10

CARRIE ROTHSTEIN-FISCH, PATRICIA M. GREENFIELD, ELISE TRUMBULL, HEIDI KELLER, AND BLANCA QUIROZ

Each child in kindergarten is making a book called *All About Me.* The teacher asks each child to say what is special about himself or herself, writing down these comments, with space for the child to draw a picture corresponding to each comment. One boy responds with "my brother is good at soccer and my father is good at cooking." The teacher keeps asking the boy to think about qualities of himself, prompting him: "This is all about you. Are you smart? Yes, of course you are smart, so let's say you are special because you are smart." In the end, the boy's book contained drawings with these sentences "I am special because I am smart. I am special because I am strong. I am special because I am handsome." (Zepeda, Gonzalez-Mena, Rothstein-Fisch, & Trumbull, 2006, p. 19)

The practice of making a book called *All About Me* is a familiar activity in many early childhood classrooms. But there may be more to this activity than what meets the eye. The teacher is likely to be thinking that identifying concepts of self will promote the child's sense of self-esteem and individuality. She may also value the child's burgeoning literacy skills. Yet, the child may be experiencing something very different. He may believe that the teacher does not like his family, and thus she does not like him. Bragging about himself may make him feel very uncomfortable. Ultimately, he may be inclined to think that his values and ideas

—S
—E
—L

269

do not matter, thwarting his concept of self—exactly the opposite of the teacher's goal (Zepeda et al., 2006).

The example of *All About Me* calls attention to classroom practices that, though well-intended, may be at odds with learning, eventually leading to negative feelings about school altogether. The good intentions of the teacher and the compliant but uncomfortable boy are likely to be operating with two conflicting sets of values, each invisible to the other. The teacher's goals are representative of the cultural value of *individualism,* the characteristic value of mainstream United States. In contrast, the boy's discomfort at being isolated from his family is characteristic of the cultural value of *collectivism,* the value system of many immigrant children and families. Individualism and collectivism have emerged as powerful cultural models that tie together cultural conceptions of learning and development, drawing on theory and research in developmental psychology (Greenfield & Bruner, 1966) and anthropology (Whiting & Whiting, 1973). These two idealized developmental pathways emphasize different goals for development and learning. Individualism emphasizes individual identity, independence, self-fulfillment, and standing out. Collectivism emphasizes group identity, interdependence, social responsibility, and fitting in (Greenfield, Keller, Fuligni, & Maynard, 2003).

Each pathway is situated in a broader sociocultural system (Keller, 1997, 2003). The individualistic pathway arises as an adaptation to a complex, urban, wealthy environment featuring a well-developed system of formal education and advanced technology. The collectivistic pathway arises as an adaptation to a small-scale, face-to-face village environment based on a subsistence economy and informal education (Greenfield, Trumbull, et al., 2006). Economic conditions and political persecution tend to incorporate people from the second kind of society into the first (Greenfield, 2009). When this happens, children and their families are exposed to two contrasting and often conflicting socializing forces that are very relevant to the care and education of many immigrant, Native American, Alaska Native, and Native Hawaiian children in the United States as well as the children of immigrant or conquered peoples in other industrialized countries, such as Australia and those of western Europe (Greenfield, Trumbull, et al., 2006). In this chapter, we describe the relevance of the value systems of individualism and collectivism for learning, development, and education. The articulation of these two value systems led to research demonstrating that the home culture of collectivistic children often opposes the individualistic culture of schools (Greenfield, Raeff, & Quiroz, 2000; Raeff, Greenfield, & Quiroz, 2000).

S___
E___
L___

This situation creates the need for educational intervention. The Bridging Cultures Project®, described in the second part of this chapter, is just such an intervention. It was designed to alleviate the cross-cultural value conflict experienced by most immigrant families from Mexico and Central America when they send their children to school in the United States.

On the whole, individualism emphasizes individual success, and collectivism emphasizes the success of the group as a whole (Greenfield, Trumbull, et al., 2006). In individualistic cultures, when asked to describe themselves, people tend to list trait labels referring to aspects of their personalities, such as "hard-working," "intelligent," or "athletic" (Triandis, Brislin, & Hui, 1988), as the teacher in the example above expected. In collectivistic cultures, people are more likely to embed their own personal goals with those of the group, such as their extended family or religious group (Brislin, 1993) and to think of themselves as defined by their connections to others (Markus & Kitayama, 1991). This is more or less what the boy in the opening example was doing when he tried to talk about other members of his family rather than about himself. Not surprisingly, the United States, according to some measures, is the most individualistic country in the world (Hofstede, 2001). However, this developmental pathway is hardly universal—in the 1980s, some 70% of the world's cultures could be described as collectivistic (Triandis, 1989). While increased wealth, urbanization, technology, and formal education have driven cultures and individuals around the world in an individualistic direction since the 1980s (Greenfield, 2009), major cross-cultural differences still exist.

ETHNOTHEORIES AND DEVELOPMENTAL PATHWAYS: AN EXPLANATION FOR CULTURAL VALUES AND SOCIALIZATION PRACTICES

An ethnotheory of development is an implied notion of the ideal child, accompanied by beliefs about socialization practices that will produce this ideal (Goodnow 1988; McGillicuddy-De Lisi & Sigel, 1995). Though psychologists hypothesize, test, and report the *explicit* aspects of child development, parents and teachers (and most everyone else) use *implicit* conceptions based on cultural values that are shared and negotiated among members of cultural communities. Research on ethnotheories has uncovered individualism and collectivism (also referred to as

___S
___E
___L

independence and *interdependence*) as core dimensions, applicable to many developmental domain (Chao, 1994; Guiterrez & Sameroff, 1990; Yovsi & Keller, 2003). Participants from nonwestern cultural communities, such as Chinese (Chao, 1994), Japanese (Rothbaum, Weisz, Pott, Miyake, & Morelli, 2000), Indian (Saraswathi, 1999; Keller, Voelker, Yovsi, & Shastri, 2005), West African (Ogunnnaike & Houser, 2002, for Nigeria & Nsamenang, 1992; Yovsi, 2001; and Keller et al., 2004, for Cameroon), or Puerto Rican (Harwood, Schoelmerich, Ventura-Cook, Schulze, & Wilson, 1996)—among many others—hold parental ethnotheories that express the cultural ideal of collectivism (Greenfield, Trumbull, et al., 2006). These ethnotheories stress social goals related to loyalty to family, respect for elders, politeness, and responsibility for social and cognitive domains (Harwood, 1992). In Western industrialized cultural groups, such as Germans (Keller et al., 2005), European Americans (Harwood et al., 1996) or the Dutch (Harkness, Super, & van Tijn, 2000), parental ethnotheories express the cultural ideal of individualism. These ethnotheories stress individual achievement and independence, along with creativity, curiosity, and assertiveness (Greenfield, Trumbull, et al., 2006).

Socialization practices based on a particular ethnotheory of development begin at birth or even before. For example, in European American culture, expectant parents often prepare a nursery—the baby's own room—to set the stage for the development of the child's independence. This is in contrast to collectivistic cultures that utilize a family bed, where the baby sleeps with the parents.

But ethnicity or national origin alone is not sufficient to predict a person's ethnotheory. As mentioned earlier, influences such as higher socioeconomic status and formal education are associated with a more individualistic orientation (Keller, 2007; Palacios & Moreno, 1996; Tapia Uribe, LeVine & LeVine, 1994). Yet despite these external influences, historical and implicit cultural values persist in identifiable ways across various socioeconomic and educational backgrounds (Keller et al, 2005; Harwood et al., 1996). Ultimately, developmental pathways refer to *relative* group differences. In addition to differences between groups, there are individual differences within every group, especially in complex modern societies. These between- and within-group differences are a matter of emphasis; no one person in a modern society is either completely individualistic or collectivistic.

Table 10.1 describes some major differences between the individualistic and collectivistic pathway of learning and development revealed by

S___
E___
L___

research (Greenfield, Trumbull, et al., 2006). We have selected features of each pathway that are most relevant to formal education. These pathways appear and function in ways that differentially value intelligence and knowledge. For example, in more individualistic cultures, cognitive, academic, and scientific knowledge is highly valued, particularly the accumulation of factual knowledge. Independence is demonstrated in school when children work alone, show what they know through speaking out and expressing themselves, and expect praise or other tangible rewards for doing so. Incidentally, the importance of praise and rewards also applies to informal education at home—for example, household chores—as well as to school-based activities. In parallel fashion, the material world is also conceptualized in relation to the individual. Children have individual toys and spaces; sharing takes place by permission of the owner rather than simply being assumed.

Table 10.1

CONTRASTING CULTURAL PATHWAYS OF LEARNING AND DEVELOPMENT

DOMAIN	INDIVIDUALISTIC PATHWAY	COLLECTIVISTIC/ SOCIOCENTRIC PATHWAY
Ethnotheory	Independence, individual success	Interdependence, group/ family success
Valued intelligence	Cognitive/academic/ scientific	Social/relational
Valued knowledge	Physical world, factual knowledge	Social world, narrative knowledge
Models of learning	Independent, active participation, praise	Working in groups, observation, criticism
Communication	Speaking, self-expression	Comprehending, speech that is respectful to authority
Material world	Personal ownership, sharing by choice	Shared use, responsibility to share

Adapted from "Cultural Conceptions of Learning and Development," by P. M. Greenfield, E. Trumbull, H. Keller, C. Rothstein-Fisch, L. Suzuki, & B. Quiroz, 2006. In P. Alexander & P. H. Winne (Eds.), *Handbook of Educational Psychology* (2nd ed., pp. 675–692). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

___S
___E
___L

In contrast, collectivistic cultures value social intelligence as it relates to people, not facts or things: It is situated in a social world where knowledge about people's experiences is highly valued. Children are socialized to become interdependent with others. They work together to help and share with other members of the group, instead of being showcased for their individual achievement (Rothstein-Fisch & Trumbull, 2008). Praise may also make them feel singled out and uncomfortable rather than make them feel good about themselves (Greenfield, Quiroz, & Raeff, 2000).

FROM THEORY TO RESEARCH: APPLYING THE TWO CULTURAL PATHWAYS OF DEVELOPMENT TO FORMAL EDUCATION

Two empirical studies document cross-cultural value conflict between the cultural pathway of development assumed by Latino immigrant families and that taken for granted by the schools. In both studies, immigrant parents demonstrated a much stronger collectivistic orientation to child socialization than their children's teachers (Greenfield et al., 2000; Raeff, et al., 2000). For example, Greenfield and colleagues (2000) found that immigrant Latino parents of third and fourth-grade students and their European American teacher were often confused by each other's comments during naturally occurring parent–teacher conferences. Most conversations between the parents and the teacher did *not* confirm or elaborate a common theme—a phenomenon referred to as "noncooperative discourse." Instead, there were frequent instances where parents and teachers seemed to completely miss what the other was trying to say. More important, the implicit values related to expectations for learning, development, and behavior that underpinned each participant's approach to the topics under discussion seemed to be unknown to the other. These differences between the teacher's values and those of the parents coalesced into five major themes. In each case, the teacher's orientation (listed first) represented individualistic values whereas the Latino immigrant parents' orientation (cited second) reflected collectivistic values. These differences included (a) individual versus family accomplishment; (b) praise versus criticism; (c) cognitive versus social skills; (d) oral expression versus respectful communication with authority; and (e) parents' role in teaching the child versus the parents' role in socializing the child. Overall, this study demonstrated that cultural val-

S___
E___
L___

ues and the behaviors that emanate from them were not shared between the parents' and their child's teacher.

In the second study, fifth-grade children, their parents, and their teachers were given social dilemmas based on the real-world experience of immigrant Latino families in Los Angeles (Raeff et al., 2000). These dilemmas were likely to be resolved in either an individualistic or collectivistic manner. In the School One sample, the children and parents were all European American; the teachers were predominantly European American. In this setting, the scenarios were solved by children, parents, and teachers in a predominantly individualistic manner. This was not the case with School Two, where all of the families were Latino immigrants; again the teachers were predominantly European American. Data from responses to several scenarios showed that the Latino parents were more concerned about their children's sharing and helping, while the teachers expressed a greater orientation toward task completion (get the job done), individual choice (the student can chose to help or not help), and personal property (maintaining personal ownership versus sharing).The data from this study demonstrate that, as in the study of parent-teacher conferences, children are pulled in two directions: having to make choices about their behavior that either coincide with the expectations of their families or that align with those of their teachers.

Note that in both schools there was a minority of teachers who were not European American (including two Latino teachers in each school). However, a subsequent study (described in more detail below) confirmed that teachers generally give individualistic responses no matter what their ethnic background (Trumbull, Rothstein-Fisch, Greenfield, & Quiroz, 2001). Our conclusion concerning teachers' values is that formal education and, especially, teacher training exert a strong pull toward individualistic values. Indeed, the average educational level of the Latino immigrant parents was fifth grade, obviously a much lower level of formal education than that possessed by Latino teachers in the two schools (Trumbull et al., 2001). In contrast, the European American parents had, on the average, completed 4 years of postsecondary education, very comparable to the educational level that would be expected of teachers. The role of formal education as an individualizing influence was confirmed by a later study comparing the ethnotheories of Latino immigrant nannies and their employers in Los Angeles. There, it was very clear that formal education trumped ethnicity or national origin as a primary influencing factor on cultural beliefs and practices relating to early care and informal education (Greenfield,

—S
—E
—L

Flores, Davis, & Salimkhan, 2008). Thus, as the level of formal education increases around the world, we can expect increasing individualism in parental ethnotheories (Greenfield, 2009).

FROM RESEARCH TO INTERVENTION: THE *BRIDGING CULTURES PROJECT*

Based on ethnographic observation, the study of parent–teacher conferences, and the scenario study, four researchers (Patricia M. Greenfield, Blanca Quiroz, Carrie Rothstein-Fisch, and Elise Trumbull) posed the question: How might knowledge of the cultural pathways of individualism and collectivism impact teachers' ability to work with students and families with a collectivistic values system? Because our research was based on Latino immigrant families and their school experience, we selected schools serving predominantly Latino immigrant students and families as the target of our intervention. We reasoned that teachers with large numbers of immigrant Latino students might be best situated to see overt cultural differences between the collectivistic immigrant Latino families and the individualistic orientation of schools. Therefore, we recruited seven bilingual (Spanish-English) elementary school teachers from the greater Los Angeles area (see Trumbull, Diaz-Meza, Hasan, & Rothstein-Fisch, 2000). Four of the teachers were Latino and three were European American; six were female, one was male; all grade levels of elementary school were represented, kindergarten through fifth grade. Teachers' years of teaching experience ranged from 5 to 21 years (average 12.7 years).

Methods of the *Bridging Cultures Project*

The seven teachers and four researchers participated in three half-day workshops approximately one month apart. In the first workshop, the teachers completed a pretest using the same individualism–collectivism dilemmas described above (Raeff et al., 2000). The teachers responded with a strongly (86%) individualistic perspective (Trumbull et al., 2001). In the debriefing, the teachers were stunned to learn two things. First, they found out that Latino parents solved the dilemmas differently from the largely European American teachers. Second, the Latino teachers were particularly surprised to see how individualistic they had become: Their responses seemed to align much more with the mainstream values

of individualism, at least on the surface, than with the collectivistic values of the students and families (and in most cases their own home culture). As they told us later, they attributed this shift to their own schooling process where the school way was right and the family way was wrong, causing untold confusion and stress. These Latino teachers had sensed the tension but never understood it or given it a name up to that point.

The remainder of the first workshop consisted of more examples of cross-cultural conflict, including those regarding individual versus shared class materials (Quiroz & Greenfield, 1996) and what counts as "valued" knowledge in the classroom (Greenfield, Raeff, & Quiroz, 1996). Between the first and second workshops, teachers were asked to observe examples of individualism and collectivism in their classrooms and school. They returned a month later for the second workshop with many examples highlighting the implicit values of the school. In the workshop, the researchers clarified and elaborated on the teachers' observations. At the end of the second workshop, the teachers were asked to make a change in their classroom practice with the goal of reducing a conflict between individualistic and collectivistic practices. One month later, the teachers came back to the group meeting abuzz. They reported that they had made changes in classroom management and in their relations with families. This marked the beginning of a process through which recognition of the individualism–collectivism pathways could generate new classroom practices to facilitate learning. It is an important feature of the Bridging Cultures teacher development process that the researcher/trainers provide the theoretical paradigm and supporting data, but the changes in practices come from the teachers themselves (Rothstein-Fisch & Trumbull, 2008).

At the end of the third workshop, teachers took a posttest drawn from the same set of dilemmas as the pretest (Raeff et al., 2000). The posttest revealed that the teachers had made a significant shift in thinking about how to resolve home and school conflict: Collectivistic responses increased from 14% to 57%, while individualistic responses dropped from 86% to 21%. Likewise, 21% of the responses in the posttest combined individualistic and collectivistic elements. In addition to representing many more collectivistic responses, teachers' solutions were much better distributed between the two value systems. The teachers initiated the idea and unanimously agreed to continue meeting (as was our hope), with one teacher's comment speaking for the whole: "Meeting three times sets the fire, but nothing's been cooked yet. The risks are that people will go back and close the door on their class-

rooms. We should keep this core group alive" (Trumbull, Diaz-Meza, Hasan, & Rothstein-Fisch, 2000, p. 13). Over the next 5 years, the researchers met with the teachers every 2 or 3 months. The meetings always included at least one meal because we valued the social as well as the intellectual components of the relationships within the group. In this way, we were modeling the integration of social and the cognitive values that was necessary to bridge the two cultural paradigms (see Table 10.1).

In addition to the whole-group meetings, we gathered information through classroom observations of the seven teachers at least twice, including a debriefing after each visit. We also conducted detailed interviews with all seven teachers, gathering insights into their teaching innovations, the effects of their innovations on students' learning, and reflections on their own teaching practices. These methods (direct classroom observations; lengthy, reflective individual interviews; and meetings of the researchers and teachers) yielded an extensive body of data for all seven teachers.

Teachers as Researchers

Almost immediately, the teachers became teacher–researchers themselves. They experimented with new ways of using their knowledge of individualism and collectivism to modify and adapt their practices. During group meetings they reported their experiences for others, thus keeping their own thinking fresh and helping others to learn from their experiences. We believe that teacher research is an important and unique source of knowledge about teaching and learning (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1999; Dinkelman, 1997). It follows that artificial boundaries between the practice of teaching and research on teaching need to be challenged. Much can be gained from collaborations between researchers, educational psychologists, professional development specialists, and classroom teachers.

The Bridging Cultures teachers proved to be important partners in the dissemination process. Our seven teachers have disseminated locally (in their schools and at the district level), regionally, and nationally, as have the researchers. The teachers have also contributed to the broader educational community through collaborative publications with the researchers (cf. Quiroz, Greenfield, & Altchech, 1998, 1999; Rothstein-Fisch, Trumbull, Isaac, Daley, & Pérez, 2003; Trumbull, Rothstein-Fisch, & Hernandez, 2003).

S___
E___
L___

Ethnography: A Useful Method for Understanding Families

Another aspect of teacher research that was part of the Bridging Cultures professional development process was the use of ethnography, a technique from anthropology that is often defined as participant observation (Trumbull et al., 2001). We encouraged teachers to get to know their students' parents and to learn more about their backgrounds—including how much access parents had had to formal education in their home countries. The teachers learned that most of their students' parents had little opportunity to go beyond sixth grade in Mexico or Central America, and this limited formal education then became a barrier to helping their children with homework and the development of academic skills. Individual family differences—as a function of acculturation level, economic level, and educational level—were revealed through ethnography; while the individualism–collectivism paradigm provided a framework through which the developmental goals that motivated observed differences could be understood.

FROM INTERVENTION TO INNOVATION: HOW BRIDGING CULTURES CHANGED CLASSROOM PRACTICES

The teachers' experimentation in their own classrooms and schools has shown the framework of individualism and collectivism to be more generative than we ever dreamed possible, resulting in vast numbers of innovations to support student learning. We have identified many of these classroom practices elsewhere (e.g., Rothstein-Fisch, 2003; Rothstein-Fisch & Trumbull, 2008; Trumbull et al., 2003). The innovations highlighted in this chapter pertain to math, language arts, science, classroom management, and relations with parents.

Utilizing Group Motivation to Achieve Learning in Mathematics

During one classroom visit, one of the core Bridging Cultures researchers noticed an interesting classroom chart. It was a graph displaying children's names and corresponding stars next to each name indicating the level of memorized multiplication facts they had mastered. This seemed

___S
___E
___L

like a curiously individualistic motivational tool for children of migrant farm workers. When asked about the star chart during the observation debriefing interview, the teacher explained that the students were doing poorly in learning timed multiplication facts. She was having difficulty motivating the students, and she fell back on the star chart idea she had learned during teacher training. At the time she introduced the star chart, she conducted a class meeting that allowed her to share her concern for students' lack of math progress. She gave the students an opportunity to look at the chart and talk about it. The teacher reports,

> The students said, "Wouldn't it be neat if it would be a solid block of stars, and the whole chart was filled in," and everybody said "Yeah, yeah, that would be so neat." The students started to say they wanted to help each other. Everyone who needed help got adopted by students who had already mastered [the work]. They started helping each other pass, and they seemed to move ahead. The [more advanced] buddies put their own learning on hold in order to help their [less advanced] buddies, not for individual success, but for the success of the group. (Rothstein-Fisch et al., 2003, p. 132)

Thus the children were motivated to help each other study timed math facts (so that the whole group could achieve proficiency) much more than to work on increasing their own individual accumulation of stars, indicating their individual competence (Rothstein-Fisch & Trumbull, 2008).

Their motivation was rooted in the value of group success rather than in objects or individual awards. Incidentally, when a student was ready to be tested by the teacher at the back of the room, the teacher allowed the buddy to observe, not to provide answers but just to show support and provide encouragement. If the student was not successful, the buddy knew where to help out during the next study session. If the student was successful, the buddy would ring a special bell. This signaled to the entire class that another star had been added to "their" chart, and the children all stopped their work to applaud the individual's contribution to the group's success.

We observed this process several times in the classroom: the bell ringing to mark a shared success never seemed to interrupt the classroom but rather it alerted the class to the progress being made for the collective good. According to the teacher "In third grade, they only have to go up to the 5s [tables], but many went to the 12s! All got to

S___
E___
L___

the 6s . . . they went beyond the requirement (Rothstein-Fisch et al., 2003, p. 133).

This example highlights how students were motivated to work for the good of the group rather than for their own individual success. Moreover, it appears that they had never conceptualized the star chart as meaning-ful as an individual enterprise in the first place. Filling in the chart with stars made sense to them only when they understood it as something for the whole group to achieve. But without an understanding of collectiv-ism (or, as the teacher in this example likes to say, "the power of the group"), the teacher would have been unlikely to allow the students to construct their own meaning of the chart. Likewise, it is highly improb-able that the students could have accomplished so much math success on their own. Most important, this example demonstrates that academic goals can be achieved (or in this case exceeded) if children's home cul-tures are understood and treated as sources of learning strengths.

Another example of honoring the children's collectivistic home cul-ture in the service of mathematics learning occurred in an activity de-signed to teach the meaning of the concept 1,000. In one class, children were organized into table groups of four, each responsible for collecting 1,000 of the same kind of object of their own choosing. Children volun-teered to help not only their own group but all the groups, saying things like, "I can bring in pennies to help Table 3"; "I can bring in rocks"; "I can bring in plastic bags." When the teacher asked them what they were going to do next, the third-grade children said, "Get our stuff out, help each other, and count" (Rothstein-Fisch & Trumbull, 2008, p. 134).

In mainstream classrooms, it is likely that teachers would set up col-lections by individual students or perhaps teams of four children, but these might be established as a competition—to see which person or table could get 1,000 objects collected first. This kind of teacher might be reasoning that an individual prize would be motivating for the stu-dents. However, in the case of these immigrant Latino children, it ap-peared that the "helping of others" was the true incentive. Teachers who think that they need to provide rewards for success in a competition may be undermining students' collaborative goal, a goal that ultimately helps children from more collectivistic home backgrounds to learn. Whereas a teacher might think that offering an incentive would speed up the col-lection of items and thus the opportunity to learn about the concept of 1,000, just the opposite is likely to be true for children raised with a more collectivistic value system. Because all the children helped their classmates as a whole, everyone's learning was likely to be enhanced.

—S
—E
—L

This point is evidenced in the children's discussion of their collection and counting processes:

> The groups reported on how many objects they had gathered and how many more they needed. They also described the method they used to count their objects. This activity led other students to know how many more pennies, rocks or nails to gather (identifying which group needed the most help), while allowing the children to see the many different ways that objects could be grouped. Discussion centered on why certain objects were easier to count in larger or smaller groups, making explicit the strategies behind the choices the children had made. (Rothstein-Fisch & Trumbull, 2008, p. 134)

Cultural Knowledge Facilitates Learning in Language Arts and Science

Bridging Cultures teachers were also successful in promoting language development, which was particularly important because many of their students were English learners. Frequent use of choral reading activities allowed students to practice their burgeoning English skills without fear of error because their voices could blend in with the group (Rothstein-Fisch & Trumbull, 2008). Oral language development is an important academic goal. However, children from collectivistic families are generally socialized by their parents to show respect by listening and not speaking up. The teachers reported that their students seemed uncomfortable even when discussing an object brought from home on sharing day. To mitigate students' discomfort, teachers allowed students to come to the front of the room in small groups of four to discuss their special object. Thus, meeting the individualistic goal of learning to "speak out" was facilitated by the teacher's application of her knowledge that group support, at least initially, would help students.

Another aspect of promoting language development centered around the children's need to tell stories; narratives, especially narratives involving family, are a valued form of discourse in Latino immigrant culture. The value placed on narrative discourse contrasts with the almost exclusively cognitive or academic discourse emphasized in school—often presented in the form of decontextualized facts, skills instruction, or topic-restricted discussions (see Gee, 1989; Heath, 1983; and Michaels, 1981, for discussions of different narrative styles). All seven teachers

S___
E___
L___

found ways to incorporate children's stories into their instruction. In one classroom, children shared stories with seat mates as a way of tapping prior knowledge about a particular topic before the teacher presented the lesson in math, science, or social studies. In this way, everyone had a chance to share a story, but it required only a fraction of the class time compared to what would be required if everyone in the whole class took a turn. As the stories were being told to seat mates, the teacher circulated around to hear snippets of each story allowing him to adapt the transition to "academic" knowledge in his lesson by pointing out a few key points from various stories.

In one fourth-grade classroom, the children seemed particularly eager to discuss their grandmothers, many of whom still lived in Mexico or El Salvador. To honor their interest and to facilitate language development, the teacher helped the children to craft a series of questions they could all answer in describing their grandmothers: where their grandmother lived, how old she was, what foods she liked to cook, what they liked to do with their grandmother, and how much they loved their grandmother. These papers were drafted, edited, and prominently displayed on the classroom bulletin board. In this way, children's identified interests were tapped; they learned how to write and edit a descriptive paragraph; and their work was shared for everyone to read (Rothstein-Fisch & Trumbull, 2008).

Another example illustrates how students are able to connect their narrative knowledge with scientific knowledge. The children in fifth grade were studying the wetland habitat and preparing for a field trip to see it up close. A docent from the Audubon Society was visiting the classroom to help the children learn more about the birds of the wetlands, and he asked the children what they knew about birds. The students responded with stories about their family experiences, including trips to the park or beach. After a few family stories, the frustrated visitor screeched: "No more stories!" and the children's voices fell silent.

After the docent left, the teacher knew exactly what she wanted to do. Based on a discussion from a Bridging Cultures group meeting, the teacher recalled the "egg" example wherein the teacher asked the children "what eggs look like when they are cracked." One child tried several times to tell about a time she had cooked and eaten eggs with her grandmother, but the child was overlooked in favor of a child who described eggs as white and yellow (Greenfield et al., 1996). With the egg example in mind, the Bridging Cultures teacher drew a large

—S
—E
—L

"T" chart on the board. She began with the key phrases from the children's stories on the left side of the chart. One student commented that, while she was in the garden with her grandmother, she noticed a hummingbird flying yet staying in one place. This observation produced a fascinating discussion and led to the facts, placed in the right-hand column, that hummingbirds can "hover" and fly in any direction. To fly in one place (i.e., hover) required the hummingbird's wings to beat very rapidly, demanding large amounts of energy. How do the hummingbirds sustain this kind of energy? The children reasoned that hummingbirds must have to eat frequently and the topic of metabolic rates ensued (Rothstein-Fisch, 2003). Because the learning was embedded in the social world of a classmate, it was likely to increase students' interest in the subject and, arguably, to improve learning (Alexander & Jetton, 2003).

Classroom Management

Changes in classroom management seemed to be affected early on and most dramatically. Like approaches to learning, approaches to classroom management are culturally situated. The cultures of the school, teacher, and the students are all systems at work affecting every kind of classroom management issue, from establishing classroom rules (Rothstein-Fisch & Trumbull, 2008) to deciding what constitutes helping versus cheating (Rothstein-Fisch et al., 2003). In some cases, lengthy classroom rules were shortened to emphasizethe overarching goal of "respecting others." The value of respect (*respeto)* has rich meaning for children from Latino immigrant families: Respecting others is central to their socialization (Valdés, 1996). Thus when these children list "respect others" in their classroom rules, the phrase is likely to conjure up a wide range of appropriate behaviors, such as listening to the teacher, complying with the teacher's requests, sharing materials, and not offending another person's sense of dignity.

Room arrangement and the physical aspects of the classroom also reflected a collectivistic perspective in the Bridging Cultures classrooms. In the lower elementary grades, children sat very close to each other during rug time, not on individual carpet squares as is often the case in classroom practice. The children were observed touching each other's hair or shoes in a completely nondisruptive way, much as they might do in their homes with siblings or cousins. Because the teachers now understood this to be natural they did not have to take away from lesson time to say, "Keep your hands to yourself," instead they let the children

S___
E___
L___

behave as they would naturally—allowing them to stay focused rather than separated and perhaps less comfortable (Rothstein-Fisch & Trumbull, 2008).

Changed Practices With Families

In the United States, the No-Child-Left-Behind legislation indicates that "parents are seen as the child's first and most important teachers, and for children to be successful in school, parents and families need to be actively involved in their children's learning" (U.S. Department of Education, 2007). However, as the study of parent–teacher conferences demonstrated, there was genuine disconnection (in 21 of the 22 times this topic came up) between what the parents thought their role was and what the teacher thought they should do (Greenfield et al., 2000). According to the researchers, "Although the parents did not want to teach at home, they did want to maintain their jurisdiction as socializing agents at home" (p. 105).

Understanding that parents might not be able or inclined to "teach" their children at home, one teacher allowed children to practice and discuss homework in small groups without writing anything down (Rothstein-Fisch & Trumbull, 2008). The children were observed to discuss the homework questions (in this case about a story from their language arts textbook) and decide what would be the best answer for each question. This allowed the children more time to think about and reflect on what they had read, discuss the questions in the group, and essentially practice the homework, thereby making it far easier to complete the homework without any assistance at home.

Bridging Cultures teachers almost immediately initiated changes in how they communicated with and supported families (Trumbull et al., 2003). One teacher divided her students' families into three groups: two for Spanish-speaking parents and one for English-speaking parents. According to the teacher,

> a warm feeling came across during the conferencing. Many parents had questions that benefited the others. . . The group conferencing was relaxing for the parents. It was a less threatening environment than the individual style; parents supplied support and were company for one another. This format provided a group voice for the parents rather an individual voice. After one hour, parents could sign up for a private conference or ask a few questions privately. (Quiroz et al., 1999, p. 69)

——S
———E
——L

As a result of this teacher's success, her principal asked her to conduct a workshop at her school to encourage other teachers to try the group conference approach. Other teachers have picked up on this practice and continue to experiment and adapt it to their own settings.

In another case, one teacher decided she would try to increase the number of her parent volunteers. Although the teacher is Latina and her first language is Spanish, she reports,

> Both the parents and I had difficulty approaching each other for help. Most parents had little formal education and probably did not know they could actually assist in the classroom: only a few had attended junior high or high school. I had to conduct my own informal ethnographic research about my families and began to build relationships with parents in the process. . . . Although I was now averaging five parent volunteers a week, I still felt like there was something missing. Many parents would stay but were uncomfortable [interrupting me] while I was teaching a lesson and ask what they could do. (Trumbull et al., 2001, pp. 85–86)

To support parents, the teacher compiled a notebook with a paragraph describing why parental help would be so useful in the class. She also described an array of different ways parents could help in the classroom, from cutting out materials to help with reading. Younger siblings also were welcome in the class because this would allow more parents to participate while providing younger children with some exposure to elementary school.

We observed the parent volunteers in action during our visits to her classroom, each checking in and out via the parent notebook. On one day, there were four parent volunteers. One was helping a group of children read, while another was watching and learning from that parent how to support this kind of learning. In this way, the teacher set up a scaffold for classroom volunteers: The more experienced volunteers showed the newer ones how to use materials and support student learning. This arrangement had multiple benefits. First, because of the volunteers, the children were getting more help (not incidentally, something the parents were likely to value greatly, both in being the person able to help and in knowing the children were getting assistance). Second, parents otherwise unfamiliar with the U.S. system of education gained an intimate, up-close view of how a classroom was set up and organized; they also became familiar with the teacher's expectations for learning. Third, because the younger siblings were also included in the group—with the

S___
E___
L___

kindergarten, first-, and second-grade students—they too were able to preview what school would be like for them while at the same being able to participate as part of the family group. Ultimately, the teacher more than doubled her volunteers from 5 to 12, 10 of whom put in over 100 hours during the school year (Trumbull et al., 2003).

BEYOND THE ORIGINAL BRIDGING CULTURES TEACHERS

The Bridging Cultures paradigm, based on the concepts of individualism and collectivism, has been applied to other educational audiences beyond the seven original teachers. Our team has carried out professional development with preservice teachers (Rothstein-Fisch, 2003) and early childhood educators (Zepeda et al., 2006), with participants indicating that they found the framework applicable to their work with typical and special needs populations (Rothstein-Fisch, 2006, 2007a,b,c). School counselors have also found the framework useful (Geary, 2001; Roman, 2003). Current research is underway to explore the impact of the individualism-collectivism framework on students studying elementary, secondary, and special education; educational psychology and counseling; and educational leadership and policy studies at California State University, Northridge.

The innovations developed by teachers are seemingly endless. Teachers can apply the framework of individualism and collectivism in ways that make sense in their classrooms and schools and with which they are comfortable. Not all innovations have been equally valuable or successful. One linchpin to the success of innovations we describe is the support of school administrators. As teachers create new classroom practices, principals and coworkers (such as paraprofessionals and school specialists) need to support these efforts and not impose unnecessary obstacles. For instance, it was important that the principal allow younger siblings in the classroom in the parent-volunteer example described earlier.

There is no recommended ratio of individualism to collectivism in the classroom, although most of the innovations have, quite naturally, been in the direction of making uniformly individualistic classrooms more collectivistic. However, it is equally important to note that the Bridging Cultures teachers have not rejected individualism; they are just more mindful of when individualistic practices support learning and when they hinder it. From the beginning, they were very aware that eventually their students would have to learn how to succeed in

—S
—E
—L

an individualistic educational world. For them, the bridge to individualism was as important as the introduction of more collectivistic practices. Ultimately, because it affords a deeper understanding of culture, the Bridging Cultures framework has allowed teachers to become creative and mindful problem solvers as they try to support learning in ways that do not undercut their students' home values.

It is important to note that our method is nonprescriptive. We provided the paradigm and the teachers used the paradigm to generate their own ideas varying greatly not only from teacher to teacher but also from setting to setting. When the teacher whose parent volunteer activities were described above moved from one school to another, she found that the new social context demanded new strategies for parent involvement. Thus, innovations can be taken up at one time with one group of students and families and jettisoned for another strategy as appropriate with a new group of students and families.

Reasons for Optimism

The outcomes of the Bridging Cultures Project are causes for optimism. Some of the most striking effects have to do with (a) the perspective teachers have gained on their own culture, their students' home culture, and school culture; (b) the degree to which this new perspective has begun to influence their thinking and their practice in ways that reduce conflicts between home and school culture; and (c) the increased confidence teachers have in their own abilities to build the kinds of relationships with families that will support student success in school and family unity at home.

Note that it is highly unusual for professional development efforts to have a documented long-term impact on teacher practice beyond the training itself. We have documented an enduring transformation in the Bridging Cultures teachers in their ability to reach their students and work with families successfully. These teachers know how to learn from their students' families, and they have new ways of understanding what parents are sharing with them. We believe that the project has been successful for the following reasons:

- It uses a theory- and research-based framework to guide practical and applied experimentation with new educational methods.
- The theoretical framework is economical—that is, it has only two organizing concepts, individualism and collectivism. This sim-

plicity makes it accessible. Yet it is simple without being simple-minded or simplistic. Because it is accessible, teachers can use it immediately to guide their work, rather than thinking that culture is entirely too complex and thereby throwing up their hands as if to say "there are so many cultures, I have to just treat each student as an individual." When this happens, educators have essentially defaulted to the mainstream value of individualism and, as a result, have eliminated the role of culture altogether.

■ The individualism–collectivism framework has been productively applied to some of the most important and difficult aspects of teachers work, including classroom management, subject matter instruction, assessment, and parent-school relations

■ Longitudinal professional development offers teachers opportunities to share and analyze practice over an extended period of time, valuing their knowledge and experience as a group. One cannot know to what degree shorter-term professional development activities would have affected teacher practice and student learning.

■ The Bridging Cultures Project included meetings that incorporated both rigorous intellectual work and enjoyable interpersonal activities such as sharing meals, humor, and personal celebrations. This format provided an opportunity (not available in shorter-term interventions) to integrate the intellectual with the social, thus enacting a bridge between the two cultures in the professional development activities themselves.

In the final analysis, teachers recognize that neither value system is all good or all bad. One teacher said, "I think that it is a good point to bring out about culture . . . that . . . we're not saying collectivism is right and individualism is wrong. We're just saying to recognize it. It's different" (Greenfield, Trumbull, et al., 2006, p. 686).

CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Culture is not simply a variable to consider in describing learners: It is at the core of decisions made by teachers, parents, school officials, and administrators. As systems of values and beliefs, ethnotheories drive learning, socialization, and development (Greenfield, Suzuki, & Rothstein-Fisch, 2006). The framework of individualism and collectivism allows teachers

___S
___E
___L

to understand the values and practices of families that do not share the school's cultural assumptions. It has proven to be a helpful way to begin to rethink formal education in a multicultural context.

AuQ1

Thus far, we have explored the use of intensive qualitative longitudinal methods to document and assess the impact on teachers. We have also begun to explore the impact on parents (Esau, Greenfield, Daley, Robles, & Tynes, in preparation). The next step is to explore the impact on students more explicitly, beyond what teachers have reported informally. An important future direction for research would be a longitudinal intervention in which children from immigrant Latino families in one school are exposed to the Bridging Cultures approach for a period of years, from kindergarten through secondary education, while children from similar backgrounds in another comparable school are not. Academic outcomes, degree of comfort in the school climate, and family-school relationships would ideally all be compared across the two groups. This type of extended intervention and controlled research design have great potential to confirm and extend our qualitative findings. We hypothesize that this type of research will demonstrate that the Bridging Cultures approach reduces the conflict children feel between home values and school values, enhances their motivation to learn, and enables them to function harmoniously at home while achieving academically at school.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

S___
E___
L___

REFERENCES

Alexander, P. A., & Jetton, T. L. (2003). Learning from traditional and alternative texts: New conceptualizations for the information age. In A. L. Graesser, M. A. Gernsbacher, & S. R. Goldman (Eds.), *Handbook of discourse processes* (pp. 199–242). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Brislin, R. (1993). Understanding culture's influence on behavior. Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace.

Chao, R. K. (1994). Beyond parental control and authoritarian parenting style: Understanding Chinese parenting through the cultural notion of training. *Child Development, 65,*111–119.

Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S. L. (1999). The teacher research movement: A decade later. *Educational Researcher, 28*(11), 15–25.

Dinkelman, T. (1997). The promise of action research for critically reflective teacher education. *Teacher Educator, 32*(4), 250–274.

Esau, P., Greenfield, P.M., Daley, C., Robles, F., & Tynes, B. (0000). Developing cross-cultural harmony in schools serving Latino immigrant families in Los Angeles: Bridging Cultures parent workshops. In G. Marsico, K, Komatsu, & Iannaccone, A., *Crossing boundaries: Intercontextual dynamics between family and school.* Manuscript in preparation.

Geary, P. (2001) *Bridging cultures with middle school counselors.* Unpublished master's thesis. California State University, Northridge.

Gee, J. P. (1989). Two styles of narrative construction and their linguistic and educational implications. *Discourse Processes, 12,* 287–307.

Goodnow, J. J. (1988). Parents' ideas, actions, and feelings: models and methods from developmental and social psychology. *Child Development, 59*(2), 286–320

Greenfield, P. M. (2009). Linking social change and developmental change: Shifting pathways of human development. *Developmental Psychology, 45,* 401–418.

Greenfield, P. M., & Bruner, J. S. (1966). Culture and cognitive growth. *International Journal of Psychology, 1,* 89–107.

Greenfield, P. M. & Cocking, R. (Eds.). (1994). *Cross-cultural roots of minority child development.* Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Greenfield, P. M., Flores, A., Davis, H., & Salimkhan, G. (2008). What happens when parents and nannies come from different cultures? Comparing the caregiving belief systems of nannies and their employers. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology.*

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., 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.), *Variability in the social construction of the child* (pp. 93–108). New Directions in Child Development, No. 87. 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: A vision for changing beliefs and practices* (pp. 37–55). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

AuQ2

AuQ3

——S
——E
——L

Greenfield, P. M., Suzuki, L., & Rothstein-Fisch (2006). Cultural pathways through human development. In W. Damon & R. M. Lerner (Series Eds.) & I. E. Sigel & K. A. Renninger (Vol. Eds.), *Handbook of child psychology. Vol. 4: Child psychology in practice* (6th ed., pp. 655–699). New York, Wiley.

Greenfield, P. M., Trumbull, E., Keller, H., Rothstein-Fisch, C., Suzuki, L., & Quiroz, B. (2006). Cultural conceptions of learning and development. In P. Alexander & P. H. Winne (Eds.), *Handbook of educational psychology* (2nd ed., pp. 675–692) Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Guiterrez, J., & Sameroff, A. J. (1990). Determinants of complexity in Mexican-American and Anglo-American mothers' conceptions of child development. *Child Development, 61,* 384–394.

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.), *Variability in the social construction of the child* (pp. 23–39). New Directions in Child Development, No. 87. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass

Harwood, R. L. (1992). The influence of culturally derived values on Anglo and Puerto Rican mothers' perceptions of attachment behavior. *Child Development, 63,* 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,* 2446–2461.

Heath, S. B. (1983). *Ways with words: Language, life, and work in communities and classrooms.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions and organizations across nations* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Keller H. (1997). Evolutionary approaches. In J. W. Berry, Y. H. Poortinga, & J. Pandey, (Eds.), *Handbook of cross-cultural psychology, Vol. 1: Theory and method* (pp. 215–55). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Keller, H. (2003). Socialization for competence: Cultural models of infancy. *Human Development 46,* 288–311.

Keller, H. (2007). *Cultures of infancy.* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Keller, H., Hentschel, E., Yovsi, R. D., Abels, M., Lamm, B., & Haas, V. (2004). The psycho-linguistic embodiment of parental ethnotheories: A new avenue to understand cultural differences in parenting. *Culture & Psychology, 10,* 293–330.

Keller, H., Voelker, S., Yovsi, R. D., & Shastri, J. (2005). The representation of independent and interrelated conceptions of caretaking. In P. Mohite (Ed.), *Theoretical approaches to early development: Implications for intervention.* Baroda, India: University of Baroda.

Markus, H., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review, 98*(2), 224–253.

McGillicuddy-De Lisi 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

Michaels, S. (1981). "Sharing time": Children's narrative styles and differential access to literacy. *Language in Society, 10,* 423–442.

Nsamenang, A. B. (1992). *Human development in cultural context: A third world perspective.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

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,* 145–153.

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.

Quiroz, B., & Greenfield, P. M. (1996). *Cross-cultural value conflict: Removing a barrier to Latino school achievement.* Department of Psychology, UCLA, Unpublished manuscript.

Quiroz, B., Greenfield, P. M., & Altchech, M. (1999) Bridging cultures with a parent-teacher conference. *Educational Leadership, 56,* 68–70.

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. Super (Eds.), *Variability in the social construction of the child* (pp. 59–74). New Directions in Child Development, No. 87. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Roman, L. (2006). *Bridging cultures: Taking a look at independence and interdependence among high school seniors.* Unpublished master's thesis. California State University, Northridge.

Rothbaum, F., Weisz, J., Pott, M., Miyake, K., & Morelli, G. (2000). Attachment and culture: Security in the United States and Japan. *American Psychologist, 55,* 1093–1104.

Rothstein-Fisch, C. (2003). *Bridging cultures: Teacher education module.* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Rothstein-Fisch, C. (June, 2007a). *Training the trainers on cultural influences in early childhood.* Los Angeles: Los Angeles Unified School District.

Rothstein-Fisch, C. (June, 2007b) *Bridging cultures in classroom management: Multiple cultures, multiple voices.* Harrisburg, PA: Pennsylvania Department of Education and the Pennsylvania State University.

Rothstein-Fisch, C. & Albarran, A. (December, 2007c). *Cultural pathways in infant care and development: Why culture matters.* Orlando, FL: Zero to Three National Training Institute.

Rothstein-Fisch, C. & Trumbull, E. (2008). *Managing diverse classrooms: How to build on students' cultural strengths.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Rothstein-Fisch, C., Trumbull, E., Isaac, A., Daley, C., & Pérez, A. (2003). When "helping someone else" is the right answer. *Journal of Latinos and Education, 3,* 123–140.

Saraswathi, T. S. (1999). *Culture, socialization, and human development: Theory, research, and applications in the Indian setting.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Tapia Uribe, F. M, 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.

Triandis, H. C. (1989). Cross-cultural studies of individualism and collectivism. *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation, 37,* 43–133.

Triandis, H., Brislin, R., & Hui, C. H. (1988). Cross-cultural training across the individualism-collective divide. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 12,* 269–289.

Trumbull, E., Diaz-Meza, R., Hasan, A., & Rothstein-Fisch, C. (2001). *Five-year report of the Bridging Cultures Project.* San Francisco: WestEd. Retrieved from http://www.wested.org/bridgingcultures

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—according to whose values? *School Community Journal, 13,* 45–72.

U.S. Department of Education. *Tools for student success.* Retrieved October 14, 2007, from http://www.ed.gov/parents/academic/help/tools-for-success/tools-for-success.

Valdés, G. (1996). *Con respeto.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Whiting, B. B. & Whiting, J. W. M. (1975). *Children of six cultures*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Yovsi, R. D. (2001). *Ethnotheories about breastfeeding and mother-infant interaction. The case of sedentary Nso farmers and nomadic Fulani pastorals with their infants 3–6 months of age in Mbvem subdivision of the Northwest providence of Cameroon, Africa.* PhD thesis. Osnabrück, Germany: University of Osnabrück.

Yovsi, R. D., & Keller, H. (2003). Breastfeeding. An adaptive process. *Ethos, 31,* 147–171.

Zepeda, M., Gonzalez-Mena, J., Rothstein-Fisch, C., & Trumbull, E. (2006). *Bridging cultures in early care and education.* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

S____
E____
L____

AUTHOR QUERIES

1   For Esau et al. (in preparation), the APA style manual prefers that the date you last read the draft be used rather than "in preparation." Please add that here and see also my query in the reference entry.

2   For Esau et al. (in preparation), the APA manual prefers that the date you last read a draft of this work be used rather than "in preparation." Please add that here.

3   For Greenfield et al. (2008), please provide the publication information for this journal.