Becoming a Team: Individualism, Collectivism, Ethnicity, and Group Socialization in Los Angeles Girls' Basketball

CLAUDIA L. KERNAN
PATRICIA M. GREENFIELD

ABSTRACT *We utilize the concepts of individualism and collectivism (or communitarianism) to understand group differences and longitudinal change in what it means to belong to a team, itself a communal context. Our setting is two multiethnic high school girls' basketball teams in southern California. Players were asked to keep journals documenting experiences of interpersonal harmony and conflict in the team setting. Earlier analysis indicated that the experience of playing on a team made players more collectivistic in response to a values questionnaire. How did this change come about? Here we use player journals to answer this question. The journals also show that the process of value change differs depending on whether players interpret the issues surrounding team building through an individualistic or a collectivistic lens. Individualistic journals were more likely to be written by players having at least one European American or African American parent and by Asian American and Latina players having at least one parent born in the United States, whereas they were less likely to be written by Asian American or Latina players from purely immigrant families. However, perhaps because of the situational press towards collectivism in the team context, a collectivistic orientation in player journals was not associated with a particular set of ethnic backgrounds.* [individualism, collectivism, sports, team, values, adolescents, value change]

ETHOS, Vol. 33, No. 4, pp. 542–566, ISSN 0091-2131, electronic ISSN 1548-1352. © 2005 by the American Anthropological Association. All rights reserved. Please direct all requests for permission to photocopy or reproduce article content through the University of California Press's Rights and Permissions website, http://www.ucpress.edu/journals/rights.htm.

anthrosource

With increasing ethnic diversity in the United States, understanding the dynamics of intergroup contact among youth is vital to our nation's future. Despite the importance of this topic, there has been a dearth of research on intergroup contact among youth in settings outside of the classroom (Braddock et al. 1995). Multiethnic high school sports teams offer an alternative to the classroom as a context for the study of forces that affect intergroup conflict and harmony among adolescents in American society (Braddock et al. 1995; Greenfield et al. 2002). Like classrooms, sports teams are a context in which many young people are exposed to people of differing backgrounds. Unlike classrooms, however, the sports team context is not influenced by the effects of academic tracking (Braddock et al. 1995; Slavin and Madden 1979). The sports team context is therefore more likely than the classroom to be a setting where students with differing ethnic backgrounds work together cooperatively towards a common goal (Braddock et al. 1995). For these reasons, multiethnic sports teams can be viewed as microcosms for studying the types of interactions that take place in a wide variety of American multiethnic institutions where people of differing backgrounds work together in order to accomplish common objectives. Our research utilizes multiethnic sports teams as just such a natural laboratory.

When people play together in a sports context, the common goal of winning may lead individuals of diverse ethnic backgrounds to create a superordinate group identity—that of "team member." Social psychologists have suggested that the development of superordinate group identities may be the key to intergroup harmony in pluralistic societies (Brewer and Schneider 1990; Gaertner, Dovidio, Nier, et al. 1999). Jackson et al. (2002) have lent empirical support to this notion in a study of first-year intercollegiate athletes. Thus, the study of the processes by which people from differing cultural backgrounds come to think of themselves as "team" or "group" members has important implications for understanding the forces that affect harmony and discord in multiethnic settings. Such processes are therefore the focus of the present study.

This article represents the third phase of a larger research project that focuses on the role of values in intergroup relations on multiethnic high school sports teams in Los Angeles County. In Phase 1, we examined value differences as a source of intergroup conflict and misunderstanding (Greenfield, Davis, et al. 2002). Through the analysis of player journals and ethnographic observation, we concluded that many misunderstandings occurred because one member of a dyad interpreted a given situation through a collectivistic (or communitarian) lens, whereas the other one interpreted the same situation through an individualistic lens. For example, one player drank from another's water bottle during practices

anthrosource

and games, instigating a negative reaction on the part of the second player, who thought the first player should bring her own water. According to our analysis, the first player assumed the value of sharing, whereas the second player prioritized the value of personal property. This particular value conflict between sharing and personal property mirrored others we had documented in our research on cross-cultural value conflict between Latino immigrant families and the schools, where immigrant parents prioritized sharing, while their children's teachers, representing mainstream U.S. values, prioritized personal property (Raeff, Greenfield, and Quiroz 2000).

Later analysis of our sports data confirmed an association between ethnic group membership and value position in these conflicts: Asian American and Latina players tended to interpret situations through a collectivistic lens, while European American and African American players tended to interpret the same situations through an individualistic lens (Suzuki, Davis, and Greenfield, in press). This pattern corresponded to the fact that the former groups were often immigrants or children of immigrants from collectivistic countries (Hofstede 1989/2001), whereas the latter generally had families in the United States for multiple generations. Whereas Shore (1996) analyzes baseball as cultural performance offering opportunities poised between communitarian and individualistic values, we document how different individuals enact more communitarian or more individualistic values in the practice of a given sport. As in prior research (e.g., Triandis 1989), we find a connection between value orientation and group membership, although value orientation is here assessed in a real-life situation rather than by a questionnaire measure. A second difference between this research and the traditional individualism-collectivism research is that we are identifying value differences between individuals as a source of misunderstanding. The association of ethnicity with value orientation indicates that interindividual misunderstanding is often intergroup misunderstanding, although enculturation and biraciality complicate this picture.

In Phase 2, we carried out an intervention (three three-hour workshops) to try to reduce intergroup conflict by increasing understanding of different value systems. We found that the workshops did not have the intended effect of increasing understanding of a value system different from one's own. Instead, we documented a longitudinal process taking place with or without our intervention: as the basketball season progressed, players from all ethnic groups increasingly endorsed collectivistic strategies to solve realistic social dilemmas presented to them in questionnaire format (Richland and Greenfield in press).

These dilemmas were developed out of the ethnography and player journals of Phase 1; an example follows:

anthrosource

> Both Andrea and Emily work hard during practice. Andrea says she practices hard so that she can improve her performance and do well in games. Emily says she practices hard to encourage team unity in order to improve the team's overall ability. Whose philosophy do you agree with more, Andrea's or Emily's?

After giving a free response to the above question, the participant would then turn the page and be asked to choose from two solutions:

> People might have different ideas about how to handle this situation. Which of these choices do you agree with most?

a. I agree with Andrea, self-improvement is more important.
b. I agree with Emily, learning to play as a team is more important.

In this example, choice "a" would be coded as the more individualistic response and choice "b" as the more collectivistic response. Augmented collectivism from playing on a sports team is perhaps an example of what Shore (1996) terms the tension between individualism and communitarianism (collectivism) in another sport, baseball: one must function as part of a collectivity, the team, but do so in the context of an individualistic society.

In Phase 3, this article, we analyze players' journal entries to elucidate the processes by which diverse players developed more collectivistic attitudes and practices as the season progressed. This phase of the project explores processes of group formation by examining the pathways through which young women of differing backgrounds become socialized into multiethnic high school basketball teams. In general, we are interested in how these young women come to think of themselves as a "team".

METHOD

Sample

Participants in this study were members of two girls' varsity high school teams from two different high schools in the Los Angeles area. Girls' teams were chosen because our research team was primarily female, and we felt that boys' teams might be less willing to learn from female instructors than girls' teams. Team 1 is from a high school in a historically diverse community, known for its Bohemian, artistic, and activist atmosphere, as well as for its ghetto and gangs. Team 2 is from a high school in a more conservative community; it has much more recently received an influx of Asian and Latino immigrants. Both schools represent predominantly middle-class neighborhoods; however, the first school is more economically diverse, with families on both the lower and the upper end of the economic spectrum.

anthrosource

Participants in the present analysis consisted of 15 girls of ethnically varied backgrounds. They were selected from the 23 team members who participated in the intervention by the following criteria: (1) They had the most extreme value scores on the questionnaire and therefore could best illustrate the two contrasting interpretive lenses; and (2) their journals (described in the next section) brought up two frequently recurring topics that were highly relevant to team building: "showing up" and "playing time." Because of their frequency, these topics became the focus of our analysis.

In terms of ethnic distribution, seven of the fifteen players came from Asian American families, two came from African American families, one came from a Latino family, one came from a European American family, and four came from ethnically mixed families. Here and throughout the article, the ethnicity of a player is described in terms of the ethnic background of her parents.

Personal Journals

Participants in this study were instructed to keep journals of their experiences over the course of a basketball season. They were asked to write entries for every day that they participated in basketball or had contact with their teammates. They were told to write about any "incident or problem, such as conflicts or hurt feelings" that had to do with their experience on the basketball team that year. They were asked to describe what happened in as much detail as they could, explain what caused the problem or led up to it, describe how they felt when the incident was happening and what they thought others felt in the situation, and talk about what could have been done to prevent the incident. They were also asked to write about problems they observed on the team, but were not personally involved in. In addition, they were instructed to write about times when "people get along or make others feel good." Participants were paid fifty cents per page. Although the frequency of writing and depth of detail in the journals varied, participants generally followed the instructions given to them, and the journals provide detailed, coherent narratives of the events of the season as viewed through the eyes of the authors.

Most important, the journals present the "voices" of the participants and contain their personal constructions of meaningful events, people, and feelings. Together, the diaries form a "multivocal ethnography" (Tobin 1989) from which events were recorded from several different points of view. The narrative quality of journal entries provided us as researchers with unique opportunities to explore how processes unfold through the eyes of the authors (Bruner 2001; Heath 1995).

Data on the 13 players who had a consistent journal orientation throughout the season are presented in the first section. Seven of these

anthrosource

had an individualistic orientation, six a collectivistic one. Detailed data on the change process itself are presented in the second section, through the eyes of two additional players, one more collectivistic, the other more individualistic.

Intervention

Over the course of three Saturday workshops, each lasting about three hours, team members were taught about the value systems of individualism and collectivism and how differences in these value systems might give rise to conflict. Team members engaged in role playing and were presented with material designed to make their implicit values explicit and to foster a respect for both individualism and collectivism as value systems (see Richland and Greenfield, in press, for more detail).

Ethnicity and Values

Based on prior research (e.g., Greenfield, Davis, Boutakidis, et al. 2002; Suzuki et al. in press; Hofstede 1989/2001), we expected players from African American and European American backgrounds to interpret events more individualistically in their journals, whereas we expected players from Asian American and Latino backgrounds to interpret the world through a collectivistic lens. In Southern California, the former groups have generally been exposed to the dominant U.S. value system of individualism for generations, whereas the latter groups are much closer to their collectivistic immigrant roots.

We must note, however, that African Americans are a complex case in which segregation and discrimination kept them isolated from mainstream society for an unusually long period of time. However, since the granting of civil rights, African Americans have become much more integrated into mainstream society and a more individualistic perspective has taken hold (J. Croft, personal communication, 2005). This individualistic perspective is particularly noticeable in the domain of basketball where African Americans have innovated and developed the individualistic style of play that has become dominant in professional basketball. This is a style in which personal showmanship is prime and passing the ball to another player is minimized. In contrast, a game with more passing involves more direct collaborative activity and therefore can be considered a more collectivistic style of play.

But we also realized, in the course of this study, that ethnicity has additional complexity for a multiethnic society and for the multiethnic families in which a number of players were raised. With the passing of generations, acculturation to the dominant society takes place in both Asian American and Latino families (e.g., Suzuki and Greenfield 1998). Hence, we decided to consider that if an Asian American or Latina player

anthrosource

had at least one parent born in the United States, they might reasonably be expected to adopt a more individualistic perspective through having experienced greater exposure to individualistic practices and values at home. We also reasoned that, where players were the product of mixed marriages and where one parent was either European American or African American, the values of individualism might be relatively strong because of the dominance of individualism in U.S. society as a whole. Hence we concluded that children of this sort of mixed marriage might also adopt an individualistic perspective.

Statistical analysis confirmed these complex relationships between ethnicity and individualistic value perspective. A binomial test indicated that individualistic journals were significantly more likely to be written by players having at least one European American or African American parent and by Asian American and Latina players having at least one parent born in the United States, whereas they were less likely to be written by Asian American or Latina players from purely immigrant families (both parents born in the ancestral country) ($p = .035$). However, perhaps because of the situational press toward collectivism in the team situation, a collectivistic orientation in player journals was not associated with a particular set of ethnic backgrounds.

PART ONE: PATHWAYS TO INTERDEPENDENCE—TEAM OBLIGATIONS AND ROLES

In this section, we explore variation in participants' conceptions of the duties, obligations, and rights of team members. We have focused our analysis on team members' conceptions of showing up for games and practices and their beliefs about when and why players should receive playing time during games. "Showing up" and "playing time" were of major importance to the participants in our study and the majority of team members wrote about these topics in journals that they were instructed to keep over the course of the sports season. In essence, "showing up" appeared to one of the most significant contributions or sacrifices a team member could make for the team, and "playing time" was the one of the most valued commodities or benefits that a team member could receive from their coaches.

Two qualitatively different ways of conceptualizing these issues emerged from the journal entries. As will be illustrated below, one way of conceptualizing "showing up" and "playing time" can be thought of as more individualistic, while the other was more collectivistic.

anthrosource

"Showing Up" and "Playing Time" for Collectivists: Team Cohesion and Implicit Understandings

In this section, our attention is turned to team members who wrote in a collectivistic manner. In their journals, these individuals stressed that showing up for games and practices was a duty for all team members because these events were integral to the team bonding process. These team members all mentioned bonding and team cohesion when they spoke about "showing up." Claudia, the child of Latino immigrant parents, was co-captain of Team 2; she wrote in her journal:

> Little by little, I learned everyone's names and not just that but I started to get to know them. That is the most important part of summer camp. Sure it is also about learning plays and skills. But getting to know your teammates is the most important part. To learn how each person plays, to become friends. I think that in order to become a team every one has to be friends or at least able to act civil around each other.... we had some girls who could not come to summer camp. That made it hard for us to undergo the bonding process.

As reflected in this entry, Claudia felt that camp was necessary to make her a better basketball player, but she indicates that she is more concerned about the strengthening of interpersonal relationships that occurs during these team events. Practice is not something that comes easily to her: she is both physically challenged and experiences some degree of intrapersonal stress when surrounded by unfamiliar people, but she is willing to suffer this discomfort for the sake of the team cohesion.

Later in the season, Claudia hurt her finger and was unable to play:

> It is very frustrating to sit on the bench and watch my team play whether we are winning or losing it is always hard for me because it does not feel like I'm part of the team.

As will be further illustrated in our analysis of the journals, many team members are upset when they do not get to play. These young women love basketball, and many are concerned about their performance on the team, eager to impress parents, coaches, and, in some cases, to increase their chances of someday playing college ball. However, Claudia does not write about any of these things when she misses a game; her primary emotional concern is that she is less "part of the team" when she does not play.

This type of concern is echoed by Jamie, a member of Team 2 who has a Dominican father and a Taiwanese mother. She began missing a lot of practices due to other school activities and felt a sense of guilt about her absences, decreasing her teammates' sense of closeness with her:

> I am leaving for two weeks. That means I will be missing more practices and games. I wonder sometimes, how the team feels about me... I think I am going to promise myself to work hard after Christmas break. I owe it to myself and my team.

anthrosource

Note that although Jamie's parents have an interracial marriage, one would expect both mother and father to see the world through a collectivistic lens. One would therefore expect Jamie also to adopt this perspective, as she does.

Maggie, who was a Japanese American member of Team 2 with U.S.-born parents, made the following comments about missed practices. In essence, she saw not showing up as synonymous with not "really" being a team:

> This year it seems like basketball is not everyone's first priority. . . . It is hard to play as a team when the team isn't really a team. I'm hoping that will not affect our season but I can't see how it won't.

Zoe was an African American player from Team 1. While at first her ethnicity seems to make her an unusual collectivist, Zoe had other influences in her socialization. She was very proud of having a Japanese grandmother, was enrolled in Japanese class in her school, and had many Asian American friends. Her case is an example of how a highly multicultural environment (for example, her high school had a language magnet school-within-a-school which she attended to study Japanese) can greatly reduce the association between ethnicity and value system.

Zoe generally wrote about practice in a collectivistic manner, writing a lot about social interactions during practice. She mentioned little of what she learned about the technical aspects of basketball and wrote mostly about what she learned socially. When the coach would not let her play in a game, she spoke of being "humiliated" in front of her teammates, focusing on the social repercussions of not participating. She appeared to value team practices for what they taught her about group dynamics:

> I'm learning—I learn from my team—cooperation, tolerance, and patience.

She also complained about the lack of emphasis she felt other team members placed on team cohesion at times:

> It wasn't *team* this, *we* that. It was *I* gotta start, *my* little social group has to play at one time.

She even referenced the intervention as not emphasizing team cohesion enough:

> I appreciate the fact that we go over these basic problem solving skills, but the thing is . . . I think we need team bonding.

This high value placed on fulfilling social responsibility for the sake of group cohesion in collectivistic groups has been documented in previous research (Raeff et al. 2000). For example, Raeff et al. (2000) have found that Latino families tend to think of individuals' contributions to household work as an implicitly agreed on duty that is valued because it helps

anthrosource

the group as a whole and offers individuals an opportunity to contribute to the overall social cohesion of the family unit. The journal entries of these young women illustrate how these same values are particularized in a sports team context.

Another manifestation of the implicit understanding that group cohesion should be a goal for which all team members are willing to sacrifice is the belief that team members should share playing time for the sake of group cohesion. Sharing group resources, in this case "playing time," is generally valued in more collectivist communities as an absolute and implicitly understood rule that group members should follow in order to promote good will and close relationships among group members (Raeff et al. 2000). This belief appeared to be held by some of our more collectivistic team members. This sharing of playing time was given priority only if it did not dramatically hurt the team's chances of winning. When it did, the collectivistic preference was to play the better players for the sake of the team as a whole.

Angie, a member of Team 1, had an English father and a mother she described as black and Native American. In her journal entries, she demonstrates both concern for the team to win and for team cohesion. She accepts that she will not play if it is not "good for the team" and attends to the feelings of others who do not play:

> In the game I only played about a quarter, but I played the quarter to my hardest. I am usually 2nd or 3rd string, but I do not mind. I recognize that I am small and skinny.... The 1st string point guard was down on how much playing time she got so I went over to her and talked to her about it.... I hope I made her feel better.

An Asian American player, Amber, wrote that, in preseason and when the team had little chance of winning, the less talented players should get a chance to play. This is indicative of the belief that sharing playing time is important if it does not hurt the team. Amber's narrative will be discussed in further detail in the second part of our study, as the changes she went through over the course of the season illustrate the dynamic nature of value systems.

Lisa, a Japanese American member of Team 1 with two immigrant parents, felt sorry for a team member, Mindy, who was not getting playing time in a particular game. Although Lisa got to play in the game, she felt bad for Mindy:

> Today, after the game, Mindy quit the team. She was crying and I didn't know what was wrong until I found out she had quit. She did not get any playing time the past two games.... I feel really bad for her. I guess coach has to realize that she can't just play the best players all game long because it is not fair for the rest of us. I think it hurts us emotionally not to play in a game.

anthrosource

Although there are some individualistic elements in this entry (for example, her idea that it is not "fair for the rest us" connotes a belief in the individual rights of players), Lisa seems to care about sharing for the sake of promoting good will among teammates. Even though she herself got playing time, she does not like the fact that others did not—she seems concerned that the team as a whole will be "hurt emotionally." That she placed team cohesion above individual rights is revealed in another journal entry:

> I did not get any playing time. I guess because I am not one of the better players, but it puts my self esteem down when I see that Coach can't put me in for not even a second. . . . But whatever. I don't care. Everybody who did get to play did a good job though. There was no tension between the players tonight and they played well together.

Although it hurt Lisa not to get playing time, she emphasized that it was because she was not one of the better players and was happy that, as a group, the team did well and bonded. Lisa emphasizes the importance of team cohesion again in a later journal entry:

> Claudia was a very caring person on and off the court. She always remembered to make everybody feel like they are a part of the team. I think every team needs a player that tries to keep the team unity and make sure everybody is getting along.

Lisa spends time elaborating on Claudia's contribution to team unity, which suggests that this is of more importance to Lisa than it is to the more individualistic players who will be contrasted in the next section of this article.

"Showing Up" and "Playing Time" for Individualists—Personal Rights and Contractual Conceptualizations of Social Obligations

According to Raeff, individualism as a theoretical construct should not be viewed "as antithetical to interdependence" (Raeff et al. 2000:60). "Going beyond previous approaches to individualism, which have suggested that such attention to others is precluded by the individualistic worldview," Raeff refined our understanding of individualism by exploring the ways in which relationships can be conceptualized through individualistic lenses (Raeff et al. 2000:71). Their study of Latino and European American families demonstrated how the same behavior, contributing to household duties, is valued by both groups but for different reasons. European American families tended to think of obligations to the group, not so much as implicit duties that are inherently valuable because they help the group and promote group cohesion, but as being negotiable and contractual (Raeff et al. 2000). Raeff et al. believe that this tradition arose out of Western liberal philosophy, which views democracy "as the most

anthrosource

viable political system for ensuring national unity while simultaneously preserving the liberty of all citizens" (Raeff et al. 2000:60). In this tradition, "because people are free and responsible for their own needs, some dimensions of their relationships are explicitly created" through contractual means (Raeff et al. 2000:69).

This contractual conceptualization of group obligations manifested itself in the team context in one group of journals. In contrast to the collectivistic perspective, these journals treated the issue of showing up as a contract—you show up because it is agreed that in order to reap the benefits of being on the team, such as getting more playing time during games, you have to fulfill this contractual obligation. For example, Leila, an African American player, commented about other team members missing practice:

> Coach told us that the other players who did not show will not play. I agree with her. You don't come to practice, you don't play. Everyone on the team knew that this week would be some hard practices and that's why they all made excuses and why they could not make it.

According to Leila's description of the situation, this rule "You don't come to practice, you don't play" was explicitly stated by the coach and discussed by the players. The fact that this player engaged in dialogue on this issue and the agreement reached was presented in her entry as part of her personal justification for the enforcement of this rule, makes her conceptualization of the "showing up" issue sound very different from the collectivistic perspective. Team cohesion is not the central issue for her, and the "showing up" rule is not conceived in her mind as an absolute "given" or an a priori rule of group membership.

Jill, a Japanese American member of Team 1 with immigrant parents, had a similar conception of "showing up":

> Players that I told you about . . . all complain about how they don't get enough playing time. But what do you expect when you don't come to practice?

Unlike Angie, described in the preceding section, who tended to the feelings of players who did not get to play, Jill showed much less sympathy for a fellow team member who did not get to play in a game:

> Traci was crying after the game and like ran away and missed the pep talk that Coach gave us after the game. I found out later that she was upset at her playing time, but, hey, she didn't come to practice a lot.

Later in the season, Jill elaborated on her belief that showing up was a contractual obligation for which players should be rewarded. She became

anthrosource

angry with her coach when she was not played in the final game of the season:

> At the sound of the buzzer, she lost all my respect because I realized she had none for me.... I have never been so disappointed. I worked so hard and got nothing in return.

Jackson, child of a European American father and a Native American mother and a member of Team 1, also wrote of showing up as a contractual obligation to the team:

> The game was about to begin when Coach Anderson took Patricia out and put Kim in. We all felt it was unfair. Kim was late, she should have been on the bench. I know she is our best player but still. I guess that since Coach wants to win so bad, she doesn't care about fairness.

This entry describes a very individualistic view of "fairness." Fairness, in Jackson's eyes, involves abiding by the team contract to show up on time. Patricia's individual rights under this contract were infringed upon by the Coach when Patricia was replaced with Kim, who showed up late. Even though Kim was a much more talented player than Patricia, and the team as a group would most likely benefit more from Kim's presence on the court, Jackson valued the individual rights she expected to be protected under the team contract more than she valued helping the team as a whole.

Kate, a European American member of Team 1, had a similarly individualistic conception of "fairness":

> Coach said that she won't play those that weren't at practice. We all thought that was fair. We were coming every day, getting no sleep, going to school as zombies and working extra hard at practice. I was determined to prove myself to Coach and to my teammates. Then, at one of our last games, I grew very aggravated because Coach played Margaret, who *never* came to morning practices and, who *barely* every came to regular practices.... I was angry and hurt, because I didn't understand Coach. She was contradicting what she told us at practice.

Note that Kate did not talk at all about what might be best for the team, or hypothesize that perhaps the coach played Margaret with the goal of benefiting the team as a whole. Her primary concern was that her individual rights had been violated under the team contract and, in Kate's opinion, this was inexcusable.

Kim, a Japanese American member of Team 1 with U.S.-born parents, also thought it "unfair" to play players that do not come to practice:

> I thought Coach should not have put in Margaret and Zoe as much as she did. Especially because they decide not to show up to the practices or weight-lifting. I heard after the game that Margaret was upset about her playing time. I thought she has no right to complain.

Furthermore, she felt that there should be consequences for not showing up to practice:

anthrosource

> So far something that has bothered me is the fact that when some of the girls do miss practice there is no consequence or penalty for not showing up.

Although Kim expresses concern for the effects of not showing up on "our team" she is not concerned with team cohesion, she is concerned with fairness to individuals. She states that team obligations need to be expressed explicitly by the coach in a contractual manner and if you do not fulfill your duties under the contract, she believes there should be a penalty.

Sallie, a Japanese American member of Team 2 with U.S.-born parents, also expressed her individualism in her journal entries when she talked about practice and earning playing time. She discussed a practice where only six players showed up:

> How can Coach go through everything when only six people show up? But, I'm sort of glad only six people showed up because this gave me more practice time . . . if someone else was there, like Sandra. I wouldn't have had the amount of coaching I got. Plus I get to start on Monday. A starter. Wow!

Sallie's point of view is very individualistic because she focuses on her own personal benefits from attending practice and views the welfare of the team as a whole as a secondary concern. Like Sallie, Sandra, a Chinese American member of Team 2 with one U.S.-born parent, focused on personal rather than team goals in her journal entries. While she admitted that some team bonding takes place during games, she stated:

> As players and competitors, everyone is going on the court and playing their best to get more game time.

In another entry she considers the possibility that another, possibly more talented player might "take her spot":

> I don't know if I can handle being started and then demoted and having a freshman take my spot. The thought infuriates me.

Sandra appears to be more concerned with her personal status on the team than she is with the team winning or the having the best players start. These entries sound very different from the collectivist entries described earlier, where team members showed much less discomfort forfeiting playing time for the benefit of the team.

In summary, whether the goal was sharing playing time for the sake of good feelings among team members or giving certain team members playing time for the sake of the team as a whole, the collectivistic perspective stressed team cohesion and the welfare of the entire team over individual rights. Similarly, "showing up" was motivated by respect for the team as a whole. The individualistic perspective, in contrast, stressed "playing time" as a personal right and "showing up" as a contractual and enforceable obligation. Individuals who joined these basketball teams adopted the

anthrosource

team value of "showing up", but interpreted it in the light of two different values perspectives. Similarly, there were two different perspectives on when and why "playing time" should be given and taken away from players.

The individualistic perspective was roughly correlated with ethnicity, in accordance with our prior expectations. In general, a European American or African American background was associated with a more individualistic perspective. On the other hand, more generations in the United States moved a collectivistic group in the direction of individualism. When a player had parents from two different ethnic groups, one of which was African American or European American and the other of which was Asian American or Latino, the player tended to emerge with an individualistic perspective.

PART 2: CONFLICT AND VALUE CHANGE

In this section of our analysis, we address issues of value change. We argue that using the constructs of individualism and collectivism in our analysis does not mean these constructs have to be "viewed as a static trait or attribute of people . . . (they are) constantly being transformed when individuals negotiate common meanings through social interactions" (Raeff 1997:255–256). A team is a place where value systems meet and act upon one another, creating a dynamic environment of conflict and change.

As the season progressed, the narratives indicated an increase in collectivistic thinking in many of the team members. This was confirmed by the questionnaires, which indicated a statistically significant rise in collectivism in both the intervention and control groups as the season progressed (Richland and Greenfield in press). The narratives of team members offer clues as to why this may have happened. In addition, some team members appeared to be engaged in more of an "inner struggle" in terms of the ways they conceptualized "showing up," and their narratives revealed changes in their conceptualizations of team roles and obligations in reaction to various contextual forces.

How did we explore value change among our team members? As mentioned earlier, in a prior phase of this project, a change analysis of questionnaire scores demonstrated that time spent on the team increased the use of collectivistic strategies among team members in solving realistic social problems (Richland and Greenfield in press). We view this earlier phase of the analysis as a look at "snapshots" (questionnaire scores) taken at different points in time, and the differences between these snapshots demonstrate change in the constructs measured (Patton 2002). Having explored *what* happened over the course of the season and with exposure

anthrosource

to an intervention, we now turn our attention to *how* these changes may have occurred.

Our exploration of how change occurred is less like a series of snapshots, and more like a "documentary film" co-directed by the researchers and participants (Patton 2002). These accounts, interwoven with our interpretation of them, form narratives that describe culture as a dynamic "process," rather than a static entity (Greenfield 1997).

In exploring processes of change among team members, we can begin to understand under what circumstances people retain values and under what circumstances they change. Change in values involves a complex interaction among a variety of individual and contextual variables (Reed et al. 1996), so we by no means have a basis to construct a comprehensive theory of value change. We do, however, believe that a process-oriented analysis of particular individuals in specific circumstances can contribute to the identification of processes and variables of importance in understanding value change.

Sampling and Analysis

With this in mind, we selected for analysis the journal entries of two of the more "conflicted" team members in our sample, bringing light to bear on processes of conflict and change within them. These individuals were identified as conflicted because their journal entries revealed a greater degree of "inner conflict" and change in their conceptions of "showing up" and "playing time" than their teammates. In addition, these two players had the most complete journals, allowing us to trace changes throughout the season.

In the prior quantitative study in which pre- and post-intervention questionnaire scores were analyzed, the average change in questionnaire scores among all teammates who participated in the intervention was .13, which indicated a statistically significant change towards more collectivistic problem solving strategies among team members; the standard deviation was .21 (Richland and Greenfield in press). The range of change in individuals in that sample was −.24 (becoming more individualistic) to .62 (becoming more collectivistic). Like most of their teammates, the individuals whose journals are analyzed below both showed change towards more collectivistic problem solving strategies on their questionnaires, with Amber's questionnaire scores changing by .12 (about average) and Irene's questionnaire scores changing by .25 (higher than average). (Individualism-collectivism scores ran from 0 to 1, with 0 being the individualistic pole.) Note, however, that both are "typical" in that they are well within one standard deviation of the mean change. Irene's greater

anthrosource

score change, contrasted with Amber's, is reflected in her journal entries, as will become clear.

For these longitudinal analyses, the time course will be highlighted by dating the journal entries as to month and day, so that the time scale of value change will be clear. This high school basketball season ran from mid-November through March.

A Process of Conflict and Change: Amber

Amber, daughter of a Filipino American father and a Japanese American mother, both born in Los Angeles, was a member of Team 2. Amber had a difficult time during the season because she did not get much playing time. She was described by the coaches and her teammates as one of the least talented basketball players on the team, and it seems that this kept the coaches from letting her play as much her fellow team members. The first entries were written before the intervention workshops began. Amber opened her journal with a comment about the first game of the season:

> November 30. Today was our first game . . . it kinda sucked. I really did not get to play. . . . We had no chance of winning anyway. Why didn't he just play everyone just so we could practice in a game situation. Oh well, I guess I'm not too worried about it, since this is our first game and I have the rest of the season to play in games.

The concern with equality is generally considered to be characteristic of individualistic societies (Hofstede 2001). Amber's concern with equality continued a few weeks later:

> December 15. Today I hardly got to play in the game, which I do not understand. . . . Well, I think it is not right that I don't get to play as much as the other girls. I also know that I am not one of the best players on the team, but right now we are in pre-season and both coaches say that they want me to play more but I am not experienced. Well how am I supposed to get experience if they don't put me in the game every now and then?

Amber's situation and her "contractually" conceived appeals to her coaches are noticed by another team member—Sandra, an individualistic member of Amber's team, explains that another team member, Irene, has missed a lot of practices and that this really bothers Amber. The following was written two days after the first intervention workshop.

> January 11. I also know that Amber had been battling with this thing (Irene missing practice) for a long, long time . . . I think Amber's situation is kind of sad. She goes to every practice and attends everything, yet she barely gets any playing time. She tries so hard yet accomplishes so little though. I heard that her and Coach K. got into a long discussion about Irene. . . . Coach K. said that we should leave it to the coaches to get on the players, not us.

After this, the focus of Amber's next few journal entries is different. She continues thinking in an individualistic way, engaging in the more

anthrosource

contractual mode of thinking that her coaches have presented to her. According to this mode, one receives playing time in return for showing up to practices and games. She begins complaining about her team members' lack of commitment and starts to document the fact that a lot of them are not showing up to practice. She implies that they do not deserve the playing time that they are given:

> January 21. Well, we had practice on the 16th, 18th, 19th, 20th, and today, the 21st. Well we had five days of practice and you ask was there one day when everyone was there? No. It really drives me crazy that I don't play that much and I have never missed a game and I have only missed one practice. Not to sound like a snob, but out of all the people on the team, I think I have the best commitment.

In the end, Amber's appeals were to no avail. She never got more playing time. In her last journal entries, she seemed to resolve the issue within herself and come to the conclusion that perhaps her focus had gone in the wrong direction. Her final journal entry indicates that she has arrived at a more collectivist way of conceptualizing her playing experience: On March 27, at the end of season and after the intervention was complete, she wrote:

> I guess it does not matter how many games you win or how many points you get to score. I guess all that matters is that I got to meet a lot of new people and the people I already knew I got to know them better, had fun, and most of all learned a lot about working together and sportsmanship. . . . So I guess for my last entry for this journal I'll say that I had a great four years of basketball even though I did not play that much, but I think it was enough that I was part of a team and learned a lot of things, not only from the coaches but from the players also that I will never forget.

A Process of Conflict and Change: Irene

Irene, the player whom Amber resented for not "showing up" enough, had a European American mother and a Samoan father.

Her first few journal entries reflected the individualistic viewpoint that she brought to the team context. Other players on the team complained about her lack of commitment to the team and she seemed to be evoking individualistic values in order to defend herself against criticism:

> November 14. I heard that Coach K. was not gong to be the coach this year so I quit the team. So the team thought I said the reason why I was quitting was because I said the team was going to suck . . . but I never said that. So (later) I rejoined. . . . People still say stuff about me but I don't care. I'm playing basketball for myself and no one else.

Irene is most likely concerned about the negative feelings she perceives her teammates to be harboring against her. However, she defends against these criticisms by telling herself that she is playing for herself, and she does not worry about overall team cohesion. Two weeks later, her individualistic conception of team membership is tinged with collectivism: the individual must earn the right to play, but, implicitly, the right

anthrosource

to play is based on being able to help the team, not on the individualistic conception of equality.

> December 7. Today I was talking to Hanna about the game. She said that she wanted to start. I told her that she had to prove she could be a starter during practice—she gave me this look and said "Okay."

As the season progressed, Irene began to miss practices, and this appeared to further damage her relationships with her teammates. As discussed above, Amber did not like the fact that Irene got to play even though she missed practices. Unlike in the beginning of her journal, Irene seemed less able to dismiss the negative feedback she received from her teammates:

> December 9. Today I talked to Claudia about some players on the team. Like Amber. Last year we were so cool with each other we would talk and laugh all the time. But now she's ignoring me big time. And every time I do something wrong, she snaps at me.... Claudia said she thinks Amber was mad about what I said about quitting, but now that I'm back, she shouldn't care. Oh, and this girl named Nadia is always snapping at me.... She always gives me dirty looks, especially today. Why don't they like me!?

Irene approached Amber about the negative feelings she was conveying, but did not get any direct answers from Amber:

> December 9. I asked her what she had against me. She paused and said, "Well, um, what do you mean?" I said you're always giving dirty looks, making negative comments about me and a lot of other things. She said that it was nothing.

It is noteworthy that Amber was not able to tell Irene directly that she was angry about her lack of dedication and the fact that she still got playing time. This trepidation may have been related to the comment that Amber made in her own journal, that she did not want to be a "snob" about her own commitment to the team and others' lack of commitment. Although it may be, in part, that it is simply harder to confront someone face to face than to complain to others, Amber's reluctance to confront Irene strengthens the hypothesis that, as a more collectivistic player, Amber was not entirely comfortable with the contractual way of thinking that she had adopted in order to improve her status on the team. Another aspect of collectivism that may have come into play is the preference for nonconfrontational conflict resolution (Greenfield and Suzuki 1998).

Later in her journal, although she does not fully admit it at first, Irene appears to understand more why her teammates are not very supportive of her:

> December 11. I have been missing so many games and practices lately. People have been ignoring me and I don't know why. I feel weird when I'm around them.... The team had a game today in the city-wide tournament. Claudia asked if I was going and I

anthrosource

> made up an excuse. I feel bad that I can't go but they don't talk to me when I'm there and I feel so uncomfortable. I tried talking to people on our team before the game today but everyone ignores me. Well, almost everyone. I told Georgina good luck at the game and she said, "Why aren't you playing?" I told her I wasn't cleared by ASB yet. She said that the team needs me to be there because they need a tall person to help out with the tall people on the other team. I said thanks.

Irene is beginning to see more clearly why her teammates have shunned her. After this point in the journal, her language begins to sound very different from the language she used at the beginning of her journal. Unlike her statement that "she is playing for herself and no one else" she begins to argue that it is important to play and practice "as a team" more and more the season progresses. For example, after a practice in which she felt that team cohesion was high she said:

> December 12. In my opinion, we look a little better. We started to talk to each other a little during practice. Now, we kind of look like a team.

At another practice where team cohesion was high she commented:

> December 21. I can honestly say I never laughed so hard at a practice like I did today. It seemed like everything every one said was funny. We did this shooting drill stuff that was fun. We started to act like sisters, not teammates.

It is significant that she contrasted "teammates" with "sisters," as if to emphasize the strong cohesion and intragroup cooperation that took place during this practice. In a game following these more pleasant practices, Irene's sense of loyalty to the team really came through in the language she used to describe her experience of playing:

> December 28. I hate when I have a bad game because I felt like I let the team down. . . . After the game Coach K. told me in front of everyone that he's gonna get on me until I start playing physical. . . . I want to go into tomorrow's game and make me, my team, and my coach proud of me.

In Irene's next few journal entries, she describes the games that they won and lost. In every entry, she attributes doing well to playing "as a team" and doing poorly to "playing as individuals."

> December 15. We won our first league game. Who knows, we still have a chance to make it into the playoffs if we win all the other games. I'm so glad we played as a team today.

Here Irene expresses interdependence with the in-group and competition with the out-group. This is very characteristic of the dynamics of collectivism. After the team lost a game (and six days after the final workshop) she wrote:

> January 29. Today we weren't playing like a team. The thing that disturbed me, is when I come out of the game. . . . I don't hardly hear any encouragement from my teammates. . . . If we don't play together we're going to lose every game.

anthrosource

In her second to last entry (undated) which she entitled "Closure on Season" she wrote:

> This year was very interesting. We played as a team one game, the only game we won. All the other games we lost were a result of not playing as a team.

In her last entry, Irene compared this season to the last season and stated that she felt that there was not as much team cohesion this year:

> March 27. We were so cool (last year) and then this year it was like "Hi, but I don't know you anymore" causing us not to play as a team, resulting in a loser season.

In Irene's journal entries over the season, we see a clear shift in her expressed attitudes toward the team. She began the season saying that she was playing only for herself. As she suffered rejection, she began to think more about team cohesion and actually craved a sense of belonging with her teammates. She also attributed winning to team cohesion and losing to "playing as individuals." The shift to "team" terminology seemed to follow close on the heels of the first intervention workshop.

In tracing the pathways of change of two individuals, we have demonstrated how expressed values may change in the face of contextual forces. It seems that in the face of a scarcity of resources, these two players reconceptualized their relationships toward the team. In Amber's case, there was a scarcity of playing time: she was not getting enough, and hence seemed willing, albeit reluctantly, to adopt a more contractual way of thinking. When this strategy did not work, she expressed a more collectivistic point of view, valuing team cohesion above all else. In the case of Irene, the scarcity involved friendships on the team and the winning of games. Beginning with a "play for self" attitude, she changed over the course of the season, realizing that in order to be liked by her teammates and to win games she needed to think about the team as a whole. As expressed in their narratives, the individual personalities of these two players appear to have interacted with contextual factors, contributing to their accepting or rejecting values that were "under debate" in the team context.

DISCUSSION

It is reasonable to expect that the process of socialization into an American sports team would lead players toward a greater valuing of collectivity in social situations. Anyone who has been exposed to sports in American society is familiar with the rhetoric that surrounds the description of "team players." According to this rhetoric, individuals must be willing to work and sacrifice for the good of the team—they must be willing to put the team first and "pass the ball," even if this means sacrificing

anthrosource

personal glory. A "team" is by definition interdependent in that players must work together in pursuit of a common goal—winning (Jackson et al. 2002). It is therefore not surprising that the participants in our study became more collectivistic after a season of playing together on a basketball team. The documentation of change processes in two players illustrated the results of Phase 2 (Richland and Greenfield in press) and gave insight into the processes by which the changes came about.

A contribution of this analysis was to show how different value lenses created different pathways through which team members reached the common end of team consciousness. Although teammates often ultimately reached agreement on what constituted appropriate behavior over the course of the season, their personal understandings and justifications for these behaviors were not the same. Team leaders and others who wish to promote the adoption of group unity in multicultural settings can use these lessons to help them develop techniques for motivating individuals with varying value orientations.

The diaries in our study provided an excellent tool for understanding how the subjective experiences of individual team members differed. They provided a narrative in which change could be explained through an understanding of the ecological (team membership), sociocultural (ethnicity), and psychological (personality) contexts in which these writers were embedded. As hypothesized, the individualistic value lens revealed in journal writing was roughly linked to ethnic group membership, exposure to the dominant U.S. culture, and the dynamics of socialization in a biracial family. In contrast, the collectivistic value lens appeared to be more a function of team membership than of ethnic background. Not only does active participation in a local situation (e.g., participating in a team sport in high school) produce value change; so does the dynamic influence of a society's dominant value system. Whichever value lens a player adopted—individualistic or collectivistic—the situation of playing together impelled all players to think more as the season wore on about their responsibilities as team members. We conclude by asserting that the stories told by these young women revealed something about the nature of the implicit value systems they held. Moreover, their value orientations were not static, but dynamic systems influenced by a variety of contextual factors.

This theory of value construction is consistent with the idea that the value systems of individualism and collectivism arose in response to different ecological demands on different cultural groups (Whiting and Whiting 1975; Markus and Kitayama 1991; Triandis 1989). The important point to note, which unfortunately has been ignored in much past research employing the constructs of individualism and collectivism, is that these cultural value systems were not created in the past to be transmitted

anthrosource

intact from generation to generation. They are continually being recreated though a process in which historical roots interact with current ecological circumstances to create specific cultural practices in specific contexts (Greenfield 1994).

Major points that arise from our study are that (1) that players bring different values into the team situation; (2) these are sometimes linked to ethnic background as well as exposure to the dominant culture; (3) there is also an interacting process of forming a team culture. This process, we have found, involves developing a more collectivistic perspective on the part of all team members. Nevertheless, perhaps our most general conclusion is that value systems are not static essences; instead, they are dynamic adaptations to real-world situations.

CLAUDIA KERNAN is currently serving as a clinical intern at NYU Northshore University Hospital; she will receive her Ph.D. in clinical psychology from UCLA in 2006.
PATRICIA GREENFIELD is Professor of Psychology at UCLA and founding Director of the FPR-UCLA Center for Culture, Brain, and Development.

NOTES

Acknowledgments. We are grateful to the Russell Sage Foundation and the Carnegie Corporation of New York for their support of this study. We owe a debt of appreciation to Blanca Quiroz for her many seminal and crucial contributions and to Helen Davis, Lalita Suzuki, Lindsey Engle Richland, Adrienne Isaac, and NanaEfua Baidoo for helping us to plan and carry out the intervention described in this article. Last, but not least, we are grateful for the support of the schools, the coaching staff, and the players who participated.

REFERENCES CITED

Braddock, Jomills Henry, II, Marvin P. Dawkins, and George Wilson
1995 Intercultural Contact and Race Relations among American Youth. *In* Toward a Common Destiny: Improving Race and Ethnic Relations in America. Willis D. Hawley and Anthony W. Jackson, eds. Pp. 237–256. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Brewer, Marilyna B., and S. Schneider
1990 Social Identity and Social Dilemmas: A Double-Edged Sword. *In* Social Identity Theory: Constructive and Critical Advances. D. Abrams and M. Hogg, eds. Pp. 169–184. London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Bruner, Jerome
2001 Self-Making and World-Making. *In* Narrative and Identity: Studies in Autobiography, Self and Culture. Jens Brockmeier and Donal Carbaugh, eds. Pp. 25–37. Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Gaertner, Samuel L., John F. Dovidio, J. A. Nier, C. M. Ward, and B. S. Banker
1999 Across Cultural Divides: The Value of a Superordinate Identity. *In* Cultural Divides: Understanding and Overcoming Group Conflict. D. A. Prentice and D. T. Miller, eds. Pp. 173–212. New York: Russell Sage.

anthrosource

Greenfield, Patricia Marks
N.d. How Can Sports Teams Promote Racial Tolerance and Positive Intergroup Relations? Key Lessons from Recent Research. Submitted for Publication.
1997 Culture as Process: Empirical Methods for Cultural Psychology. *In* Handbook of Cross-Cultural Psychology, vol. 1: Theory and Method, 2nd edition. E. John W. Berry, et al., eds. Pp. xxv, 406. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.
1994 Independence and Interdependence as Developmental Scripts. *In* Cross-Cultural Roots of Minority Child Development. P. M. Greenfield and R. R. Cocking, eds. Pp. 1–37. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
Greenfield, Patricia Marks, Helen Davis, Lalita K. Suzuki, and Ioakim Boutakidis
2002 Understanding Intercultural Relations on Multiethnic High School Sports Teams. *In* Paradoxes of Youth and Sport. M. Gatz, M. A. Messner, and S. Ball-Rokeach, eds. Pp. 141–157. Albany: SUNY Press.
Greenfield, Patricia Marks, Blanca Quiroz, and Catherine Raeff
2000 Cross-Cultural Conflcit and Harmony in the Social Construction of the Child. *In* Variability in the Social Construction of the Child. S. Harkness, C. Raeff, and C. M. Super, eds. Pp. 93–108. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
Greenfield, P. M., and L. Suzuki
1998 Culture and Human Development: Implications for Parenting, Education, Pediatrics, and Mental Health. *In* Handbook of Child Psychology, 5th edition, vol. 4: Child Psychology in Practice. I. E. Sigel and K. A. Renninger, eds. Pp. 1059–1109. New York: Wiley.
Heath, Shirley Brice
1995 Ruling Places: Adaptation in Development by Inner-City Youth. *In* Ethnography and Human Development. R. Jessor, ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Hofstede, Geert
2001[1989] Culture's Consequences, 2nd edition: Comparing Values, Behaviors, Institutions, Organizations across Nations. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
Jackson, James S., Shelley Keiper Keioper, Kendrick T. Brown, Tony N. Brown, and Warde Manuel
2002 Athletic Identiy, Racial Attitudes, and Aggression in First-Year Black and White Intercollegiate Athletes. *In* Paradoxes of Youth and Sport. Margaret Gatz, Michael A. Messner, and Sandera J. Ball-Rokeach, eds. Pp. 159–172. Albany: SUNY Press.
Markus, Hazel Rose, and Shinobu Kitayama
1991 Culture and the Self: Implications for Cognition, Emotion, and Motivation. Psychological Review 98(2):224–253.
Patton, Michael Quinn
2002 Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
Raeff, Catherine
1997 Reply: Maintaining Cultural Coherence in the Midst of Cultural Diversity. Reply to "Culture, Self, and Development: Are Cultural Templates Useful or Stereotypic?" Developmental Review 17(3):250–261.
Raeff, Catherine, Patricia M. Greenfield, and Blanca Quiroz
2000 Conceptualizing Interpersonal Relationships in the Cultural Contexts of Individualism and Collectivism. New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development 87:59–74.
Reed, E., Elliot Turiel, and Terrance Brown
1996 Values and Knowledge. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
Richland, L. E., and Patricia Marks Greenfield
In press Culture and Intergroup Relations: Effects of Team Experience and Targeted Intervention on Adolescent Girls' Cultural Values and Intercultural Understanding.
Shore, Bradd
1996 Culture in Mind. New York: Oxford University Press.

anthrosource

Slavin, Robert E., and N. A. Madden
1979 School Practices That Improve Race Relations. American Educational Research Journal 16(2):169–180.
Suzuki, Lalita K., Helen M. Davis, and Patricia M. Greenfield
N.d. Self-Enhancement and Self-Effacement in Reaction to Praise and Criticism: The Case of Multi-Ethnic Youth. *In* Psychology Meets Anthropology: Jerome Bruner and His Inspiration. Cheryl Mattingly and Nancy Lutkenhaus, eds. New York: Palgrave.
Suzuki, Lalita K., and Patricia Marks Greenfield
2002 The Construction of Everyday Sacrifice in Asian Americans: The Roles of Ethnicity and Acculturation. Cross-cultural research 36:200–228.
Tobin, Joseph J.
1989 Visual Anthropology and Multivocal Ethnography: A Dialogical Approach to Japanese Preschool Class Size. Dialectical Anthropology 13:173–187.
Triandis, Harry C.
1980 Values, Attitudes, and Interpersonal Behavior. *In* Nebraska Symposium on Motivation. M. Page, ed. Pp. 195–259. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
1989 Cross-Cultural Studies of Individualism and Collectivism. *In* Nebraska Symposium on Motivation. H. Howe and M. Page, eds. Pp. 41–133. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

anthrosource