. 55-86). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Dornbusch, S. M., Ritter, P. L., Leiderman, P. H., Roberts, D. F., & Fraleigh, M. J. (1987). The relation of parenting style to adolescent school performance. *Child Development*, 58, 1244-1257.
- Duranti, A., & Ochs, E. (1986). Literacy instruction in a Samoan village. In B. B. Schieffelin & P. Gilmore (Eds.), *Acquisition of literacy: Ethnographic perspectives* (pp. 213-232). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Durrett, M. E., Otaki, M., & Richards, P. (1984). Attachment and mothers' perception of support from the father. *Journal of the International Society for the Study of Behavioral Development*, 7, 167-176.
- Engle, L., & Greenfield, P. M. (2005). *Culture and intergroup relations: Effects of team experience and targeted intervention on cultural values and intercultural understanding*. Manuscript in preparation.
- Esau, P. C., Greenfield, P. M., & Daley, C. (2004, May). *Bridging cultures parent workshops: Developing cross-cultural harmony in minority school communities*. University of California Linguistic Minority Research Institute Conference, University of California, Santa Barbara.
- Farr, B. P., & Trumbull, E. (1997). *Assessment alternatives for diverse classrooms*. Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon.
- Farver, J. M., Narang, S., & Bhadha, B. R. (2002). East meets West: Ethnic identity, acculturation, and conflict in East Indian families. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 16(3), 338-350.
- Fernald, A., & Morikawa, H. (1993). Common themes and cultural variation in Japanese and American mothers' speech to infants. *Child Development*, 64, 637-656.
- Fuligni, A. J., & Pedersen, S. (2002). Family obligation and the transition to young adulthood. *Developmental Psychology*, 38(5), 856-868.
- Fuligni, A. J., Tseng, V., & Lam, M. (1999). Attitudes toward family obligations among American adolescents with Asian, Latin American, and European backgrounds. *Child Development*, 70(4), 1030-1044.
- Fuligni, A. J., & Zhang, W. (2004). Attitudes toward family obligation among adolescents in contemporary urban and rural China. *Child Development*, 75, 180-192.
- Gabrielidis, C., Stephan, W. G., Ybarra, O., Pearson, V. M., & Lucila, V. (1997). Preferred styles of conflict resolution: Mexico and the United States. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 28(6), 661-677.
- Gaertner, S. L., Dovidio, J. L., Nier, J. A., Ward, C. M., & Banker, B. S. (1999). Across cultural divides: The value of a superordinate identity. In D. A. Prentice & D. T. Miller (Eds.), *Cultural divides: Understanding and overcoming group conflict* (pp. 173-212). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Garcia Coll, C. T., Meyer, E., & Brillion, L. (1995). Ethnic and minority parenting. In M. H. Bornstein (Ed.), *Handbook of parenting: Vol. 2. Biology and ecology of parenting* (pp. 189-209). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Geary, J. P. (2001). *The Bridging Cultures project: A case study with middle school counselors*. Unpublished master's thesis, California State University, Northridge.
- Georgas, J., van de Vijver, F. J. R., & Berry, J. W. (2004). The eco-cultural framework, ecosocial indices, and psychological variables in cross-cultural research. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 35, 74-96.
- Girard, K., & Koch, S. J. (1996). *Conflict resolution in the schools: A manual for educators*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Gonzalez-Mena, J. (2001). *Multicultural issues in child care* (3rd ed.). Mountain View, CA: Mayfield.
- Goodnow, J. J. (1988). Parents' ideas, actions, and feelings: Models and methods from developmental and social psychology. *Child Development*, 59(2), 286-320.
- Graves, N. B., & Graves, T. D. (1978, August). *Learning cooperation in a cooperative society: Implications for the classroom*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

- Greenfield, P. M. (1966). On culture and conservation. In J. S. Bruner, R. R. Olver, & P. M. Greenfield (Eds.), *Studies in cognitive growth* (pp. 225-256). New York: Wiley.
- Greenfield, P. M. (1994). Independence and interdependence as developmental scripts: Implications for theory, research, and practice. In P. M. Greenfield & R. R. Cocking (Eds.), *Cross cultural roots of minority child development* (pp. 1-37). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Greenfield, P. M. (1997). You can't take it with you: Why ability assessments don't cross cultures. *American Psychologist*, 52, 1115-1124.
- Greenfield, P. M. (2000). Culture and universals: Integrating social and cognitive development. In L. P. Nucci, G. B. Saxe, & E. Turiel (Eds.), *Culture, thought, and development* (pp. 231-277). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Greenfield, P. M. (2004). *Weaving generations together: Evolving creativity in the Zinacantan Maya*. Santa Fe, NM: SAR Press.
- Greenfield, P. M. (2005). Paradigms of cultural thought. In K. J. Holyoak & R. G. Morrison (Eds.), *Cambridge handbook of thinking and reasoning* (pp. 663-682). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Greenfield, P. M., Brazelton, T. B., & Childs, C. (1989). From birth to maturity in Zinacantan: Ontogenesis in cultural context. In V. Bricker & G. Gossen (Eds.), *Ethnographic encounters in southern Mesoamerica: Celebratory essays in honor of Evon Z. Vogt* (pp. 177-216). Albany: Institute of Mesoamerica, State University of New York.
- Greenfield, P. M., & Bruner, J. S. (1966). Culture and cognitive growth. *International Journal of Psychology*, 1, 89-107.
- Greenfield, P. M., & Cocking, R. R. (Eds.). (1994). *Cross-cultural roots of minority child development*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Greenfield, P. M., Davis, H., Suzuki, L., & Boutakidis, I. (2002). Understanding intercultural relations on multiethnic high school sports teams. In M. Gatz, M. A. Messner, & S. Ball-Rokeach (Eds.), *Paradoxes of youth and sport* (pp. 141-157). Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Greenfield, P. M., Keller, H., Fuligni, A., & Maynard, A. (2003). Cultural pathways through universal development. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 54, 461-490.
- Greenfield, P. M., & Lave, J. (1982). Cognitive aspects of informal education. In D. Wagner & H. Stevenson (Eds.), *Cultural perspectives on child development* (pp. 181-207). San Francisco: Freeman.
- Greenfield, P. M., Maynard, A. E., & Childs, C. P. (2003). Historical change, cultural learning, and cognitive representation in Zinacantan Maya children. *Cognitive Development*, 18, 455-487.
- Greenfield, P. M., Quiroz, B., & Raeff, C. (2000). Cross-cultural conflict and harmony in the social construction of the child. In S. Harkness, C. Raeff, & C. M. Super (Eds.), *New directions in child development: Vol. 87. Variability in the social construction of the child* (pp. 93-108). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Greenfield, P. M., Raeff, C., & Quiroz, B. (1996). Cultural values in learning and education. In B. Williams (Ed.), *Closing the achievement gap* (pp. 37-55). Alexandria, VA: Association for Curriculum Supervision.
- Greenfield, P. M., & Suzuki, L. K. (1998). Culture and human development: Implications for parenting, education, pediatrics, and mental health. In W. Damon (Editor-in-Chief) & I. E. Sigel & K. A. Renninger (Vol. Eds.), *Handbook of child psychology: Vol. 4. Child psychology in practice* (5th ed., pp. 1059-1109). New York: Wiley.
- Greenwald, A. G. (1980). The totalitarian ego: Fabrication and revision of personal history. *American Psychologist*, 37(7), 603-618.
- Gross, R., & Osterman, P. (Eds.). (1971). *Individualism: Man in modern society*. New York: Dell.
- Grossmann, K., Grossmann, K. E., Spangler, G., Suess, G., & Unzner, L. (1985). Maternal sensitivity and newborns' orientation responses as related to quality of attachment in northern Germany. In I. Bretherton & E. Waters (Eds.), *Growing points of attachment theory and research: Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, 50(1/2, Serial No. 209).
- Gutierrez J., & Sameroff, A. J. (1990). Determinants of complexity in Mexican-American and Anglo-American mothers' conceptions of child development. *Child Development*, 61(2), 384-394.
- Hanks, C., & Reblsky, F. (1977). Mommy and the midnight visitor: A study of occasional co-sleeping. *Psychiatry*, 40, 277-280.
- Harkness, S. (1988). The cultural construction of semantic contingency in mother-child speech. *Language Sciences*, 10(1), 53-67.
- Harkness, S., & Super, C. M. (1982). Why African children are so hard to test. In L. L. Adler (Ed.), *Cross-cultural research at issue* (pp. 145-152). New York: Academic Press.
- Harkness, S., & Super, C. (1996). *Parents' cultural belief systems: Their origins, expressions and consequences*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Harkness, S., Super, C., & van Tijen, N. (2000). Individualism and the "Western mind" reconsidered: Parents' ethnotheories of the child. In S. Harkness, C. Raeff, & C. M. Super (Eds.), *New directions in child development: Vol. 87. Variability in the social construction of the child* (pp. 23-39). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Harrison, A. O., Wilson, M. N., Pine, C. J., Chan, S. Q., & Buriel, R. (1990). Family ecologies of ethnic minority children. *Child Development*, 61(2), 347-362.
- Harwood, R., Miller, J., & Lucca Irizarry, N. (1995). *Culture and attachment: Perceptions of the child in context*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Harwood, R. L. (1992). The influence of culturally derived values on Anglo and Puerto Rican mothers' perceptions of attachment behavior. *Child Development*, 63(4), 822-839.
- Harwood, R. L., Schoelmerich, A., Ventura-Cook, E., Schulze, P. A., & Wilson, S. P. (1996). Culture and class influences on Anglo and Puerto Rican mothers' beliefs regarding long-term socialization goals and child behavior. *Child Development*, 67(5), 2446-2461.
- Hayes, M. J., Roberts, S. M., & Stowe, R. (1996). Early childhood co-sleeping: Parent-child and parent-infant nighttime interactions. *Infant Mental Health Journal*, 17(4), 348-357.
- Heine, S. J., Kitayama, S., & Lehman, D. R. (2001). Cultural differences in self-evaluation: Japanese readily accept negative self-relevant information. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 32, 434-443.
- Heine, S. J., & Lehman, D. R. (1997). The cultural construction of self-enhancement: An examination of group-serving bias. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 72(6), 1268-1283.
- Hewlett, B. S., & Lamb, M. E. (2002). Integrating evolution, culture and developmental psychology: Explaining caregiver-infant proximity and responsiveness in central Africa and the USA. In H. Keller, Y. Portinga, & A. Scholmerich (Eds.), *Between culture and biology: Perspectives on ontogenetic development* (pp. 241-269). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Hewlett, B. S., Lamb, M. E., Shannon, D., Leyendecker, B., & Scholmerich, A. (1998). Culture and early infancy among central African foragers and farmers. *Developmental Psychology*, 34(4), 653-661.

- Higgins, A., Power, C., & Kohlberg, L. (1984). The relationship of moral atmosphere to judgments of responsibility. In W. M. Kurtinens & J. L. Gewirtz (Eds.), *Morality, moral behavior, and moral development* (pp. 74-106). New York: Wiley.
- Ho, D. Y. F. (1994). Cognitive socialization in Confucian heritage cultures. In P. M. Greenfield & R. R. Cocking (Eds.), *Cross-cultural roots of minority child development* (pp. 285-313). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Hofstede, G. (1991). *Software of the mind*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions, and organizations across nations* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Holt, E. (1957). *How children fail*. New York: Dell.
- Janoff-Bulman, R., & Leggatt, H. K. (2002). Culture and social obligation: When "shoulds" are perceived as "wants." *Journal of Research in Personality*, 36(3), 260-270.
- Jose, P. E., Huntsinger, C. S., Huntsinger, P. R., & Liaw, F.-R. (2000). Parental values and practices relevant to young children's social development in Taiwan and the United States. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 31(6), 677-702.
- Kagan, S., & Madsen, M. C. (1972). Rivalry in Anglo-American and Mexican children of two ages. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 24(2), 214-220.
- Kagitçibasi, Ç. (1996). *Family and human development across cultures: A view from the other side*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Kagitçibasi, Ç., & Ataca, B. (2005). Value of children, family, and self: A 3-decade portrait from Turkey. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 54(3), 317-337.
- Kawakami, K. (1987, July). *Comparison of mother-infant relationships in Japanese and American families*. Paper presented at the meeting of the International Society for the Study of Behavioral Development, Tokyo, Japan.
- Keller, H. (2002). The role of development for understanding the biological basis of cultural learning. In H. Keller, Y. H. Poortinga, & A. Schoelmerich (Eds.), *Between culture and biology* (pp. 213-240). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Keller, H., & Lamm, B. (in press). Parenting as the expression of sociohistorical time: The case of German individualism. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*.
- Keller, H., Miranda, D., & Gauda, G. (1984). The naive theory of the infant and some maternal attitudes: A two-country study. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 15, 165-179.
- Keller, H., Papaligoura, Z., Kuensemueller, P., Voelker, S., Papaeliou, C., Lohaus, A., et al. (2003). Concepts of mother-infant interaction in Greece and Germany. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 34(6), 677-689.
- Keller, H., Voelker, S., & Yovsi, R. D. (in press). Conceptions of good parenting in Cameroonian Nso and northern Germans. *Social Development*.
- Keller, H., Zach, U., & Abels, M. (2002). The German family: Families in Germany. In J. Roopnarine (Ed.), *Families across cultures* (pp. 24-258). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Kernan, C. L., & Greenfield, P. M. (2005). *Becoming a team: Individualism, collectivism, and group socialization in Los Angeles girls' basketball*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Killen, M., & Wainryb, C. (2000). Independence and interdependence in diverse cultural contexts. In S. Harkness, C. Raef, & C. M. Super (Eds.), *New directions in child development: Vol. 87. Variability in the social construction of the child* (pp. 5-21). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kim, U. (1996). Seminar presented to the Department of Psychology, University of California, Los Angeles.
- Kim, U., & Berry, J. W. (1993). Indigenous psychologies: Research and experience in cultural context. *Cross-Cultural Research and Methodologies Series*, 17. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Kim, U., & Choi, S. H. (1994). Individualism, collectivism, and child development. In P. M. Greenfield & R. R. Cocking (Eds.), *Cross-cultural roots of minority child development* (pp. 227-258). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Kitayama, S., Markus, H. R., & Lieberman, C. (1995). The collective construction of self esteem: Implications for culture, self, and emotion. In J. Russell, J. Wellenkamp, T. Manstead, & J. M. F. Dols (Eds.), *Everyday conceptions of emotions* (pp. 523-550). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic.
- Kitayama, S., Markus, H. R., Matsumoto, H., & Norasakkunkit, V. (1997). Individual and collective processes in the construction of the self: Self-enhancement in the United States and self-criticism in Japan. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 72(6), 1245-1267.
- Konner, M. (1982). *The tangled wing: Biological constraints on the human spirit*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Konner, M. J., & Worthman, C. (1980). Nursing frequency, gonadal function and birth-spacing among !Kung hunters and gatherers. *Science*, 207, 788-791.
- Lamb, M., & Sternberg, K. J. (1990). Do we really know how daycare affects children? *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 11, 351-379.
- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Lebra, T. (1994). Mother and child in Japanese socialization: A Japan-U.S. comparison. In P. M. Greenfield & R. R. Cocking (Eds.), *Cross-cultural roots of minority child development* (pp. 259-274). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Leung, K. (1988). Some determinants of conflict avoidance. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 19, 125-136.
- Leung, K., Lau, S., & Lam, W. L. (1998). Parenting styles and academic achievement: A cross-cultural study. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 44, 157-172.
- Levine, R., & Uleman, J. S. (1979). Perceived locus of control, chronic self-esteem, and attributions to success and failure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 5, 69-72.
- LeVine, R. A. (1977). Child rearing as cultural adaptation. In P. H. Leiderman, S. R. Tulkin, & A. Rosenfeld (Eds.), *Culture and infancy: Variations in the human experience* (pp. 15-27). New York: Academic Press.
- LeVine, R. A. (1988). Human and parental care: Universal goals, cultural strategies, individual behavior. In R. A. Levine, P. M. Miller, & M. M. West (Eds.), *Parental behavior in diverse societies: New directions for child development*, 40 (pp. 3-12). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- LeVine, R. A. (1994, July). *Culture and infant-mother attachment*. Paper presented at the International Society for the Study of Behavioral Development, Amsterdam.
- LeVine, R. A., Dixon, S., LeVine, S., Richman, A., Leiderman, P., Keefer, C., et al. (1994). *Child care and culture: Lessons from Africa*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Levine, R. V., Norenzayan, A., & Philbrick, K. (2001). Cross-cultural differences in helping strangers. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 32(5), 543-560.

- Lewis, C. (1984). Cooperation and control in Japanese nursery schools. *Comparative Education Review*, 28, 69-84.
- Lozoff, B., Wolf, A., & Davis, N. (1984). Cosleeping in urban families with young children in the United States. *Pediatrics*, 74(2), 171-182.
- Madsen, M. C. (1967). Cooperative and competitive motivation of children in three Mexican subcultures. *Psychological Reports*, 20, 1307-1320.
- Madsen, M. C. (1971). Developmental and cross-cultural differences in the cooperative and competitive behavior of young children. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 2(4), 365-371.
- Madsen, M. C., & Lancy, D. F. (1981). Cooperative and competitive behavior: Experiments related to ethnic identity and urbanization in Papua New Guinea. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 12(4), 389-408.
- Main, M., & Weston, D. (1982). Avoidance of the attachment figure in infancy: Descriptions and interpretations. In J. Stevenson-Hinde & C. Murray Parkes (Eds.), *The place of attachment in human infancy* (pp. 31-59). New York: Basic Books.
- Markus, H., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review*, 98(2), 224-253.
- Maynard, A., Greenfield, P. M., & Childs, C. P. (1999). Culture, history, biology, and body: How Zinacantec Maya learn to weave. *Ethos*, 27, 379-402.
- Maynard, A. E. (2002). Cultural teaching: The development of teaching skills in Zinacantec Maya sibling interactions. *Child Development*, 73(3), 969-982.
- McGillicuddy-DeLisi, A. V., & Sigel, I. E. (1995). Parental beliefs. In M. H. Bornstein (Ed.), *Handbook of parenting: Vol. 3. Status and social conditions of parenting* (pp. 333-358). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- McKenna, J. J. (1986). An anthropological perspective on the sudden infant death syndrome (SIDS): The role of parental breathing cues and speech breathing adaptations. *Medical Anthropology*, 10(1), 9-92.
- McKenna, J. J., & Mosko, S. S. (1994). Sleep and arousal, synchrony and independence, among mothers and infants sleeping apart and together (same bed): An experiment in evolutionary medicine. *Acta Paediatric Supplement*, 397, 94-102.
- McKenna, J. J., Thoman, E. B., Anders, T. F., Sadeh, A., Schectman, V. L., & Glotzbach, S. F. (1993). Infant-parent co-sleeping in an evolutionary perspective: Implication for understanding infant sleep development in the sudden infant death syndrome. *Sleep*, 16(3), 263-282.
- Miller, J. G. (1994). Cultural diversity in the morality of caring: Individually oriented versus duty-based interpersonal moral codes. *Cross-Cultural Research*, 28(1), 3-39.
- Miller, J. G. (1995, April). Discussion. In C. Raeff (Chair), *Individualism and collectivism as cultural contexts for developing different modes of independence and interdependence*. Symposium conducted at the meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, Indianapolis, IN.
- Miller, J. G., & Bersoff, D. M. (1992). Culture and moral judgment: How are conflicts between justice and interpersonal responsibilities resolved? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 62(4), 541-554.
- Miller, J. G., & Bersoff, D. M. (1998). The role of liking in perceptions of the moral responsibility to help: A cultural perspective. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 34(5), 443-469.
- Miller, J. G., Bersoff, D. M., & Harwood, R. L. (1990). Perceptions of social responsibilities in India and in the United States: Moral imperatives or personal decisions? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 58(1), 33-47.
- Mistry, J., & Rogoff, B. (1994). Remembering in cultural context. In W. J. Lonner & R. S. Malpass (Eds.), *Psychology and culture* (pp. 139-144). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Miyake, K., Chen, S., & Campos, J. J. (1985). Infant temperament, mother's mode of interaction, and attachment in Japan: An interim report. In I. Bretherton & E. Waters (Eds.), *Growing points in attachment theory and research: Monographs of Cross-Cultural Human Development*, 50(1/2, Serial No. 209).
- Morelli, G. A., Rogoff, B., Oppenheim, D., & Goldsmith, D. (1992). Cultural variation in infants' sleeping arrangements: Questions of independence. *Developmental Psychology*, 28(4), 604-613.
- Mullen, B., & Riordan, C. A. (1988). Self-serving attribution in naturalistic settings: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 18, 3-22.
- Mundy-Castle, A. C. (1974). Social and technological intelligence in Western and non-Western cultures. *Universitas*, 4, 46-52.
- Munroe, R. L., & Munroe, R. H. (1994). *Cross-cultural human development*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.
- Munroe, R. L., Munroe, R. H., & Whiting, J. W. M. (1981). Male sex-role resolutions. In R. H. Munroe, R. L. Munroe, & B. B. Whiting (Eds.), *Handbook of cross-cultural human development* (pp. 611-632). New York: Garland.
- Muto, T., Kubo, Y., & Oshima-Takane, Y. (1980). Why don't Japanese ask questions? *Japanese Psychological Review (Shinrigaku Hyoron)*, 23, 71-88.
- National Association for the Education of Young Children. (2005). *Where we stand: Many languages, many cultures—Respecting and responding to diversity*. Retrieved October 31, 2005, from <http://www.naeyc.org/about/positions/pdf/diversity.pdf#xml=http://naeyc.org/texis/search/pdf/hi.txt?query=multicultural&pr=naeyc&prox=sentence&rorder=750&rprox=500&rdfreq=1000&rwfreq=1000&rlead=1000&sufs=2&order=r&cq=&id=42ea28367>.
- Nsamenang, A. B. (1987). A West African perspective. In M. E. Lamb (Ed.), *The father's role: Cross-cultural perspectives* (pp. 273-293). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Nsamenang, A. B. (1992). *Human development in cultural context: A Third World perspective*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Nsamenang, A. B., & Lamb, M. E. (1994). Socialization of Nso children in the Bamenda grassfields of northwest Cameroon. In P. M. Greenfield & R. R. Cocking (Eds.), *Cross-cultural roots of minority child development* (pp. 133-146). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Nugent, J. K. (1994). Cross-cultural studies of child development: Implications for clinicians. *Zero to Three*, 15(2), 1, 3-8.
- Nunner-Winkler, G. (1984). Two moralities? A critical discussion of an ethic of care and responsibility versus an ethic of rights and justice. In W. M. Kurtin & J. L. Gewirtz (Eds.), *Morality, moral behavior, and moral development* (pp. 348-361). New York: Wiley.
- Ochs, E., & Schieffelin, B. B. (1984). Language acquisition and socialization: Three developmental stories and their implications. In R. Shweder & R. Levine (Eds.), *Culture theory: Essays on mind, self, and emotion* (pp. 276-320). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Ogbu, J. U. (1994). From cultural differences to differences in cultural frame of reference. In P. M. Greenfield & R. R. Cocking (Eds.), *Cross-cultural roots of minority child development* (pp. 365-391). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Ogunnaike, O. A., & Houser, R. F. (2002). Yoruba toddlers' engagement in errands and cognitive performance on the Yoruba Mental

- Subscales. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 26(2), 145-153.
- Oloko, B. A. (1993). Children's street work in urban Nigeria: Dilemma of modernizing tradition. *Journal of Behavioral Development*, 16, 465-482.
- Oloko, B. A. (1994). Children's street work in urban Nigeria: Dilemma of modernizing tradition. In P. M. Greenfield & R. R. Cocking (Eds.), *Cross-cultural roots of minority and child development* (pp. 197-224). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Osako, M. M., & Liu, W. T. (1986). Intergenerational relations and the aged among Japanese Americans. *Research on Aging*, 8(1), 128-155.
- Palacios, J., & Moreno, M. C. (1996). Parents' and adolescents' ideas on children: Origins and transmission of intracultural diversity. In S. Harkness & C. M. Super (Eds.), *Parents' cultural belief systems: Their origins, expressions and consequences* (pp. 215-253). New York: Guilford Press.
- Philips, S. U. (1972). Participant structures and communicative competence: Warm Springs children in community and classroom. In C. B. Cazden, V. P. John, & D. Hymes (Eds.), *Functions of language in the classroom* (pp. 370-394). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Posada, G., & Jacobs, A. (2001). Child-mother attachment relationships and culture. *American Psychologist*, 56(10), 821-822.
- Quiroz, B., Greenfield, P. M., & Altchech, M. (1999). Bridging cultures with a parent-teacher conference. *Educational Leadership*, 56(7), 68-70.
- Rabain, J. (1979). *L'enfant du lignage*. Paris: Payot.
- Rabain-Jamin, J. (1994). Language and socialization of the child in African families living in France. In P. M. Greenfield & R. R. Cocking (Eds.), *Cross-cultural roots of minority child development* (pp. 147-166). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Rabain-Jamin, J., Maynard, A. E., & Greenfield, P. M. (2003). Implications of sibling caregiving for sibling relations and teaching interactions in two cultures. *Ethos*, 31, 204-231.
- Rabain-Jamin, J., & Sabeau-Jouannet, E. (1997). Maternal speech to 4-month-old infants in two cultures: Wolof and French. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 20, 425-451.
- Raeff, C., Greenfield, P. M., & Quiroz, B. (2000). Conceptualizing interpersonal relationships in the cultural contexts of individualism and collectivism. In S. Harkness, C. Raeff, & C. M. Super (Eds.), *New directions in child development: Vol. 87. Variability in the social construction of the child* (pp. 59-74). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Rao, N., McHale, J. P., & Pearson, E. (2003). Links between socialization goals and child-rearing practices in Chinese and Indian mothers. *Infant and Child Development*, 12, 475-492.
- Reese, L., Balzano, S., Gallimore, R., & Goldenberg, C. (1995). The concept of educación: Latino family values and American schooling. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 23(1), 57-81.
- Restak, R. (1979). *The brain*. New York: Doubleday.
- Richman, A. L., Miller, P. M., & Johnson Solomon, M. (1988). The socialization of infants in suburban Boston. In R. A. LeVine, P. M. Miller, & M. West (Eds.), *Parental behavior in diverse societies* (pp. 65-74). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Rogoff, B. (1990). *Apprenticeship in thinking: Cognitive development in social context*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Rogoff, B. (2003). *The cultural nature of human development*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Rogoff, B., Paradise, R., Arauz, R., Correa-Chavez, M., & Angelillo, C. (2003). Firsthand learning through intent participation. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 54, 175.
- Rohner, R. P., & Pettengill, S. M. (1985). Perceived parental acceptance-rejection and parental control among Korean adolescents [Special issue]. *Child Development*, 56, 524-528.
- Roopnarine, J. L., & Lamb, M. E. (1978). The effects of daycare on attachment and exploratory behavior in a Strange Situation. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 24, 85-95.
- Roopnarine, J. L., & Lamb, M. E. (1980). Peer and parent-child interaction before and after enrollment in nursery school. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 1, 77-81.
- Rothbaum, F., Weisz, J., Pott, M., Miyake, K., & Morelli, G. (2000). Attachment and culture: Security in the United States and Japan. *American Psychologist*, 55(10), 1093-1104.
- Rothbaum, F., Weisz, J., Pott, M., Miyake, K., & Morelli, G. (2001). Deeper into attachment and culture. *American Psychologist*, 56(10), 827-829.
- Rothstein-Fisch, C. (2004, February). *Bridging cultures in early care and education*. Workshop presented at the annual Birth to Three Institute, Baltimore.
- Rothstein-Fisch, C., Greenfield, P. M., & Trumbull, E. (1999). Bridging Cultures with classroom strategies. *Educational Leadership*, 56(7), 64-67.
- Rothstein-Fisch, C., Trumbull, E., Daley, C., Mercado, G., & Perez, A. I. (2003, April). *Classroom management reconsidered: Building on students' cultural strengths*. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.
- Rothstein-Fisch, C., Trumbull, E., & Greenfield, P. M. (in press). *Reconceptualizing classroom management: Building on students' cultural strengths*. Washington, DC: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Rothstein-Fisch, C., Trumbull, E., Isaac, A., Daley, C., & Perez, A. I. (2003). When "helping someone else" is the right answer: Bridging cultures in assessment. *Journal of Latinos and Education*, 2, 123-140.
- Rothstein-Fisch, C., Trumbull, E., Quiroz, B., & Greenfield, P. M. (1997, June). *Bridging cultures in the schools*. Poster session presented at the Jean Piaget Society Conference, Santa Monica, CA.
- Rudy, D., & Grusec, J. E. (2001). Correlates of authoritarian parenting in individualist and collectivist cultures and implications for understanding the transmission of values. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 32(2), 202-212.
- Sanchez Medina, J. A., Lozano, V. M., & Goudena, P. P. (2001). Conflict management in pre-schoolers: A cross-cultural perspective. *International Journal of Early Years Education*, 9(2), 153-160.
- Saraswathi, T. S. (1999). *Culture, socialization, and human development: Theory, research, and applications in the Indian setting*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Saraswathi, T. S., & Pai, S. (1997). Socialization in the Indian context. In H. S. R. Kao (Ed.), *Asian perspectives on psychology* (pp. 74-92). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Saxe, G. B. (1991). *Culture and cognitive development*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Schachter, F. F., Fuchs, M. L., Bijur, P. E., & Stone, R. (1989). Co-sleeping and sleep problems in Hispanic-American urban young children. *Pediatrics*, 84, 522-530.
- Schneider, B., Hieshima, J. A., Lee, S., & Plank, S. (1994). Continuities and discontinuities in the cognitive socialization of

- Asian-oriented children: The case of Japanese Americans. In P. M. Greenfield & R. R. Cocking (Eds.), *Cross-cultural roots of minority child development* (pp. 323-350). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Schroen, C. (1995, May). *Is it child abuse? Toward a multi-cultural field guide for social workers*. Paper presented at the UCLA Undergraduate Psychology Conference, Los Angeles.
- Scribner, S. (1985). Vygotsky's uses of history. In J. Wertsch (Ed.), *Culture, communication, and cognition: Vygotskian perspectives* (pp. 119-145). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Scribner, S., & Cole, M. (1973). Cognitive consequences of formal and informal education. *Science*, 182, 553-559.
- Scribner, S., & Cole, M. (1981). *The psychology of literacy*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Shapira, A., & Madsen, M. C. (1969). Cooperative and competitive behavior of kibbutz and urban children in Israel. *Child Development*, 40(2), 609-617.
- Shweder, R., Jensen, L., & Goldstein, W. (1995). Who sleeps by whom revisited: A method for extracting the moral goods implicit in practice. In J. Goodnow, P. Miller, & F. Kessel (Eds.), *New directions for child development: Vol. 67. Cultural practices as contexts for development* (pp. 21-39). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Shweder, R. A., Goodnow, J., Hatano, G., LeVine, R. A., Markus, H., & Miller, P. (1998). The cultural psychology of development: One mind, many mentalities. In W. Damon (Editor-in-Chief) & R. M. Lerner (Vol. Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology: Vol. 1. Theoretical models of human development* (5th ed., pp. 865-937). New York: Wiley.
- Shweder, R. A., Mahapatra, M., & Miller, J. G. (1990). Culture and moral development. In J. W. Stigler, R. A. Shweder, & G. Herdt (Eds.), *Cultural psychology: Essays of comparative human development* (pp. 130-203). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Sigel, I. E. (Ed.). (1985). *Parental belief systems: The psychological consequences for children*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Sigel, I. E., McGillicuddy-DeLisi, A. V., & Goodnow, J. J. (Eds.). (1992). *Parental belief systems: The psychological consequences for children* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Smaldino, C. (1995). Tossing and turning over "crying it out." *Mothering*, 74, 32-37.
- Spock, B. (1976). *Baby and child care*. New York: Pocket Books.
- Stigler, J. W., & Perry, M. (1988). Mathematics learning in Japanese, Chinese, and American classrooms. In G. B. Saxe & M. Gearhart (Eds.), *Children's mathematics: Vol. 41. New directions of child development* (pp. 27-54). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Suina, J. H. (1991, June/July). Discussion. In P. M. Greenfield & R. R. Cocking (Eds.), *Continuities and discontinuities in the cognitive socialization of minority children*. Proceedings of a workshop, Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration, Washington, DC.
- Suina, J. H., & Smolkin, L. B. (1994). From natal culture to school culture to dominant society culture: Supporting transitions for Pueblo Indian students. In P. M. Greenfield & R. R. Cocking (Eds.), *Cross-cultural roots of minority child development* (pp. 115-130). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Sung, B. L. (1985). Bicultural conflicts in Chinese immigrant children. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 16, 255-269.
- Sung, K.-T. (1990). A new look at filial piety: Ideals and practices of family-centered parent care in Korea. *Gerontologist*, 30(5), 610-617.
- Super, C., & Harkness, S. (1982). The infant's niche in rural Kenya and metropolitan America. In L. L. Adler (Ed.), *Cross-cultural research at issue* (pp. 47-55). New York: Academic Press.
- Super, C., & Harkness, S. (1986). The developmental niche: A conceptualization at the interface of child and culture. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 9(4), 545-569.
- Suzuki, L. K. (2000). *The development and socialization of filial piety: A comparison of Asian Americans and Euro-Americans*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.
- Suzuki, L. K., Davis, H. M., & Greenfield, P. M. (in press). Self-enhancement and self-effacement in reaction to praise and criticism: The case of multi-ethnic youth. In C. Mattingly & N. Lutkehaus (Eds.), *Psychology meets anthropology: Jerome Bruner and his inspiration*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Suzuki, L. K., & Greenfield, P. M. (2002). The construction of everyday sacrifice in Asian Americans and European Americans: The roles of ethnicity and acculturation. *Cross Cultural Research*, 36(3), 200-228.
- Takahashi, K. (1990). Are the key assumptions of the "Strange Situation" procedure universal? A view from Japanese research. *Human Development*, 33, 23-30.
- Tapia Uribe, F., LeVine, R. A., & LeVine, S. E. (1994). Maternal behavior in a Mexican community: The changing environments of children. In P. M. Greenfield & R. R. Cocking (Eds.), *Cross-cultural roots of minority child development* (pp. 41-54). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Tobin, J., Wu, D., & Davidson, D. (1989). *Preschool in three cultures: Japan, China, and the United States*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Toupin, E. A. (1980). Counseling Asians: Psychotherapy in context of racism and Asian American history. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 50, 76-86.
- Triandis, H. C., Bontempo, R., Villareal, M., Asai, M., & Lucca, M. (1988). Individualism and collectivism: Cross-cultural perspectives on self in-group relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54, 323-338.
- Trommsdorff, G., & Nauck, B. (Eds.). (2005). Factors influencing value of children and intergenerational relations in times of social change: Analyses from psychological and socio-cultural perspectives. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 54(3), 317-337.
- Trumbull, E. (2000). Avoiding bias in grading systems. In E. Trumbull & B. Farr (Eds.), *Grading and reporting student progress in an age of standards* (pp. 105-127). Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon.
- Trumbull, E., Diaz-Meza, R., Hasan, A., & Rothstein-Fisch, C. (2000). *The Bridging Cultures 5 year report (1996-2000)*. San Francisco: WestEd.
- Trumbull, E., Rothstein-Fisch, C., & Greenfield, P. M. (1999). *Bridging Cultures in our schools: New approaches that work* (Knowledge Brief). San Francisco: WestEd.
- Trumbull, E., Rothstein-Fisch, C., Greenfield, P. M., & Quiroz, B. (2001). *Bridging Cultures between home and school: A guide for teachers*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Trumbull, E., Rothstein-Fisch, C., & Hernandez, E. (2003). Parent involvement in schooling: According to whose values? *School Community Journal*, 13, 45-72.

- Tseng, W. S. (1973). The concept of personality in Confucian thought. *Psychiatry*, 36, 191-202.
- Valdés, G. (1997). *Con respeto: Bridging the distances between culturally diverse families and schools—An ethnographic portrait*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- van IJzendoorn, M. H., & Kroonenberg, P. (1988). Cross-cultural patterns of attachment: A meta-analysis of the Strange Situation. *Child Development*, 59, 147-156.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1962). *Thought and language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Wainryb, C. (1995). Reasoning about social conflicts in different cultures: Druze and Jewish children in Israel. *Child Development*, 66(2), 390-401.
- Wainryb, C., & Turiel, E. (1994). Dominance, subordination, and concepts of personal entitlements in cultural contexts. *Child Development*, 65(6), 1701-1722.
- Wang, S., & Tamis-LeMonda, C. S. (2003). Do child-rearing values in Taiwan and the United States reflect cultural values of collectivism and individualism? *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 34, 661-677.
- Weisner, T. S. (1984). Ecocultural niches of middle childhood: A cross-cultural perspective. In W. A. Collins (Ed.), *Development during middle childhood: The years from 6 to 12* (pp. 335-369). Washington, DC: National Academy of Science Press.
- Weisner, T. S. (2000). Culture, childhood, and progress in sub-Saharan Africa. In L. E. Harrison & S. P. Huntington (Eds.), *Culture matters* (pp. 141-157). New York: Basic Books.
- Weisner, T., Bausano, M., & Kornfein, M. (1983). Putting family ideals into practice: Pronaturalism in conventional and nonconventional California families. *Ethos*, 11(4), 278-304.
- Wertsch, J. V. (1985). *Vygotsky and the social formation of mind*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Whiting, B., & Edwards, C. (1988). *Children of different worlds: The formation of social behavior*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Whiting, B. B., & Whiting, J. W. M. (1975). *Children of six cultures*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Whiting, J. W. M., & Whiting, B. B. (1994). Altruistic and egoistic behavior in six cultures. In E. H. Chasdi (Ed.), *Culture and human development: The selected papers of John Whiting* (pp. 267-281). New York: Cambridge University Press. (Original work published 1973)
- Yeh, K.-H., & Bedford, O. (2003). A test of the dual filial piety model. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 6, 215-228.
- Yoshida, T., Kojo, K., & Kaku, H. (1982). A study on the development of self-presentation in children. *Japanese Journal of Educational Psychology*, 30, 30-37.
- Yovsi, R. D. (2001). *Ethnotheories about breastfeeding and mother-infant interaction: The case of sedentary Nso farmers and nomadic Fulani pastoralists with their infants 3 to 6 months of age in Mbvein subdivision of the northwest province of Cameroon, Africa*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Osnabrueck, Germany.
- Yovsi, R. D., & Keller, H. (2003). Breastfeeding: An adaptive process. *Ethos*, 31, 147-171.
- Zempleni-Rabain, J. (1973). Food and the strategy involved in learning fraternal exchange among Wolof children. In P. Alexandre (Ed.), *French perspectives in African studies* (pp. 221-233). London: Oxford University Press.
- Zepeda, M., Gonzalez-Mena, J., Rothstein-Fisch, C., & Trumbull, E. (in press). *Bridging cultures in early care and education module*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Zukow, P. G. (1989). *Sibling interactions across cultures: Theoretical and methodological issues*. New York: Springer-Verlag.