

Self in Context: Autonomy and Relatedness in Japanese and U.S. Mother–Preschooler Dyads

Tracy A. Dennis, Pamela M. Cole, Carolyn Zahn-Waxler, and Ichiro Mizuta

Cultural differences and similarities in socialization during two contrasting laboratory tasks were examined in 30 Japanese mothers and their preschoolers, both temporarily residing in the United States, and 30 U.S. mothers and their preschoolers (age: $M = 55.8$ months, $SD = 4.9$). Mother and child actions, speech, emotion, and attention were coded from videotaped observations during a free play task and waiting task. Cross-cultural comparisons showed that U.S. mothers had more conversations that emphasized individual experiences, more often acted as playmates and used joint attention, maintained more physical distance, showed more positive emotions, and made more positive responses to child accomplishment. In contrast, Japanese mothers had more conversations that emphasized shared experiences, showed more divided attention, and maintained social role distinctions. Similar, but fewer cultural differences emerged for children. However, maternal and child characteristics also varied by task context. The results suggested an emphasis on autonomy in U.S. dyads and an emphasis on relatedness in Japanese dyads, but the interactions with task context revealed the coexistence of autonomy and relatedness.

INTRODUCTION

Interactions between mothers and their young children provide insight into how children acquire skills to be competent members of society (Denham & Grout, 1993). Most of what is known about socialization, however, is limited to a few cultures (Cole & Dennis, 1998). Cultural comparisons are crucial to socialization research because they permit examination of universal and culturally specific aspects of development (LeVine, 1990).

Learning how to be a distinct person and yet relate to others—skills that are fundamental to social competence—occurs during social interactions. Therefore, the development of self is situated and constructed in sociocultural contexts (Bornstein, 1989; Bowlby, 1969; Bruner, 1990; Lebra, 1992; Rothbaum, Pott, Azuma, Miyake, & Weisz, 2000; Shweder & Bourne, 1984). Research examining social interactions has provided a window into cultural variations in self (Kitayama, Markus, & Lieberman, 1995; Markus & Kitayama, 1991, 1994; Rothbaum et al., 2000; Triandis, 1994, 1995). This research has described the United States as a society that places the most emphasis on the self as autonomous; that is, a distinct entity whose behavior is organized and made meaningful around unique internal attributes. Competition, dominance, self-actualization, uniqueness, and open expression of emotion are valued. In relative contrast, Japan is described as a society that emphasizes the self as related; that is, a socially connected entity whose behavior is organized and made meaningful around relationships with others. Cooperation, empathy, har-

mony, accommodation, and subtle expression of emotion are valued.

Comparisons between Asian and U.S. groups bring out cultural differences that are relatively subtle and context specific. Autonomy and relatedness, for example, are not mutually exclusive attributes but dimensions that coexist within individuals and cultures and vary with situational context (Kagitcibasi, 1994; Quinn & Holland, 1987; Rothbaum et al., 2000; Triandis, 1995). Indeed, research provides evidence for such intracultural variability (Holloway, 1999; Triandis & Trafimow, 2001). Therefore, any examination of cultural contributions to the development of self must treat each dimension as separate, co-occurring, and context-sensitive.

If caregivers in different societies convey cultural messages about self to their young children, they do so by slight variations during social interactions, which are affected by current context. Moreover, the socialization of self involves various modes of transmission: action, speech, emotion expression, and attention (e.g., Bates, 1990; Rothbaum et al., 2000). However, the comparative literature on the socialization practices of Japanese and U.S. mothers has not documented how mothers might transmit models of self and other to their children through these modes. The present study is the first to examine individual, cultural, and contextual variation in all four modes in order to demonstrate the subtle differences and

contextual similarities in the emphasis that U.S. and Japanese dyads place on autonomy and relatedness.

Action and Speech

Studies of Japanese and U.S. mothers' parenting attitudes and behaviors suggest cultural differences in childrearing techniques. Japanese mothers report gaining compliance through relational consequences: appeals to empathy, verbal reprimands, social disapproval, withdrawal of attention and receptivity through ignoring, and persuasion. U.S. mothers report that they rely more on praise, encouragement, and other positive responses to children's individual achievement, and on power-assertive techniques, such as punishment and physical control (Conroy, Hess, Azuma, & Kashiwagi, 1980; Kobayashi-Winata & Power, 1989; Power, Kobayashi-Winata, & Kelley, 1992). Socialization goals differ as well, with U.S. mothers hoping for early competency in autonomy, such as verbal assertiveness, and Japanese mothers hoping for social responsibility and respect for social hierarchy as reflected in maturity, compliance, and courtesy (Hess, Kashiwagi, Azuma, Price, & Dickson, 1980; White & Levine, 1986).

Based on self-report, these studies might be more subject to cultural stereotypes than observational studies. However, observational studies also suggest subtle stylistic differences during social interactions. Although mostly conducted with infants, comparative observations of Japanese and U.S. mother-child interactions conclude that Japanese mothers emphasize interpersonal intimacy and harmony (e.g., more close physical contact, soothing, and comforting), whereas U.S. mothers emphasize stimulation and individual achievement (e.g., more verbal engagement and praise for child accomplishment) (Caudill & Frost, 1970; Caudill & Weinstein, 1974; Doi, 1973; Johnson, 1992; Lebra, 1976; Miyake, Campos, Kagan, & Bradshaw, 1986; Morsbach, 1973; Ujiie, 1997; Vogel & Vogel, 1961). With older children, Japanese mothers foster implicit relatedness and keep child and adult activities separate in order to maintain social-role distinctions. Social roles define relatedness and are thus valued in Japanese society. When teaching, however, Japanese mothers involve children in an adult activity as an implicit means of instruction. In contrast, U.S. mothers foster explicit communication and autonomy. They relate more to their children as playmates, possibly reflecting the valuing of egalitarianism. When teaching, however, U.S. mothers use didactic, explicit instructions (Kojima, 1986; Rogoff, 1990). In sum, studies of U.S. and Japanese mothers' childrearing attitudes and practices suggest that there

are cultural variations in what is communicated to the child about the autonomy and relatedness of self.

Studies with preschoolers also suggest cultural variations in the children's sense of self (Mizuta, Zahn-Waxler, Cole, & Hiruma, 1996; Zahn-Waxler, Friedman, Cole, Mizuta, & Hiruma, 1996). U.S. children were more likely to assert their anger in response to interpersonal conflict than were Japanese children. In parallel, U.S. mothers of preschoolers endorsed encouraging emotional expressiveness in children, whereas Japanese mothers endorsed inducing guilt as a parenting strategy to cultivate a sense of social responsibility (Zahn-Waxler et al., 1996). In another study, Japanese preschoolers showed more *amae*, or dependency and clinginess, than did U.S. children. Japanese mothers reported cultivating such dependency, whereas U.S. mothers endorsed encouraging child autonomy and self-reliance (Mizuta et al., 1996).

In summary, there is evidence of cultural differences in the relative emphasis that Japanese and U.S. mothers might place on relatedness and harmony and on autonomy and self-assertion in their interactions with their young children. However, more research is needed to articulate how such cultural differences are conveyed, how children express them, and the degree to which they are influenced by the context in which the mother and child are interacting.

Emotion

Emotions are vital to socialization because they convey values concerning how to relate to others, the significance of social situations, and standards for behavior (Campos & Barrett, 1988; Eisenberg, Cumberland, & Spinrad, 1998; Matsumoto, 1996). Emotional qualities of interactions such as shared positive affect, emotional contingency, and caregiver sensitivity are crucial to successful socialization (Denham, 1998; Denham & Grout, 1993; Field, 1994; Kochanska, 1997; Raver, 1996; Saarni, 1993, 1999).

Emotion expression is thought to differ between the U.S. and Japan. In Japan, emotions are expressed in well-modulated ways in order to maintain smooth and harmonious interpersonal relationships, given that emotion can convey self-assertion and discord. Clear expression of both positive and negative emotion is thought to be important for the socialization of an autonomous, assertive self (Kitayama & Markus, 1994; Markus & Kitayama, 1991, 1994; Matsumoto, 1996; Matsumoto, Kudoh, Scherer, & Wallbott, 1988). Evidence indicates consistent cultural differences in the evaluation and expression of emotions (Mesquita, Frijda, & Scherer, 1997; Russell & Sato, 1995). However,

the role of emotion in Japanese and U.S. mother–child interaction has not been studied.

Attention

How individuals attend toward and away from others also conveys attitudes about interpersonal engagement and role distinctions (Humphrey & Benjamin, 1989; Rogoff, 1997). U.S. mothers differ significantly from mothers of other cultures in their attention patterns with their children (Chavajay & Rogoff, 1999; Rogoff, 1996, 1997; Rogoff, Mistry, Goncu, & Mosier, 1993). U.S. mothers appear “child-centered” compared with mothers from more traditional cultures (e.g., Indian and Mayan). They often show exclusive attention toward children, particularly during teaching exchanges; or joint attention, such as when playing a game. In contrast, mothers from traditional cultures show greater divided attention and maintain clearer adult–child role distinctions. They participate less in children’s activities, but incorporate children into adult activities as a means of instruction. In these contexts, maternal attention is divided between adult and child activity.

Attention indexes how one relates to others, and can reflect an emphasis on separateness or relatedness of selves. Exclusive attention could bolster a child’s experience of self as a unique and separate person because focus is on the individual alone, whereas divided attention de-emphasizes individuality. Joint attention is less obvious. It could promote autonomy by de-emphasizing hierarchical relationships (mother and child share focus), but could also convey harmony and cooperativeness. Thus, the quality of mutual attention might convey cultural messages about how to be a self, although evidence does not support specific predictions for each type of attention.

The Present Study

The present study sought to directly evaluate the utility and limitations of a model of socialization including self by examining the autonomy and relatedness of multiple aspects of interactions between U.S. and Japanese mothers and their preschoolers. The Japanese participants were Japanese mothers and their children who were citizens of Japan, but temporarily residing in the United States. Although they were not typical of families that resided only in Japan, they were not attempting to acculturate to a permanent stay in the United States. We examined action, speech, emotion, and attention patterns of the dyads during two laboratory tasks, a free play task and a waiting task. Based on previous findings, codes were selected

that might arguably represent autonomy or relatedness, or have been shown to discriminate the United States and Japan. It was predicted that autonomy and relatedness would co-exist in mothers and children, particularly through the influence of social context, but that subtle cultural differences would also emerge. Specifically, we expected that U.S. mothers would convey values that endorsed autonomy and self-assertion through explicit, power-assertive control and teaching techniques, references to individual experience, acting as playmates, praising and acknowledging child individuality, and maintaining physical distance. In contrast, Japanese mothers were expected to emphasize interpersonal dependence and harmony through implicit control and teaching techniques, references to shared experiences, withdrawal of receptivity through delayed responses and ignoring, parallel play to maintain distinct social roles, and physical closeness.

It was predicted that U.S. children would also emphasize autonomy and self-assertion through directive and assertive behavior and requests for maternal directives, references to individual experience, acting as playmates, praising and acknowledging maternal individuality, maintaining physical distance, and testing limits in autonomous ways. In contrast, Japanese children were expected to emphasize interpersonal dependence and relatedness through cooperation and bids for maternal aid, references to shared experiences, delayed responses and ignoring, maintaining separate but parallel activities, physical closeness, and testing limits while expressing dependency. Negative responding (e.g., scolding) was coded for mothers and children because it could occur with some frequency, but was not hypothesized to reflect autonomy or relatedness.

In terms of emotion, we explored whether the frequency of positive and negative emotion expression might distinguish cultures and mark differences in self-construal. Differences in frequency of joint, exclusive, and divided attention could also reflect this distinction.

Although cultural differences were expected, we predicted that mother–child interactions would clearly vary with the immediate context in ways that reflected the coexistence of autonomy and relatedness. Two laboratory contexts were included: a standard free play task and a frustrating waiting task. These contrasting tasks were chosen because they reflect two important components of mother–child interactions—recreation and compliance. Several patterns appeared possible, with tasks either amplifying or reducing differences attributable to self. For mothers, play might elicit teaching (both implicit and explicit), joint play (activity as

playmates and joint attention), and discussing experiences (emphasis on individuality and mutuality); whereas the frustrating waiting task would elicit attempts to gain child compliance (commands and suggestions) and divided maternal attention between the work and their child.

For preschoolers, both groups were expected to test limits and seek maternal contact more often during the waiting task than during the play task, because handling the frustration of waiting for a desirable object is likely a developing skill (see, e.g., Kopp, 1982, 1989). There was no prediction whether this would relate systematically to relatedness or autonomy.

Sex of the child is another important factor in socialization. Research on sex differences suggests that mothers emphasize relatedness with their female children and autonomy with their male children (Gilligan, 1986; Zahn-Waxler, 2000). This hypothesis was tested by examining behaviors, emotion, and attention patterns that might reflect culture-based as well as gender-based socialization practices.

METHOD

Participants

Sixty mothers and their preschool-age children (30 Japanese and 30 U.S. dyads) participated in the study; there were 17 boys (57%) and 13 girls (43%) from each culture. U.S. children were selected from an ongoing study of emotional development (Cole & Zahn-Waxler, 1988). Child age ranged from 48 to 70 months ($M = 55.8$ months, $SD = 4.9$ months). Family size ranged from one to four children. Mothers' age ranged from 26 to 46 years ($M = 34.0$ years, $SD = 3.9$ years). Families in both cultures were middle- to upper middle-class (socioeconomic status $M = 4.5$; Hollingshead, 1975). Japanese and U.S. samples were similar for each of these variables (see Table 1). Although several American mothers worked full- or part-time outside of the home, all Japanese mothers except one were homemakers. About 80% of mothers from both samples were college graduates.

The Japanese families were sojourners in the United States, temporarily living in a major northeast urban center, usually for the father's employment or education. On average, Japanese families had lived in the United States for about 19 months. All planned to and did return to Japan within 12 to 18 months of participation in the study. Although the Japanese sample was not equivalent to Japanese families living in Japan, they were not attempting to acculturate to permanent residence in the United States. These families may have been less representative of Japanese families of

Table 1 Descriptive Statistics for Japanese and U.S. Samples

	Japanese ($n = 30$)	United States ($n = 30$)
Child age (months)	56.3 (6.5)	55.3 (2.4)
Number of siblings	.9 (.7)	1.1 (.7)
Mother age (years)	33.3 (3.2)	34.8 (4.4)
Father age (years)	35.9 (3.9)	38.6 (5.3)
Socioeconomic status (Hollingshead)	4.6 (.6)	4.5 (.5)
Mother education (college degree)	80%	83.3%
Father education (college degree)	100%	90%

Note: Values represent means and standard deviations (in parentheses), unless otherwise noted.

similar socioeconomic characteristics who continued to reside in Japan, but were presumed to still be raising their children to be competent in Japanese society.

Procedure

All procedures were administered in English to the U.S. dyads and in Japanese to the Japanese dyads by research assistants who were native speakers of the respective languages. All procedures took place in the laboratory.

Free play task. Each mother and preschooler was given a box of age-appropriate, interesting toys (puzzle, train set, building blocks) and told to play with them together for 10 min.

Waiting task (Carmichael-Olson, Greenberg, & Slough, 1985). Following the free-play period, an 8-min waiting task began. This task was designed to elicit frustration. The research assistant handed the mother a clipboard, saying "Here is the work that I told you about," placed a brightly wrapped package in plain view of the child, and handed the child a plastic toy giraffe with a broken leg, saying "You can play with this." Mothers were previously familiarized with the procedure. As the assistant left the room, the mother pointed to the package and said, "This is a surprise for you but you have to wait until *after* I finish my work to open it." (The "surprise" was magnetic marbles that the child took home.) Mothers were told to do or say what they would typically do in order to complete the work.

Coding

The actions, speech, emotion, and attention patterns of each mother-child dyad were coded from videotaped records of the procedures. Three Japanese and three U.S. undergraduate students coded action and speech. One Japanese and one U.S. undergraduate

student coded emotion and attention. All coders were unaware of the study hypotheses and were trained to 90% accuracy based on tapes previously coded by the first author. Reliability was assessed for 25% of the cases from each group throughout the coding (see below for values); coders were unaware of reliability checks.

Videotapes of Japanese dyads were translated and coded by undergraduate research assistants who were native Japanese speakers, in order to facilitate supervision of the data reduction. To assure validity of translation, 20% of the translations were compared by an independent rater and judged to be equivalent.

Action and speech. For each member of the dyad, actions and speech that emphasized the self as unique, separate, and autonomous and those that emphasized the self as inherently connected or related to others were determined. In addition, face validity of the codes believed to reflect relatedness was evaluated through a focus group of Japanese mothers. The coding system was a mutually exclusive and exhaustive system designed to categorize ongoing mother and child behaviors in 30-s intervals and in sequence (see the Appendix for coding items).

Cohen's κ was used to determine interrater reliability. For mother codes, the values for Japanese participants ranged from .66 to .75, with a mean of .70; the values for U.S. participants ranged from .69 to .80, with a mean of .76. For child codes, κ s for Japanese participants ranged from .66 to .79, with a mean of .71; and for U.S. participants the values ranged from .63 to .79, with a mean of .74. Therefore, all average κ coefficients were in the substantial to excellent range (Bartko, 1991; Fleiss, 1981).

Emotion. For every second of interaction, the occurrence of mothers' and children's positive and negative emotions was coded. Positive and negative emotions were rated as two separate dimensions. This allowed for the possibility that a person could be coded as negative and as positive in a single turn, although this occurred rarely. Emotion was determined by vocal (how it was being said) and facial cues (facial expression). Variations in vocal quality included the volume, rate, flow of air, and pitch of the voice (e.g., lilting, firm). Variations in facial expression were based on facial activity (e.g., frown, smile). Each emotion was rated as low or high intensity to establish a range of expressivity (Zahn-Waxler et al., 1996). The interrater reliability values (κ) for Japanese participants ranged from .88 to .93, with a mean κ of .90; and for U.S. participants ranged from .70 to .94, with a mean κ of .87—all in the excellent range.

Attention. Attention was coded for each second of mother-child interaction and was defined as looking,

talking, or touching for a minimum of 3 s. Attention was uncodable when one or both members of the dyad were not in view of the camera. Patterns of attention were (1) joint attention, defined as instances of mothers and children simultaneously attending to an activity or object; (2) maternal divided attention, defined as instances of mother dividing attention between the child and an activity; (3) divided attention, defined as instances of either mother or child having divided attention; and (4) *exclusive attention*, defined as instances of mother or child only attending to one other (Rogoff et al., 1993). Interrater reliability values for Japanese participants ranged from .84 to .92, with a mean κ of .89; and for U.S. participants ranged from .67 to .98, with a mean κ of .84. Therefore, all average κ coefficients were in the substantial to excellent range.

RESULTS

Action and Speech

Means and standard deviations for maternal and child codes, presented as percentage scores, are shown in Tables 2 (maternal codes) and 3 (child codes). Several codes occurred too infrequently (not shown by at least 70% of participants) to include in subsequent analyses.

Intercorrelations among the remaining maternal codes are presented in Table 4, and intercorrelations among the remaining child codes are presented in Table 5. Maternal and child codes intended to index autonomy included command; emphasize individuality; activity as playmates; physical distance; positive responsiveness; and, for children, directs. Maternal and child codes intended to index relatedness included suggestion; emphasize mutuality; parallel activity; delayed response; and, for children, requests togetherness. Patterns of correlations moderately supported the dimensions of autonomy and relatedness for maternal codes, with the exception of commands and suggestions. Child codes showed a less clear pattern of associations. For maternal autonomy codes, emphasis on individuality was negatively correlated with emphasis on mutuality, parallel activity, and delayed response; both distance and positive response were negatively associated with delayed response. For maternal relatedness codes, emphasis on mutuality was negatively associated with distance and positive responsiveness and positively associated with delayed response. Parallel activity was negatively related to distance and positively related to delayed response.

Next, two 2 (culture) \times 2 (sex of child) \times 2 (task) mixed-design MANOVAs were conducted, one for

Table 2 Descriptive Statistics for Maternal Action and Speech Codes during the Free Play Task (FP) and the Waiting Task (WT)

	United States			Japan		
	FP	WT	Total	FP	WT	Total
Command	5 (4)	7 (7)	5 (4)	3 (2)	10 (6)	5 (3)
Suggest	3 (2)	7 (8)	4 (3)	2 (2)	4 (4)	2 (2)
Explicit teaching	6 (6)	1 (2)	4 (4)	2 (2)	<1	2 (1)
Implicit teaching	1 (1)	0 (0)	1 (1)	<1	<1	<1
Emphasize individuality	30 (9)	16 (7)	26 (7)	23 (7)	12 (8)	20 (6)
Emphasize mutuality	12 (4)	7 (4)	10 (3)	20 (9)	10 (8)	18 (8)
Activity as playmates	5 (5)	<1	4 (4)	1 (1)	<1	1 (1)
Parallel activity	7 (6)	35 (13)	14 (5)	15 (8)	42 (19)	21 (8)
Physical distance	13 (7)	1 (1)	9 (5)	9 (6)	<1	7 (5)
Physical proximity	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1
Positive response	21 (6)	18 (8)	20 (5)	18 (9)	13 (7)	17 (7)
Negative response	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1
Delayed response	<1	3 (4)	1 (1)	1 (2)	5 (4)	2 (2)

Note: Values represent mean percentages and standard deviations (in parentheses).

maternal codes and one for child codes. Culture and sex of the child were the between-subjects variables and laboratory task (free play or waiting task) was the within-subjects variable. The frequency of maternal and child codes, calculated as percentages of total task time to control for duration differences between tasks, were the dependent variables. Logarithmic transformations were applied to frequency scores to correct for positively skewed distributions.

Maternal codes. Multivariate tests revealed significant effects for culture, $F(9, 48) = 6.68, p < .001$, and task $F(9, 48) = 52.92, p < .001$; and a Culture \times Task in-

teraction, $F(9, 48) = 4.53, p < .001$. No sex differences emerged. Univariate effects are reported in Table 6.

Between-culture comparisons showed that U.S. and Japanese mothers differed from each other in ways suggesting that U.S. mothers expressed more autonomy and Japanese mothers expressed more relatedness. Main effects for culture indicated that, compared with Japanese mothers, U.S. mothers more often emphasized individuality in conversation, maintained physical distance, and reacted positively to children. Counter to expectations, U.S. mothers used more suggestions, not commands, than did Japanese

Table 3 Descriptive Statistics for Child Action and Speech Codes during the Free Play Task (FP) and the Waiting Task (WT)

	United States			Japan		
	FP	WT	Total	FP	WT	Total
Direct-request direction	5 (4)	5 (3)	5 (3)	4 (4)	3 (4)	3 (3)
Direct while testing limits	<1	<1	<1	<1	2 (6)	1 (2)
Request togetherness	1 (2)	<1	1 (1)	1 (2)	1 (1)	1 (2)
Demand togetherness	<1	<1	<1	0 (0)	2 (5)	1 (2)
Testing limits while distant	<1	<1	<1	<1	2 (4)	1 (2)
Testing limits while close	<1	<1	<1	<1	1 (4)	<1
Emphasize individuality	15 (6)	26 (10)	19 (6)	14 (5)	16 (12)	15 (5)
Emphasize mutuality	18 (8)	10 (6)	16 (6)	18 (9)	10 (7)	16 (7)
Activity as playmates	5 (5)	1 (1)	4 (4)	1 (2)	1 (2)	1 (1)
Parallel activity	20 (9)	28 (13)	22 (7)	27 (8)	22 (16)	24 (8)
Physical distance	3 (3)	12 (12)	6 (4)	3 (4)	21 (16)	8 (5)
Physical proximity	<1	<1	<1	<1	2 (6)	1 (2)
Positive response	19 (7)	11 (6)	17 (6)	15 (7)	8 (6)	13 (5)
Negative response	<1	<1	<1	<1	1 (2)	<1
Delayed response	5 (4)	1 (1)	3 (2)	5 (4)	2 (2)	4 (3)

Note: Values represent mean percentages and standard deviations (in parentheses).

Table 4 Intercorrelations among Maternal Action and Speech Codes

Code	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Command		.19	-.24	.05	-.12	-.07	-.12	-.30*	-.03
2. Suggest			.21	-.31*	.19	-.43***	-.05	.09	-.32*
3. Emphasize individuality				-.34**	.16	-.42***	-.10	.10	-.28*
4. Emphasize mutuality					-.22	.04	-.25*	-.47***	.30*
5. Activity as playmates						-.17	-.07	.15	-.15
6. Parallel activity							-.32*	-.25	.36**
7. Physical distance								.08	-.25*
8. Positive response									-.31*
9. Delayed response									

Note: $N = 60$.

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$.

mothers. Compared with U.S. mothers, Japanese mothers maintained more parallel activities and delayed their responses to child bids.

Main effects for task revealed that task differences were prevalent. Consistent with the nature of the tasks, recreation versus compliance, discussing individual experiences and positive responding occurred more often during the free play task than during the waiting task. Physical distance also occurred more frequently during the free play task than during the waiting task. In contrast, bids for compliance (both command and suggest), parallel activity, and delayed responses occurred more often during the waiting task than during the free play task.

Culture \times Task interactions supported predictions specifying that U.S. mothers acted as playmates more often during the free play task than during the waiting task, $t(29) = 7.83$, $p < .001$; and within the free play task, acted more as playmates than did Japanese mothers, $t(58) = 3.49$, $p < .001$. Moreover, Japanese mothers conversed about relatedness more often during the free play task than during the waiting task, $t(29) = 3.50$, $p < .01$; and within the free play task,

conversed more about relatedness than did U.S. mothers, $t(58) = 4.60$, $p < .001$.

Child codes. Multivariate tests revealed significant effects for culture, $F(9, 48) = 8.41$, $p < .001$, and task, $F(9, 48) = 20.14$, $p < .001$; and a Culture \times Task interaction, $F(9, 48) = 4.20$, $p < .001$. No sex differences emerged. Univariate effects are reported in Table 7. Main effects for culture indicated one cultural difference not qualified by an interaction with task: as predicted, compared with Japanese children, U.S. children responded more positively to mothers. In contrast, main effects of task were more prevalent. During the free play versus waiting task, children more often made bids for attention and togetherness, emphasized relatedness in conversation, made positive and encouraging responses, and delayed responses.

Although few main effects for culture emerged, significant Culture \times Task interactions largely supported predictions regarding cultural differences. U.S. children emphasized individuality in conversation more during the waiting task than during the free play task, $t(29) = 5.36$, $p < .001$; and within the

Table 5 Intercorrelations among Child Action and Speech Codes

Code	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Direct		.17	.08	-.28*	.33**	-.22	-.10	-.02	-.09
2. Request togetherness			-.03	-.28*	.37**	-.08	-.03	-.04	-.15
3. Emphasize individuality				-.19	-.01	-.39**	-.12	.05	-.01
4. Emphasize mutuality					-.16	-.17	-.11	.01	-.28*
5. Activity as playmates						-.30*	.01	.11	-.13
6. Parallel activity							-.20	-.28*	.06
7. Physical distance								-.17	-.01
8. Positive response									-.18
9. Delayed response									

Note: $N = 60$.

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$.

Table 6 Maternal Action and Speech Codes: Univariate Effects from the Mixed-Design Multivariate Analyses of Variance

	Culture $F(1, 58)$		Task $F(1, 58)$		Culture \times Task $F(3, 56)$
Command	.28		25.21***	W > P	4.27
Suggest	5.64*	U > J	14.00***	W > P	.82
Emphasize individuality	10.53***	U > J	9.98***	P > W	1.72
Emphasize mutuality	16.28***	J > U	55.34***	P > W	7.07**
Activity as playmates	18.83***	U > J	27.54***	P > W	18.04***
Parallel activity	9.35**	J > U	164.03***	W > P	.01
Physical distance	5.40*	U > J	138.60***	P > W	2.49
Positive response	6.72*	U > J	9.35**	P > W	1.52
Delayed response	5.80*	J > U	46.56***	W > P	.47

Note: U = United States; J = Japan; P = free play task; W = waiting task.
* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$.

waiting task, emphasized more individuality in conversation than did Japanese children, $t(58) = 3.56, p < .001$. U.S. children also acted more often as playmates during the free play task than during the waiting task, $t(29) = 4.60, p < .001$; and within the free play task, acted more often as playmates than did Japanese children, $t(58) = 4.12, p < .001$. On the other hand, compared with U.S. children, Japanese children showed more parallel activity during play, $t(58) = 3.04, p < .01$. Japanese children showed more distance during the waiting task than during the free play task, $t(29) = 6.09, p < .001$; and within the waiting task, showed—counter to prediction—more distance than did U.S. children, $t(58) = 2.31, p < .05$.

Emotion

Positive and negative emotions were initially coded as having either low or high intensity. However, for the following analyses, frequency ratings for low and high intensity of emotion were combined for both positive

and negative emotions, yielding one positive and one negative emotion frequency score. Means and standard deviations (in seconds) for positive emotion were: U.S. mothers, $M = 154.27, SD = 138.48$, U.S. children, $M = 230.87, SD = 161.51$, Japanese mothers, $M = 72.73, SD = 62.65$, and Japanese children, $M = 112.57, SD = 97.10$. For negative emotion: U.S. mothers, $M = 11.07, SD = 17.92$, U.S. children, $M = 35.80, SD = 77.06$, Japanese mothers, $M = 7.23, SD = 11.72$, and Japanese children, $M = 35.40, SD = 82.36$. Task was not included as a predictor variable because of strongly skewed distributions, particularly in the waiting task. Even after being transformed, the data were not appropriate for parametric analyses.

Zero-order correlations revealed significant associations between maternal positive and negative emotion, $r(60) = .37, p < .01$, whereas child positive and negative emotion were unrelated. Maternal positive emotion was also significantly correlated with child positive emotion, $r(60) = .57, p < .001$, and negative emotion, $r(60) = .44, p < .001$, as was maternal negative

Table 7 Child Action and Speech Codes: Univariate Effects from the Mixed-Design Multivariate Analysis of Variance

	Culture $F(1, 58)$		Task $F(1, 58)$		Culture \times Task $F(3, 56)$
Direct	2.59		.83		.30
Requesting togetherness	.20		5.97*	P > W	2.44
Emphasize individuality	17.22***	U > J	17.61***	W > P	10.75**
Emphasize mutuality	.04		23.53***	P > W	.14
Activity as playmates	14.76***	U > J	22.92***	P > W	12.77***
Parallel activity	.02		.49		8.90**
Physical distance	4.72		52.43***	W > P	5.29*
Positive response	8.31*	U > J	72.99***	P > W	.29
Delayed response	3.71		63.77***	P > W	1.06

Note: U = United States; J = Japan; P = free play task; W = waiting task.
* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$.

Table 8 Mother and Child Attention during the Free Play Task (FP) and Waiting Task (WT): Descriptive Statistics

	Joint Attention		Mother Divided Attention		Divided Attention		Exclusive Attention	
	Japan	United States	Japan	United States	Japan	United States	Japan	United States
FP	46 (30)	86 (17)	11 (15)	2 (7)	30 (23)	5 (13)	7 (7)	5 (7)
WT	10 (9)	20 (16)	8 (7)	6 (6)	13 (13)	9 (8)	20 (19)	19 (9)
Total	30 (16)	57 (12)	10 (9)	4 (5)	22 (15)	7 (9)	13 (9)	11 (6)

Note: Values represent mean percentages and standard deviations (in parentheses).

emotion with child positive emotion, $r(60) = .30, p < .05$, and negative emotion, $r(60) = .35, p < .01$.

Two 2 (culture) \times 2 (sex of child) MANOVAs were conducted on scores for positive and negative emotion—one for mothers and one for children. The two dependent variables were frequency scores for maternal or child positive and negative emotion. Frequencies were logarithmically transformed to correct for positively skewed distributions. Multivariate tests revealed a main effect of culture for maternal emotion, $F(2, 55) = 4.63, p < .05$, and child emotion, $F(2, 55) = 6.33, p < .01$. No sex differences emerged.

U.S. mothers and children evidenced more positive emotion than did their Japanese counterparts, $F(1, 58) = 9.42, p < .01$, and $F(1, 58) = 12.82, p < .001$, respectively. There were no effects for negative emotion.

Attention

Means and standard deviations for the four attention categories, presented as percentage scores, are shown in Table 8. Zero-order correlations among attention codes indicated that joint attention was negatively correlated with maternal divided attention, $r(60) = -.62, p < .001$, and maternal and child divided attention, $r(60) = -.74, p < .001$. Exclusive attention was not associated with other attention codes.

Attention was examined in a 2 (culture) \times 2 (sex of child) \times 2 (task) mixed-design MANOVA, with task as the within-subjects variable. The dependent variables were the frequency of joint attention, mother divided attention, mother and child divided attention, and exclusive attention, calculated as the percentage of total task time. Frequencies were transformed using square root and logarithmic transformations to correct for positively and negatively skewed distributions.

There was a main effect for culture, $F(4, 53) = 11.87, p < .001$; a main effect for task, $F(4, 53) = 87.98, p < .001$; and a Culture \times Task interaction, $F(4, 53) = 5.55, p < .001$. No sex differences emerged. Univariate effects are presented in Table 9.

Main effects for culture and task supported predictions. Main effects for culture were qualified by interactions with task, reported below. Main effects for task revealed that, for both cultures, mothers spent more time using divided attention and dyads spent more time using exclusive attention during the waiting task than during the free play task.

Culture \times Task interactions showed cultural differences during the free play task: U.S. mothers and children spent more time using joint attention than did Japanese dyads, $t(58) = 6.40, p < .001$. Also, during the free play task, Japanese mothers and Japanese mothers and children together spent more time using

Table 9 Mother and Child Attention during the Free Play Task (FP) and Waiting Task (WT): Univariate Effects from the Multivariate Analysis of Variance

	Culture $F(1, 58)$	Task $F(1, 58)$	Culture \times Task $F(3, 56)$
Joint attention	42.19*** U > J	183.81*** P > W	5.39*
Mother divided attention	11.47** J > U	5.61* W > P	3.97*
Mother and child divided	27.93** J > U	.46	21.02***
Exclusive attention	.48	37.70*** W > P	.12

Note: U = United States; J = Japan; P = free play task; W = waiting task.

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$.

divided attention than did U.S. dyads, $t(58) = 2.98$, $p < .01$, and $t(58) = 5.03$, $p < .001$, respectively. There were no cultural differences in exclusive attention.

DISCUSSION

Individuals within all cultures must learn to negotiate an essential interpersonal dilemma: how to be in relationships with others and yet be separate, unique persons (Kagitcibasi, 1996; Rothbaum, Pott, & Tsang, 1997). The present findings lend explanatory value to a model of socialization including self, and offer a unique glimpse into how Japanese and U.S. mothers transmit cultural values regarding self and other to their preschoolers. The results demonstrated that (1) behaviors reflecting relatedness and autonomy coexist in mothers and children, (2) culture influences the relative degree of each, and (3) differences exist due to the influence of the context in which mothers and children interact. Thus, subtle differences in the relative emphasis placed on the nature of self and other are both culturally specific and context sensitive.

Autonomy and relatedness were expressed by mothers and children in both cultures through behavior, emotion, and attention; however, the two cultures varied in the degree to which they expressed each. As predicted, U.S. mothers' and children's social behavior was characteristic of an emphasis on the autonomy and separateness of self and other. Compared with Japanese mothers, U.S. mothers more often made positive responses to their children—such as praising and encouragement of accomplishment—and showed positive emotion. They communicated more about individual experiences, and were at times physically distant. During the free play task, they engaged more with their children as playmates and shared attention jointly. Compared with Japanese preschoolers, U.S. preschoolers more often made positive responses and showed positive emotion. During the free play task, they engaged mothers as playmates while showing joint attention; and during the waiting task, U.S. children communicated more about individual experiences. U.S. mothers' and children's behaviors were thus consistent with autonomy: a focus on individual experience, bolstering uniqueness and pride in self, and reduced mother-child role distinctions.

Japanese mothers and children differed from their U.S. counterparts by showing more behavior that was characteristic of an emphasis on the relatedness of self and other. Mothers more often maintained role distinctions by engaging in parallel activities and delayed responses. During the free play task, they communicated about shared experiences and used divided attention. Compared with U.S. children, Japanese chil-

dren also showed more parallel activity and divided attention during the free play task. Counter to prediction, they were more distant during the waiting task, possibly because they were complying by occupying themselves independently. Overall, these behaviors appear to reflect relatedness: a focus on togetherness and hierarchical role distinctions, a de-emphasis of autonomy, and social withdrawal as a socialization strategy. Notably, relatively few differences emerged in child relatedness. This suggests that at this early point in development, U.S. and Japanese children express dependency in similar ways, although they differ somewhat in the degree to which they emphasize autonomy. Alternatively, the coding system might not have captured relatedness, or children did not initiate such behaviors because mothers might have already been meeting their dependency needs. In a similar vein, the lack of effects due to child sex suggests that differences in the socialization of male and female "cultures" had not yet clearly emerged, or, alternately, that our measures did not capture these differences.

Although cultural differences emerged, the context of interaction was equally important, clearly influencing the behavior, emotion, and attention patterns of mothers and preschoolers, although neither laboratory context revealed a dominant pattern of autonomy or relatedness. During the free play task, mothers and their preschoolers acted as playmates and used joint attention. They were engaged in conversation and activities that addressed both the autonomy and relatedness of each partner. In general, preschoolers appeared to enjoy themselves, either reacting positively or increasing interaction with mothers. Thus, unstructured play afforded opportunities to interact in varied and engaging ways. In contrast, the taxing nature of the waiting task led mothers to work autonomously while their preschoolers tried to occupy themselves. However, children asked questions and expressed their individual feelings and thoughts. In turn, mothers emphasized compliance by using more commands and suggestions, and needed to divide their attention between the work and their child or focus exclusively on the child. Thus, although one might argue that the free play task heightens relatedness and the waiting task, autonomy, each context afforded unique ways to communicate about both.

Findings were consistent with observational studies that documented subtle differences between Japanese and U.S. mothers, but added to this previous work by emphasizing the influence of social context (Caudill & Weinstein, 1974; Morsbach, 1973). Behaviors hypothesized to reflect either autonomy or relatedness discriminated between cultures in this study and showed some internal coherence, although this was

limited for child behavior. However, results captured the difficulty in cleanly characterizing behaviors as reflecting autonomy or relatedness and the vital importance of using social context to guide interpretation. For example, commands and suggestions did not distinguish the two cultures as previously found (Power et al., 1992). In that work, Japanese mothers were characterized as using more suggestions to maintain interpersonal harmony and U.S. mothers as using more commands to emphasize power assertion and autonomy. In the present study, U.S. mothers used more suggestions, and mothers from both cultures used commands equally. U.S. mothers' use of suggestions could reflect their attempts to subtly encourage child-independent exploration and autonomy instead of attempts to maintain harmony. Likewise, Japanese mothers might have used commands to maintain hierarchical role distinctions, valued in contexts of relatedness (Triandis, 1994). On the other hand, if contextual influences predominated, while in the laboratory, commands might have increased along with perceived social pressure to gain child compliance (especially for Japanese mothers who also showed other possible signs of perceiving social pressure and of discomfort at being videotaped in an unfamiliar setting: more delayed responses, less activity as playmates, and less positive responding).

Other behaviors were also difficult to classify as reflecting autonomy or relatedness, even in the presence of expected cultural differences. For example, greater parallel activity in Japanese dyads was argued to reflect relatedness because hierarchical roles are maintained (Barnlund, 1989). However, whether parallel activity or its counterpart—activity as playmates—represent relatedness or autonomy remains unclear. Parallel activity might reflect autonomous working side by side instead of hierarchical roles. Similarly, activity as playmates, instead of indicating reduced role distinctions, might reflect cooperation, which is central to relatedness. Culture is not isomorphic with self, and thus interpretation requires careful consideration of the function of behaviors and the context of interaction.

In addition to behavior, differences in emotion and attention appeared to reflect the socialization of autonomy and relatedness. Clear emotion expression might be more common among autonomous selves because emotion affords a vehicle for individual self-expression. Indeed, U.S. dyads did show more positive emotion. However, no differences were detected in negative emotions, possibly due to the infrequency of negative emotion expression in the laboratory. On the other hand, U.S. and Japanese dyads could have shown equal amounts of negative emotions because

negativity might be common during bids for dependence and indulgence between Japanese mothers and children, or *amae* (Doi, 1973; Kumagai & Kumagai, 1986), thus attenuating cultural differences found in previous research with adults.

Contrasting patterns of attention emerged: during the free play task, U.S. dyads showed more joint attention and Japanese dyads showed more divided attention. Other research documenting such unique patterns between cultures attributed differences to socioeconomic status and degree of urbanization and traditionalism (Rogoff et al., 1993). However, the present study's sample could not be distinguished in these ways. Instead, we conceptualized joint attention as representing autonomy because it reduces hierarchy and bolsters open expression of self, such as during play with mother. We further hypothesized that divided attention reflects relatedness because it de-emphasizes the separateness and uniqueness of self and highlights interpersonal connection. Indeed, Japanese mothers have been characterized as using more participatory learning—which requires the mother to divide her attention between task performance and instruction—in the course of fostering dependency and togetherness (Matsumoto, 1996; Rothbaum et al., 2000). However, it is interesting that these cultural differences only emerged during the free play task, possibly suggesting that the challenging nature of the waiting task, because it pulls for divided attention as mothers complete the work while also helping children to wait, reduced differences attributable to culture.

This study was limited by its small sample size and atypical population of Japanese mothers and children, but makes several methodological contributions. First, given that socialization has been conceptualized as a way of communicating about the nature of self and other (Azuma, 1986; Cousins, 1989; Harkness & Super, 1983; Lebra, 1992), we attempted to define socialization in terms of self-construal and provided some initial empirical support for its utility. Second, we evaluated socialization in contrasting interpersonal contexts and in terms of multiple dimensions. Third, by coding mother and preschooler interactions rather than relying on self-report data, we targeted a little studied age group (preschoolers) and provided needed preliminary evidence for relations between self and socializing interactions.

Future research could extend the present study's findings by more thoroughly examining the multiple contexts of socialization and behavior in cultures of origin. Socializing practices and relationship qualities could be observed and evaluated in a natural context (e.g., at home) and with other social partners (e.g.,

peers, fathers). Such research would allow for the examination of a range of social contexts and the ability to explore the interaction between culture and immediate situation. Moreover, the coding system used in this study would have benefited from considering how behaviors gain meaning in reference to their role in social interaction. For example, if positive responding (ostensibly bolstering autonomy because it provides encouragement for individual accomplishment) follows a relatedness behavior, the positive response might serve to reinforce relatedness. Thus, again, social context is vital to the accurate interpretation of behavior.

During social interactions, models of self and other emerge and are drawn on to varying degrees, depending not only on culture, but also on current circumstances, history, and personality (Gjerde, 1996; Nucci & Turiel, 2000; Shweder, 1990; Super & Harkness, 1993; Triandis, Leung, Villareal, & Clack, 1985). The autonomy-relatedness distinction, if combined with careful analysis of coexistence issues and context effects, might provide a powerful point of reference for examining socialization across cultures.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors thank Dr. Noriko Hiruma for her help with data collection; and Cory Clouser, Tomoko Kato, Yuka Matsudaira, Jodie Sumerachi, and Eiko Yasui for their help with data coding. They also gratefully acknowledge the three anonymous reviewers for their extremely helpful comments on previous drafts.

ADDRESSES AND AFFILIATIONS

Corresponding author: Tracy A. Dennis, New York University School of Medicine, Child Study Center, 577 First Avenue, New York, NY, 10016; e-mail: dennit01@med.nyu.edu. Pamela M. Cole is at Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA; Carolyn Zahn-Waxler is at The National Institute of Mental Health, Bethesda, MD; and Ichiro Mizuta, is at Kobe College, Hyogo, Japan.

APPENDIX

MATERNAL AND CHILD ACTION AND SPEECH CODES

Maternal Codes

Command: Using explicit directives or prohibitions, e.g., "put the toy back," "stop that."

Suggest: Using implicit attempts to gain compliance, e.g., "maybe you can just sit and wait."

Explicit teaching: Giving explicit instruction, such as teaching facts or demonstrating how to do something, e.g., "first put the red one here and then put the blue one here."

Implicit teaching: Facilitating participatory learning and allowing the child to infer information, e.g., "what happens if you pull that string?"

Child Codes

Direct-request direction: Child directs the mother or asks for direction, but not to elicit help, e.g., "mom, you play with that toy over there," "should I say my ABC's?"

Direct while testing limits: Child directs the mother in a demanding and inappropriate way, but not to elicit help, e.g., child grabs the toy, saying, "give me that toy."

Request togetherness: Child draws mother into play or elicits help, e.g., "mom, please play with me."

Demand togetherness: Child draws mother into play or elicits help in an inappropriate and demanding way, e.g., child yells, "help me go to the bathroom now!"

Testing limits while distant: Child plays independently in an inappropriate or destructive manner, e.g., child repeatedly bangs the toy loudly on the table.

Testing limits while close: Child maintains physical contact with mother while playing in an inappropriate or destructive manner, e.g., child hits mother.

Maternal and Child Codes

Emphasize individuality: Discussing separate thoughts, feelings, and actions, often in a questioning way, e.g., "What did you do while I was gone?"; "Which one do you want?"

Emphasize mutuality: Discussing shared activities and experiences, e.g., "This puzzle is hard for us."

Activity as playmates: Playing together, doing an activity cooperatively.

Parallel activity: Playing simultaneously, but separately.

Physical distance: Physically near but not touching, e.g., sitting near but in separate chairs.

Physical proximity: Physically close and touching, e.g., child sits on mother's lap.

Positive response: Responding to the other in a positive or reinforcing way, e.g., "Good job!"

Negative response: Responding to the other in a negative or punishing way, e.g., "You're being bad," "Ha, you lost!"

Delayed response: Not responding to the other verbally or nonverbally within 5–10 s.

REFERENCES

- Azuma, H. (1986). Why study child development in Japan? In H. Stevenson, H. Azuma, & K. Hakuta (Eds.), *Child development and education in Japan* (pp. 3–12). New York: Freeman.
- Barnlund, D. C. (1989). *Communicative styles of Japanese and Americans: Images and realities*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

- Bartko, J. J. (1991). *Some comments on the intraclass correlation and kappa: Measures of reliability*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Bates, E. (1990). Language about me and you: Pronominal reference and the emerging concept of self. In D. Cicchetti & M. Beeghly (Eds.), *The self in transition: Infancy to childhood* (pp. 165–182). Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Bornstein, M. H. (1989). Cross-cultural developmental comparisons: The case of Japanese–American infant and mother activities and interactions. What we know, what we need to know, and why we need to know. *Developmental Review*, 9, 171–204.
- Bowlby, J. (1969). *Attachment and loss: Vol. 1. Attachment*. New York: Basic Books.
- Bruner, J. (1990). *Acts of meaning*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Campos, J. J., & Barrett, K. C. (1988). Toward a new understanding of emotions and their development. In C. E. Izard & J. Kagan (Eds.), *Emotions, cognition, and behavior* (pp. 229–263). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Carmichael-Olson, H., Greenberg, M. T., & Slough, N. (1985). *Coding manual for the waiting task*. Unpublished manual, University of Washington, Seattle.
- Caudill, W., & Frost, L. (1970). A comparison of maternal care and infant behavior in Japanese–American, American, and Japanese families. In U. Bronfenbrenner & M. A. Mahoney (Eds.), *Influences on human development* (pp. 139–150). Hinsdale, IL: Dryden.
- Caudill, W., & Weinstein, H. (1974). Maternal care and infant behavior in Japan. In T. Lebra & W. Lebra (Eds.), *Japanese culture and behavior* (pp. 225–276). Honolulu, HI: East-West.
- Chavajay, P., & Rogoff, B. (1999). Cultural variation in management of attention by children and their caregivers. *Developmental Psychology*, 35, 1079–1090.
- Cole, P. M., & Dennis, T. A. (1998). Variations on a theme: Culture and the meaning of socialization practices and child competence. *Psychological Inquiry*, 9, 276–278.
- Cole, P. M., & Zahn-Waxler, C. (1988). *The prediction of conduct problems during the transition from preschool to school age*. National Institute of Mental Health unpublished data, protocol 88M217.
- Conroy, M., Hess, R. D., Azuma, H., & Kashiwagi, K. (1980). Maternal strategies for regulating children's behavior. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 11, 153–172.
- Cousins, S. (1989). Culture and selfhood in Japan and the U.S. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 56, 124–131.
- Denham, S. A. (1998). *Emotional development in young children*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Denham, S. A., & Grout, L. (1993). Socialization of emotion: Pathways to preschoolers' emotional and social competence. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior*, 17, 205–227.
- Doi, T. (1973). *The anatomy of dependence*. Tokyo: Kodansha International.
- Eisenberg, N., Cumberland, A., & Spinrad, T. L. (1998). Parental socialization of emotion. *Psychological Inquiry*, 9, 241–273.
- Field, T. (1994). The effects of mother's physical and emotional unavailability on emotion regulation. In N. A. Fox (Ed.), *The development of emotion regulation: Biological and behavioral considerations* (pp. 208–227). *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, 59(2–3, Serial No. 240).
- Fleiss, J. L. (1981). *Statistical methods for rates and proportions*. New York: Wiley.
- Gilligan, C. (1986). Remapping the moral domain: New images of the self in relationship. In T. C. Heller, M. Sosna, & D. E. Wellbery (Eds.), *Reconstructing individualism: Autonomy, individuality, and the self in western thought* (pp. 237–252). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Gjerde, P. F. (1996). Longitudinal research in cultural context: Reflections, prospects, challenges. In D. W. Shwalb & B. J. Shwalb (Eds.), *Japanese childrearing: Two generations of scholarship* (pp. 279–299). New York: Guilford Press.
- Harkness, S., & Super, C. M. (1983). The cultural construction of child development: A framework for the socialization of affect. *Ethos*, 11, 221–231.
- Hess, R. D., Kashiwagi, K., Azuma, H., Price, G. G., & Dickson, W. P. (1980). Maternal expectations for mastery of developmental tasks in Japan and the United States. *International Journal of Psychology*, 15, 259–271.
- Hollingshead, A. (1975). *Four factor index of social status*. Unpublished manuscript, Yale University, New Haven, CT.
- Holloway, S. D. (1999). Divergent cultural models of child rearing and pedagogy in Japanese preschools. In E. Turiel (Ed.), W. Damon (Series Ed.), *New directions for child and adolescent development: Vol. 83. Development and cultural change: Reciprocal processes* (pp. 61–75). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Humphrey, L. L., & Benjamin, L. S. (1989). *An observational coding system for use with structural analysis of social behavior: The training manual*. Chicago: Family Institute.
- Johnson, F. A. (1992). *Dependency and Japanese socialization: Psychoanalytic and anthropological investigations in clinginess*. New York: New York University Press.
- Kagitcibasi, C. (1994). A critical appraisal of individualism and collectivism: Toward a new formulation. In U. Kim, H. Triandis, C. Kagitcibasi, S. Choi, & G. Yoon (Eds.), *Individualism and collectivism: Theory, method, and applications* (pp. 52–65). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Kagitcibasi, C. (1996). The autonomous-relational self: A new synthesis. *European Psychologist*, 1, 180–186.
- Kitayama, S., & Markus, H. R. (Eds.). (1994). *Emotion and culture: Empirical studies of mutual influence*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Kitayama, S., Markus, H. R., & Lieberman, C. (1995). The collective construction of self-esteem. In J. A. Russell (Ed.), *Everyday conceptions of emotions* (pp. 523–550). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Kobayashi-Winata, H., & Power, T. G. (1989). Child rearing and compliance: Japanese and American families in Houston. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 20, 333–356.
- Kochanska, G. (1997). Mutually responsive orientation between mothers and their young children: Implications for early socialization. *Child Development* 68, 94–112.

- Kojima, H. (1986). Child rearing concepts as a belief-value system of the society and individual. In H. Stevenson, H. Azuma, & K. Hakuta (Eds.), *Child development and education in Japan* (pp. 49–54). New York: W.H. Freeman.
- Kopp, C. B. (1982). Antecedents of self-regulation: A developmental perspective. *Developmental Psychology*, *18*, 199–214.
- Kopp, C. B. (1989). Regulation of distress and negative emotions: A developmental view. *Developmental Psychology*, *25*, 343–354.
- Kumagai, H. A., & Kumagai, A. K. (1986). The hidden “I” in clinginess: “Passive love” and Japanese social perception. *Ethos*, *15*, 305–320.
- Lebra, T. S. (1976). *Japanese patterns of behavior*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Lebra, T. S. (1992). Self in Japanese culture. In N. Rosenburger (Ed.), *Japanese sense of self* (pp. 105–120). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- LeVine, R. A. (1990). Enculturation: A biosocial perspective on the development of self. In D. Cicchetti & M. Beeghly (Eds.), *The self in transition: Infancy to childhood* (pp. 99–117). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review*, *98*, 224–253.
- Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1994). The cultural construction of self and emotion: Implications for social behavior. In S. Kitayama & H. R. Markus (Eds.), *Emotion and culture: Empirical studies of mutual influence* (pp. 89–132). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Matsumoto, D. (1996). *Unmasking Japan: Myths and realities about the emotions of the Japanese*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Matsumoto, D., Kudoh, T., Scherer, K., & Wallbott, H. (1988). Antecedents of and reactions to emotions in the United States and Japan. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *19*, 267–286.
- Mesquita, B., Frijda, N. H., & Scherer, K. R. (1997). Culture and emotion. In J. W. Berry & P. R. Dasen (Eds.), *Handbook of cross-cultural psychology: Vol. 2. Basic processes and human development* (2nd ed., pp. 255–297). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Miyake, K., Campos, J. J., Kagan, J., & Bradshaw, D. L. (1986). Issues in socioemotional development. In H. Stevenson, H. Azuma, & K. Hakuta (Eds.), *Child development and education in Japan* (pp. 239–261). New York: W.H. Freeman.
- Mizuta, I., Zahn-Waxler, C., Cole, P. M., & Hiruma, N. (1996). A cross-cultural study of preschoolers’ attachment: Security and sensitivity in Japanese and US dyads. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, *19*, 141–159.
- Morsbach, H. (1973). Aspects of nonverbal communication in Japan. *The Journal of Nervous and Mental Diseases*, *157*, 262–277.
- Nucci, L. P., & Turiel, E. (2000). The moral and the personal: Sources of social conflicts. In L. P. Nucci & G. B. Saxe (Eds.), *Culture, thought, and development. The Jean Piaget symposium series* (pp. 115–137). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Power, T. G., Kobayashi-Winata, H., & Kelley, M. L. (1992). Childrearing patterns in Japan and the United States: A cluster analytic study. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, *15*, 185–205.
- Quinn, N., & Holland, D. (1987). Culture and cognition. In D. Holland & N. Quinn (Eds.), *Cultural models in language and thought* (pp. 1–40). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Raver, C. C. (1996). Relations between social contingency in mother-child interactions and two-year-olds’ social competence. *Developmental Psychology*, *32*, 850–859.
- Rogoff, B. (1990). *Apprenticeship in thinking: Cognitive development in social context*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Rogoff, B. (1996). Developmental transitions in children’s participation in sociocultural activities. In A. J. Sameroff & M. M. Haith (Eds.), *The five to seven year shift: The age of reason and responsibility* (pp. 273–294). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Rogoff, B. (1997, April). *Development as transformation of participation in sociocultural activities*. Paper presented at the biennial meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, Washington, DC.
- Rogoff, B., Mistry, J., Goncu, A., & Mosier, C. (1993). Guided participation in cultural activity by toddlers and caregivers. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, *58*(1, Serial No. 236).
- Rothbaum, F., Pott, M., Azuma, H., Miyake, K., & Weisz, J. (2000). The development of close relationships in Japan and the United States: Paths of symbiotic harmony and generative tension. *Child Development*, *71*, 1121–1142.
- Rothbaum, F., Pott, M., & Tsang, B. Y. (1997, April). The development of close relationships in Japan and the United States: Merging with others versus incorporating others. In M. Pott (Chair), *The development of close relationships in Japan and the United States*. Symposium conducted at the biennial meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, Washington, DC.
- Russell, J. A. & Sato, K. (1995). Comparing emotion words between languages. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *26*, 384–391.
- Sarni, C. (1993). Socialization of emotion. In M. Lewis & J. M. Haviland (Eds.), *Handbook of emotions* (pp. 435–446). New York: Guilford Press.
- Sarni, C. (1999). *The development of emotional competence*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Shweder, R. A. (1990). Cultural psychology—What is it? In J. W. Stigler, R. A. Shweder, & G. Herdt (Eds.), *Cultural psychology: Essays on comparative human development* (pp. 1–46). Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.
- Shweder, R. A., & Bourne, E. J. (1984). Does the concept of the person vary cross-culturally? In R. A. Shweder & R. A. Levine (Eds.), *Culture theory: Essays on mind, self, and emotion* (pp. 158–199). Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.
- Super, C. M., & Harkness, S. (1993). The developmental niche: A conceptualization at the interface of child and culture. In R. A. Pierce & M. A. Black (Eds.), *Life-span*

- development: A diversity reader* (pp. 61–77). Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt Publishing.
- Triandis, H. C. (1994). Theoretical and methodological approaches to the study of collectivism and individualism. In U. Kim, H. C. Triandis, C. Kagitcibasi, S. Choi, & G. Yoon (Eds.), *Individualism and collectivism: Theory, methods, and applications* (pp. 41–51). London: Sage.
- Triandis, H. C. (1995). *Individualism and collectivism*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Triandis, H. C., Leung, K., Villareal, M., & Clack, F. L. (1985). Allocentric vs. idiocentric tendencies: Convergent and discriminant validation. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *19*, 395–415.
- Triandis, H. C., & Trafimow, D. (2001). Cross-national prevalence of collectivism. In C. Sedikides & M. B. Brewer (Eds.), *Individual self, relational self, collective self* (pp. 259–276). Philadelphia, PA: Psychology Press.
- Ujiie, T. (1997, April). Emotion as a relational process: Preliminary observations of Japanese and U.S. mother–infant dyads in relation to stress regulation. In J. J. Campos (Chair), *Cultural and cross-cultural approaches to emotional development*. Symposium conducted at the biennial meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, Washington, DC.
- Vogel, E. F., & Vogel, S. H. (1961). Family security, personal immaturity, and emotional health in a Japanese sample. *Marriage and Family Living*, *23*, 161–166.
- White, M. I., & Levine, R. A. (1986). What is an ii ko (good child)? In H. Stevenson, H. Azuma, & K. Hakuta (Eds.), *Child development and education in Japan* (pp. 55–62). New York: W.H. Freeman.
- Zahn-Waxler, C. (2000). The early development of empathy, guilt and internalization of distress: Implications for gender differences in internalizing and externalizing problems. In R. Davidson (Ed.), *Wisconsin Symposium on Emotion: Vol. 1. Anxiety, depression and emotion* (pp. 222–265). Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press.
- Zahn-Waxler, C., Friedman, R. J., Cole, P. M., Mizuta, I., & Hiruma, N. (1996). Japanese and United States preschool children's responses to conflict and distress. *Child Development*, *67*, 2462–2476.