

## **INFORMATION TO USERS**

**This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.**

**The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.**

**In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.**

**Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.**

**Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.**

# **UMI**

**A Bell & Howell Information Company  
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA  
313/761-4700 800/521-0600**



**Order Number 9520537**

**Culture and preschoolers' activities: The United States and  
Korea**

**Lee, Soeun, Ph.D.**

**The University of North Carolina at Greensboro, 1994**

**U·M·I**

**300 N. Zeeb Rd.  
Ann Arbor, MI 48106**



CULTURE AND PRESCHOOLERS' ACTIVITIES:

THE UNITED STATES AND KOREA

by

Soeun Lee

A Dissertation Submitted to  
the Faculty of the Graduate School at  
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro  
in Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the degree  
Doctor of Philosophy

Greensboro  
1994

Approved by

  
Dissertation Advisor

LEE, SOEUN, Ph.D. Culture and Preschoolers' Activities:  
the United States and Korea. (1994)  
Directed by Dr. Jonathan R. H. Tudge. 137 pp.

The purpose of this study was to explore the variation in children's daily activities both within and across the US and Korea. For this purpose, observations were made of the types of activities available for young children, the extent of children's participation in those activities, their partners, the respective roles taken by children and their partners, and the location in which children's activities took place.

Participants, ranging in age from 28 to 48 months, were drawn from four cultural groups: middle and working class communities of the US and Korea. Data were obtained through the observation of children's daily life in natural settings. A total of 5725 observation from 32 preschool (20 from the US and 12 from Korea) children were used in the analyses. To test the differences between nations and/or classes, phi coefficient tests were employed.

The results indicate that preschoolers' activities varied as a function of class differences as well as societal differences. US and Korean children experienced different types of daily activities that reflected socio-cultural values of their respective communities, i.e., independence in the US and interdependence in Korea. In both societies, however, middle class children were more

likely than their working class counterparts to be self-directed, and to be more involved in academic lessons and play with academic objects.

APPROVAL PAGE

This dissertation has been approved by the following committee of the Faculty of The Graduate School at The University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Dissertation Advisor

Jonathan Tudge  
Dr. Jonathan Tudge

Committee Members

Dale Farran  
Dr. Dale Farran

Hyman Rodman  
Dr. Hyman Rodman

Willie Baber  
Dr. Willie Baber

October 12, 1994

Date of Acceptance by Committee

September 27, 1994

Date of Final Oral Examination



## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to thank to all the people who contributed in completing this study in some way.

Above all else, I deeply thank to my advisor, Dr. Jonathan Tudge for giving me a chance to be a member of this wonderful project and for educating me to salute differences in different worlds. My thanks is extended to the other committee members, Drs. Dale Farran, Hyman Rodman, and Willie Baber, for their thoughtful evaluation and guidance of my work. I also thank to Dr. Changeun Koh for his help in preparation of final copies of this dissertation.

Recognition is extended to all the families who participated in this study. Without their cooperation and patience this study could not exist. I gratefully acknowledge the help of Sarah Putnam and Judy Sidden who collected the US data. Finally, my thanks go to HDFS department for its consistent financial support, which made it possible for me to study in this great school.

TABLE OF CONTENT

	Page
APPROVAL PAGE.....	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT.....	iii
LIST OF TABLES.....	vi
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Objective.....	4
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.....	6
Theoretical Framework: Cultural-Historical Theory and Ecological Systems Theory.....	6
Six Cultures Project.....	15
Cultural Traits of the US and Korea.....	20
Cultural Values and Child Rearing: Empirical Studies.....	26
Social Class and Child Rearing.....	32
Summary.....	39
Research Questions and Hypotheses.....	41
III. METHODOLOGY.....	45
Observation of Children's life in Cultural Context.....	45
Participants.....	46
USA (Greensboro, NC).....	47
Korea (Suweon).....	50
Instrument.....	53
Procedure.....	57
Method.....	58
Videotaping.....	59
Reliability.....	60
Analytic Plan.....	62
IV. RESULTS.....	64
Question 1.....	64
Hypothesis 1-1.....	65
Hypothesis 1-2.....	68
Hypothesis 1-3 and 1-4.....	69
Question 2.....	71
Hypothesis 2-1.....	74
Hypothesis 2-2.....	74

Hypothesis 2-3.....	79
Question 3.....	80
Hypothesis 3-1.....	82
Hypothesis 3-2.....	83
Question 4.....	85
Hypothesis 4-1.....	87
Hypothesis 4-2.....	88
Variance of data.....	89
V. DISCUSSION.....	93
REFERENCES.....	107
· APPENDIX A. Coding Manual and Sheet.....	114
APPENDIX B. Parental Letter.....	129
APPENDIX C. Telephone Protocol.....	131
APPENDIX D. Initial Home Interview.....	133
APPENDIX E. Parental Consent Form.....	135
APPENDIX F. Child Care Center Consent Form.....	137

## LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Exposure to and Engagement in Activities, by Community.....	66
2	Activities Coded While Children Were Sleeping, by Community.....	67
3	Exposure to and Engagement in Conversation, by Nation.....	68
4	Exposure to and Engagement in Interpersonal Lessons, by Nation.....	69
5	Exposure to and Engagement in Academic Lessons and Play with Academic Objects, by Class Within Nation.....	71
6	Partners in Activities, by Community.....	72
7	Partners in Each Activity, by Community.....	73
8	Activities Accompanied by Partners, by Nation.....	75
9	Mothers' Engagement in Activities, by Nation.....	76
10	Mothers' Engagement in Activities Given Their Presence, by Nation.....	78
11	Mothers and Fathers as Partners Given Their Presence, by Community.....	78
12	Children's Roles in Activities, by Community.....	81
13	Partners' Roles in Activities, by Community.....	82
14	Initiation of Activities and Involvement in the Activities, by Nation.....	84
15	Initiation of Activities and Involvement in the Activities, by Class within Nation.....	86
16	Location of Activities, by Community.....	87
17	Activities Occurring in Child-modified Locations, by Nation.....	88

18	Exposure to and Engagement in Academic Lessons in Preschool (or Other Childcare Settings), by Nation.....	89
19	Variance of Data Regarding Available Activities, by Community.....	91
20	Variance of Data Regarding Mothers as Partners, by Community.....	92
21	Variance of Data Regarding Children's Initiation of Activities, by Community.....	92

CHAPTER I  
INTRODUCTION

Life as a human being means living in a socially organized world and knowing how to move around comfortably in some part of that world. It means knowing, in various contexts and settings, the rules for social interaction with others; and it means possessing the various kinds of competencies required in each context or setting. Humans, above all else, are social animals.

Children acquire the competencies considered important in their culture through participation in everyday activities and through interaction with people surrounding them. The types of activities in which adults engage, and which they give children the opportunity to practice, differ widely across cultural communities. Simultaneously, the ways that adults encourage or discourage children's participation in those activities also vary across cultures. This variation in activities is determined by the values and beliefs of competent members, which are in turn derived from the cultural and historical institutions of the community.

Children are not just assigned to activities but they try to get involved in the activities that are going on around them. They attempt to participate in the available activities, to start new activities, and to gather partners to participate with them. Children themselves become

competent members of their society through active participation in daily activities.

Different cultural communities design different daily routines for children which serve to enhance their learning of cultural knowledge. The main assumption of this study is that in different cultures there will be variation in children's daily life in terms of the type of available activities, the extent of participation in those activities, their partners, the respective roles taken by children and their partners, and the location in which the activities take place.

This assumption was tested in two different societies: the US and Korea. Both the US and Korea are industrialized and technologically complex societies. Despite this similarity in maintenance systems, the dominant socio-cultural values of the US and Korea are radically different. The differences are represented at both the personal and the societal level. At the personal level, the fundamental concepts about the self are different. Americans define themselves as independent while Koreans regard themselves as interdependent (Cousins, 1989; Marsella, De Vos, & Hsu, 1985; Shweder, 1990; Shweder & Levine, 1984; Stigler, Shweder, & Herdt, 1990; Triandis, 1989). At the societal level, the structures of interpersonal relationships are different. Interpersonal relationships in the US are horizontal whereas those in Korea are vertical. Because of

the influence of traditional Confucian values, interpersonal relationships in Korea were based on the superiority/inferiority rule (Baker, 1979; Kuno, 1986). Some changes have been going on over the last few decades (mainly because of the Western influence), but compared to the US, the nature of society is still more hierarchal in Korea.

To say that all the people in the US or in Korea hold the same values, however, oversimplifies reality. Within-society differences do exist in the two nations. The common significant factor that causes within-society differences in the US and Korea is social class. Kohn (1977, 1979) argued that middle class people value self-direction while working class people value conformity. Kohn (1979) also argued that this value difference may be relatively invariant across societies.

The purpose of this study is to explore the variation in children's daily activities both within and across the US and Korea. I predict that children of the US and Korea experience different daily routines which assist their learning of different socio-cultural values, i.e., independent and equal as opposed to interdependent and hierarchal. At the same time, I expect that middle and working class children undergo different daily activities that encourage their learning of different social class values, i.e., self-direction as opposed to conformity.



Especially, I predict that the class differences cut across the societal differences. In other words, I anticipate finding relatively similar effects of class membership across the US and Korea. The daily routine activities of children, therefore, will vary as a function of class difference as well as societal difference.

#### Objective

Culture has been defined in various ways. In this study, culture is defined as a set of shared and learned values and beliefs, behaviors, attitudes, ideals that are characteristics of a particular group, and which are passed on and recreated anew from generation to generation. In this sense, different levels of culture exist -- such as society (US and Korea), subculture (race, ethnicity, social class, etc.), region (for example, US north and south), family, and so on. Though there are various levels of cultures, the main interest of this study is to examine cultural differences at the societal level (the US and Korea) and the within-societal level (class).

The objective of this study is to explore the variation in the types of activities available to young children both within and across the US and Korea. Children from four different cultural groups were examined: middle and working class communities of the US and Korea. The type of available activities for young children, the extent of children's participation in those activities, their

partners, the respective roles taken by children and their partners, and the location in which children's activities take place were compared to describe the variation in children's daily routines. Through this study the process whereby children are assisted to become competent members, i.e., skillful in performing culturally specified tasks of their cultural groups (Ogbu, 1981), will be illustrated.

## CHAPTER II

## REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Theoretical Framework: Cultural-Historical Theory and Ecological Systems Theory

The theoretical foundation for this study are Vygotsky's cultural-historical theory, and Bronfenbrenner's ecological systems theory. Both theories emphasize the need for considering the processes of development, as they occur in different cultural, historical, and social contexts, rather than just focusing on the developmental outcomes.

Cultural-historical theory has emphasized that ways of thinking and behaving are not innate characteristics of a person but partly the product of the environment in which the person functions (Vygotsky, 1978, 1987). Influenced by the Marxian concept of dialectical materialism, Vygotsky believed that all phenomena should be studied as processes in motion and in change. That is, the process of development or adaptation, instead of static outcomes, should be examined in order to understand individual psychological functioning. Rather than focusing on individual responses to environmental stimuli as the unit of analysis, the Vygotskian approach therefore focuses on the concept of activity.

Vygotsky (1978) argued that human development is inseparable from human social and cultural activities. And

children's development can best be understood by observing both the immediate interactional context and the broader social and cultural setting within which their activities take place. Central to Vygotsky's theory is that it is in the course of everyday routine activities that children gain cultural knowledge, including knowledge about ways of behaving and thinking considered important in that community (Rogoff, 1990; Tudge & Winterhoff, 1993; Vygotsky, 1978, 1987; Wertsch, 1991). The intellectual skills or patterns of thinking that a person displays, therefore, are not primarily determined by innate factors, such as inherited intelligence or mental abilities. Instead, patterns and levels of thinking are products of the activities practiced in the social institutions of the culture in which the individual grows up.

Vygotsky emphasized the social adaptation of humans to their environments through cultural history. He believed that the development of higher mental processes involves learning to handle inventions of society such as tools, symbolic systems, and institutions which are formed over historical time. Broader cultural and historical surroundings in which a person is currently embedded mold the thought and behavior patterns of the person. He described the dynamics of cultural and historical development as follows:

Culture creates special forms of behavior, changes the functioning of mind, constructs new levels in the developing system of human behavior... In the process of historical development, a social being changes the means and methods of his behavior, transforms natural inclinations and functions, develops and creates new, specifically cultural forms of behavior (1983, pp. 29-30, quoted in Tudge & Winterhoff, 1993, p. 66).

Vygotsky maintained that patterns of interpersonal behaviors are also fashioned by cultural history, and interpersonal interactions can only be understood within broader cultural and historical contexts. From the Vygotskian point of view, the nature and processes of interaction between people in a specific setting cannot be fully understood without reference to the meaning of the context within their cultural history.

Vygotsky believed that children need to be guided by people who are already skilled in handling inventions of their cultures in order to learn to competently deal with them. Development and learning, therefore, are not spontaneous but guided and channeled by other people. Interpersonal situations are crucial for guiding children in the development of the normative skills and behaviors of their culture, since information regarding tools, practices, and institutions is obtained through children's interaction with more experienced members of society. The social interaction style of a culture, therefore, provides an essential context for human development. Indeed, the child's individual social and cognitive activity derives

from his interactions with other people. The fundamental tenet of Vygotsky's approach that human development emerges out of social interaction is well captured in the following sentences:

Any function in children's cultural development appears twice, or on two planes. First it appears on the social plane and then on the psychological plane. First it appears between peoples as an interpsychological category and then within the individual child as an intrapsychological category. This is equally true with regard to voluntary attention, logical memory, the formation of concepts and the development of volition (Vygotsky, 1978, p. 57).

Stated succinctly, in the Vygotskian perspective, proximal (i.e., social interactions) as well as distal influences of culture (i.e., broader historical and cultural inventions) are viewed as central to the process of human development.

In spite of his emphasis on environment, Vygotsky did not believe that development is a passive process. Instead, as Rogoff, Gauvain, and Ellis (1984) argued, Vygotsky emphasized the instrumental function of the person who, by acting upon his environment, changes his own development. Vygotsky held a firm belief in transaction between organisms and environment. Cultures socialize or enculturate children, but, at the same time, children themselves create their own understanding of the world from their own activity on it. Development, therefore, is the process of co-

construction in which children actively construct and reconstruct their world with the help of competent others (Tudge, Putnam, & Valsiner, in press; Valsiner, 1989).

How can we analyze the complex unit of a constantly changing "child in activity" in relation to his/her constantly changing environment? The methodology can be found in Bronfenbrenner's ecological systems theory.

Bronfenbrenner's ecological systems theory is a way of conceptualizing the changing maturing person in relation to the changing environment--social, physical, cultural and historical (Bronfenbrenner, 1979, 1988, 1993; Bronfenbrenner & Crouter, 1983; Bronfenbrenner, Ceci, & Lenzenweger, in press; Tudge, Gray, & Hogan, in press). Like Vygotsky, Bronfenbrenner perceived development as a two-way process. The developing child is greatly affected by the immediate and remote environments, but, at the same time, his/her attributes also shape the course of development. Bronfenbrenner has also emphasized the need to consider process, i.e., the interrelationships between the developing child and environments, throughout his theory. He describes the dynamics between the developing organism and the environment as follows:

Hence, from its beginnings, development involves interaction between organism and environment. Moreover, interaction implies a two-way activity. The external becomes internal, and becomes transformed in the process. But because, almost from their moment of birth, the organism begins to change its environment,

the internal becomes external, and becomes transformed in the process (Bronfenbrenner, Ceci, Lenzenweger, in press, p. 9).

In agreement with Vygotsky, Bronfenbrenner (1979, 1983, 1993) believes that although the direct effects of the immediate social and physical environment are very important, these cannot be well understood without taking into account more distal processes, such as social, historical, and cultural conditions that only affect the developing child indirectly. Based on proximity, he defined the various interrelated set of contexts as microsystem, mesosystem, exosystem, and macrosystem. The microsystem and mesosystem refer to the environments in which the developing person is actually present, and direct interaction with persons or objects in the immediate situation is possible. Conversely, the exosystem and macrosystem refer to rather broad environmental contexts in which such direct interaction is not possible.

Specifically, a microsystem is a setting in which an individual develops through interaction with social partners. A setting is a place where people can readily engage in face to face interaction, such as a home, daycare center, play group, classroom, work place and so on. Such factors as activities in which a person engages, the roles taken by the participants in those activities, and the interpersonal relations between the person and others constitute the elements of the microsystem.



Two or more microsystems, of course, can affect the behavior and development of the child simultaneously. For example, a child engages in activities occurring in different settings, i.e., home, peer groups, school, and church, at the same time. The relations between the microsettings constitute the mesosystem.

The exosystem comprises the linkages between two or more settings, at least one of which does not contain the developing person, but in which events occurring indirectly influence the immediate setting in which the person lives. An example for the developing child is the link between home and parental work place. The nature of the work that parents perform can regulate their values and behaviors and influence the activities and the interpersonal relations that the child experiences at home. For instance, parents whose occupations are not routinized or supervised tend to emphasize self-direction, such as individualism, initiative, and achievement, whereas those who work in routinized, and closely supervised conditions tend to stress characteristics such as orderliness, neatness, and obedience in their children.

The broadest context that Bronfenbrenner specified is the macrosystem which mainly refers to the attributes of a culture. He defined the macrosystem as follows:

The macrosystem consists of the overarching pattern of micro- meso- and exosystems characteristic of a given

culture, subculture, or other extended social structure, with particular reference to the developmentally instigative belief systems, resources, hazards, lifestyles, opportunity structures, life course options and patterns of social interchange that are embedded in such overarching systems (Bronfenbrenner, 1993, p. 25).

The developing person is affected, although indirectly, by cultural and/or subcultural attributes. For example, people in an independent culture may promote independence, assertiveness, and individuation, whereas people in an interdependent culture encourage interdependence, modesty, and group-orientedness in their children. Such differences in value systems of overarching cultural groups regulate many facets of the developing children's life.

The methodology, proposed by Bronfenbrenner (1988, Bronfenbrenner, et al., in press), that enables researchers to study the developing child in conjunction with the changing environment is the Person-Process-Context model. This model requires information about three domains: first, the contexts in which development is taking place (such as cultural and subcultural); second, the personal characteristics of the person present in that context (such as gender or degree of independence/assertiveness); and third, the process through which their development is brought about (such as interaction with others in daily activities).

Bronfenbrenner (1988) argued that, though widely employed, social address models which only demonstrate that social groups differ along some dimension such as nationality, race, ethnicity, or social class without considering the process are simplistic. They are simplistic because they just focus on the followings:

...only at the social address - that is, the environmental label - with no attention to what the environment is like, what people are living there, what they are doing, or how that activities taking place could affect the child (Bronfenbrenner & Crouter, 1983, pp. 361-2).

The person-process-context model, which emphasizes the processes of reciprocal and enduring interaction between a child and the person, objects, and symbols in its environment, enables scholars to focus on the interactional process which the social address model fails to address. The person-process-context model, therefore, gives a better understanding of how membership in different cultural groups leads to different developmental outcomes for the group members.

In sum, the theories of both Vygotsky and Bronfenbrenner point out the necessity of analyzing the "child in activity" as a unit in order to understand the developmental processes of children. At the same time, their theories maintain that considering the history of the community in which a child is reared (i.e., its broad social

and cultural traditions), and the child's own developmental history in term of his own experience in that community (i.e., daily routine activities being engaged in, interaction with other members of his community), are both essential in understanding the development of children. Accordingly, ecological systems theory proposes that an appropriate methodology for studying the complex and ever-changing developmental processes of children should be the Person-Process-Context model.

#### Six Cultures Project

As Vygotsky (1978, 1987) and Bronfenbrenner (1988, 1993) have argued, in dealing with phenomena like child rearing, the broader cultural background and context of the phenomena should be considered. Child rearing practices in a particular culture can be badly misinterpreted if reported without consideration of the cultural context in which they occur. The most extensive research investigating child rearing within different cultural contexts, focusing on interactions between children and people in their immediate environments, is the Six Cultures Project.

The Six Cultures Project was directed by John and Beatrice Whiting, using the method of direct observation of children's daily life in natural settings. Six pairs of investigators collected firsthand data on 134 children from six communities: India, Okinawa, the Philippines, Mexico, Kenya, and the US. A total of at least fourteen five-minute

observations were made on each child; special attention was given to the behavior of children between three and eleven years olds as they interacted with peers, infants, and adults during various kinds of activities (play, work, and learning) in various natural settings (home, garden, and school). The findings of the project were summarized by several scholars (Minturn & Lambert, 1964; Whiting & Whiting, 1975).

Minturn and Lambert (1964) designed a study to examine how cultural variables influence maternal child training practices. Their analyses were based primarily on data from questionnaires administered to mothers in each community. The results show that cultural variance in household composition, size of family, work load, etc., determine the time and energy that mothers have available to care for children. These factors regulate the range and content of mother-child relations and the context in which these relations must take place.

Based on their findings, Minturn and Lambert argued that the differences in natural and social environmental conditions relate to the diversity of cultural norms regarding child rearing such as adult attitudes toward child obedience, responsibility for chores, treatment of aggression, and discipline in the six societies.

Whiting and Whiting (1975) also presented data on child behavior in relation to selected variables. Their study

documented the powerful influence of culture on children's behavior and their relationships to the people with whom they interacted. Data on the history, environment, maintenance system, and learning environments of each culture were collected. The best predictors of the social behavior of children between the ages of three to eleven were, in order of importance, the type of economic system (for example, whether industrial or agricultural) in which the child was reared, the status of the person with whom the child was interacting, the child's sex, the child's age, the child's position in sibling order, and differences between the child's learning environment and that of his/her peers. Of the cultural predictors, the most powerful was the level of socioeconomic complexity. Children in relatively simple cultures were high on nurturance and low on egoism, whereas children in complex cultures were egoistic and not very nurturant.

Whiting and Whiting reported that socioeconomic and domestic structures (i.e., nuclear or extended) of a community regulate children's daily routines - such as play space and playmates, available caretakers, teachers, the activities in which children participate, the workload of mother, opportunity to interact with father and so on - and result in different social behavior of children across communities.

Following the Six Cultures Project, further observational study of children's social behavior was conducted in Africa. Besides the original communities which were included in the six cultures study, six other communities were added. B. Whiting and six other scholars participated in the study, collected and coded behavior observations using a modified version of the methods developed for the Six Cultures Project. Recently, Whiting and Edwards (1988) published the results of their study.

They reported that socio-cultural conditions of daily life, such as workloads, and availability of social supports determine the nature of maternal behavior to children and children's activities. For instance, prosocial commanding was the most frequent form of social acts to children for African mothers who bore the heaviest workload among communities. Accordingly, African children, especially daughters, were recruited as mothers' main assistants in economic and household work and child care from an early age. By contrast, for US mothers who had the lightest workloads and the least opportunity for adult social contact during the day, sociability ranked highest in maternal behavior.

Based on these findings, Edwards and Whiting also concluded that cultural forces modulate the social development of children. The types of behavior which adults expected from children, which they gave children the most

opportunity to practice, and which they made meaningful to children in terms of central cultural goals and values were all compellingly regulated by cultural factors such as type of economy, workloads of adults, household composition, and the like.

The Six Cultures Project examined the impact of cultural conditions - especially the maintenance system such as subsistence patterns, means of production, settlement patterns, and family structures - on the child rearing patterns and subsequent child behaviors. This project set a new perspective in child rearing studies, since the conclusion of this study is that child training practices are based upon certain conditions in the natural and social environment that make them necessary for survival.

The authors in the Six Cultures Project did a good job in explaining the effect of maintenance systems on child rearing, but they largely ignored the role played by cultural values and beliefs. As many researchers (Caudill & Plath, 1966; Caudill & Weinstein, 1969; Conroy, Hess, Azuma, & Kashiwagi, 1980; Otaki, Durrett, Richards, Nyquist, & Pennebaker, 1986; Toda, Fogel, & Kawai, 1990) have reported, societies with similar technological complexity often show radically different child rearing practices as the result of different value systems.

The scholars in the Six Cultures Project also did not pay specific attention to within-society differences in



child rearing. Within any single society, there is likely to be variation of values that is reflected in child rearing practices. The most common factor that causes the within-society differences across cultures is class difference (Kohn, 1969, 1979). In most cases, however, authors in the Six Cultures Project observed only one community from a country, and did not consider the fact that the mother-child interaction patterns that they found could vary in terms of social class grouping.

For these reasons, this study examines the child rearing practices within as well as across technologically similar societies, and tries to reveal the effects of value system and class membership on child development, something that the Six Cultures Project did not explore.

#### Cultural Traits of the US and Korea

The US and Korea are both technologically complex and industrialized nations. However, at the basic level of culturally and historically developed values and beliefs, they are quite different. In particular, the US and Korea belong to two different cultures, the West and the East. The basic philosophies of Westerners and Easterners regarding people's lives are different in some marked ways.

People of the West and the East are known to have strikingly different conceptions of the self, of others, and of the relation of the two. In general, people in the West perceive themselves as independent while Easterners regard

themselves as highly interdependent with others (Cousins, 1989; Marsella, et al., 1985; Shweder, 1990; Shweder & Levine, 1984; Stigler, et al., 1990; Triandis, 1989). In many Western cultures, there is a belief in the inherent separateness of distinct persons. On the contrary, Easterners believe in the fundamental relatedness of individuals to each other.

The normative requirement of Western culture is to become independent from others and to discover and express one's unique attributes (Johnson, 1985; Marsella, De Vos, & Hsu, 1985; Miller, 1988). According to Geertz (1975), the person is viewed as follows in Western cultures:

...a bounded, unique, more or less integrated motivational and cognitive universe, a dynamic center of awareness, emotion, judgement, and action organized into a distinctive whole and set contrastively both against other such wholes and against a social and natural background (p. 48).

For those with independent conceptions of the self, the important factor which regulates behavior is inner attributes, namely one's own internal thoughts and feelings.

According to Hsu (1985), many non-Western cultures insist on the fundamental connectedness of human beings. A normative requirement of these cultures is to maintain interdependence among individuals (De Vos, 1985; Miller, 1988). The interdependent view of the self features the person as more connected and less differentiated from

others. The behavior of interdependent selves is to a large extent determined by what the actor perceives to be the thoughts and feelings of others in the relationship.

The interdependent self does not put as much emphasis on one's own internal concerns as the independent self (Lebra, 1976; Markus & Kitayama, 1991). The opinions, judgements, and even personal characteristics of the interdependent self are interpersonal situation specific, and thus sometimes elusive and unreliable. They are unlikely to assume a powerful role in regulating overt behavior, if the behavior relates to significant others. To accomplish the cultural goal of interdependence, one's beliefs, ideas, and feelings are assigned only secondary roles. They are constantly controlled and regulated by many domains of social life. Such voluntary control of one's own concerns is the core of the cultural ideal of becoming mature. As Markus and Kitayama argued (1991), the attitude of one's autonomy as secondary to, and constrained by, the primary task of interdependence distinguishes interdependent selves from independent selves, for whom autonomy and its expression often acquire primary significance.

The differences in self concepts are also reflected in communicative styles. It is widely recognized that the communicative style of interdependent cultures is intuitive, indirect and taciturn, compared with that of independent cultures (Barnlund, 1975; Clancy, 1986; Okabe, 1987;

Tsujimura, 1987; Yum, 1987). The basis of this style is a set of interdependent values that emphasize empathy and mutual understanding without words - since overt expressions may often be erratic and elusive and not reflect one's true thoughts and feelings - over explicit verbal communication. People of interdependent cultures, therefore, have little faith in verbal expression or in those who rely upon it. In many interdependent cultures, being so articulate about one's innermost thoughts and feelings is taken as an unmistakable sign that he/she is neither profound nor very sincere (Barnlund 1975). Accordingly, verbosity has traditionally been looked down upon in interdependent cultures. By contrast, the skill of expressing one's thoughts in articulated forms has been one of the highly desired capacities in independent cultures, where speaking serves as the most clear and intelligible communicative tool for one's beliefs and feelings.

The US and Korea are typical countries which show these radically different features of independence and interdependence. Many Americans tend to value attending to the self, and the appreciation of their difference from others. In contrast, most Koreans tend to appreciate the importance of attending to and fitting in with others. Self-advertisement is the credo of Americans while modesty is the value of Koreans. A person who does not express his opinion may be regarded as a misfit in the US, while the

same person can be viewed as modest and socially competent in Korea. As some researchers (Barnlund, 1975; Weisz, Rothbaum, & Blackburn, 1984) have summarized, learning group skills in independent cultures, including the US, means learning to stand out, that is to make one's individuality salient, but by contrast in interdependent cultures, including Korea, one learns to stand in, that is, to become so identified with the group that one's individuality is not noticed.

Another trait that makes Korean society different from that of the US is the vertical structure of interpersonal relationship. Like all other societies, hierarchal structures do exist in the US. Nevertheless, the US has been more firmly based on the notion of equality than other countries. As Gorer (1964) insisted, the US was founded on a rejection of the European ancestry and traditions of its largely immigrant population. Gorer interpreted this rejection as analogous to Freud's myth of primal parricide, "which establishes the legal equality of the brothers, based on common renunciation of the father's authority and privileges" (p.29). The themes of equality and of resistance to authority in American life thus have a deep psychological basis. Respect and awe are unfamiliar emotions for most Americans. The attitudes of equality and independence permeate family life, where the parents are not models on which the child is expected to mold himself, but

rather someone to be surpassed. American children, therefore, are constantly urged toward independence and initiative.

Unlike the US, Korean society is hierarchal in nature. Traditionally, interpersonal relationships in Korea were based on the superiority/inferiority rule for two reasons: First, the existence of a strict caste system; during the Yi dynasty, four different castes were layered in Korean society. People of lower castes were required to show obedience and respect to those of higher castes. Second, the influence of Confucian values; the core of Confucianism is about proper ways of behaving in social life (Baker, 1979; Kuno, 1986). Confucian values provided a general hierarchal order in interpersonal relationships. According to Confucian rules, the basic criteria for the hierarchal relationship were superiority in generation, age, and sex (with males considered superior to females). Theoretically, then, anyone in traditional Korea should know precisely where he/she stands in the relationship referring to caste as well as Confucian order. A person who was inferior according to these criteria had to be submissive to others who were superior.

The caste system in its traditional form has ceased to exist since the collapse of the Yi Dynasty. The behavior regulatory power of Confucianism has also weakened over the past few decades because of Western influences. However,

the superiority/inferiority rule based on Confucian values still regulates the daily life of Koreans.

Because of the interdependent and vertical social structure, maintaining harmonious social interaction is crucial in managing a successful life in Korea. Korean children, therefore, are encouraged to learn proper hierarchal etiquette from an early age. The language that Koreans use even reflects this condition; in the Korean language, the conversational form differs according to the sex or status of the speakers in the family or society, and Koreans are supposed to master the correct usage of appropriate phrases regarding their relative positions.

In sum, previous research indicates that people of the US and Korea have different socio-cultural values which can be represented as independent and equal as opposed to interdependent and hierarchal. According to the theories of Vygotsky and Bronfenbrenner, these differences in value system would be reflected in various aspects of daily life of Americans and Koreans. I expect, therefore, that children of the US and Korea experience different daily routines which are fashioned by cultural values, and at the same time which can best enhance their acquisition of cultural knowledge.

#### Cultural Values and Child Rearing: Empirical Studies

How do children come to internalize such values as independence and interdependence? How do they become

competent members of their cultures? Research has shown that the childrearing style of parents, especially mothers, plays an important role in children's acquisition of culturally relevant values and behaviors.

One of the major factors that can contribute to the acquisition of independent and interdependent traits is physical proximity and intimacy between child and caretaker. In fact, researchers have consistently reported that close physical connectedness fosters dependency in the child (Caudill & Plath, 1966; Caudill & Weinstein, 1969; Morelli, Rogoff, Oppenheim, & Goldsmith, 1992). Researchers have taken different approaches to investigate this relationship, such as examining sleeping arrangement patterns, analyzing interaction patterns, or measuring the amount of time that the caretaker spends with children.

Many studies indicate that sleeping arrangements during infancy reflect major interpersonal and emotional patterns of family life in a culture. For instance, Caudill and Plath (1966) found that the Japanese tended to cosleep with family members throughout their life either in a two generation group, i.e., with parents, or in a one generation group, i.e., with siblings or a spouse. By and large, Japanese children were allowed to sleep with their parents until their puberty. Morelli, Rogoff, Oppenheim, and Goldsmith (1992) examined middle class US and Highland Mayan parents and reported that all Mayan children investigated



slept in their mothers' beds into toddlerhood, while none of American infants slept with their mother on a regular basis as newborns. Crowell, Keener, Ginsburg, and Anders (1987) also reported that only 11% of 18- to 36-month-olds slept with their parents for all or part of the night on a regular basis in US middle class families.

Interaction patterns, and the amount of time that caretakers spend with their children, are also related to cultural values. Through observation of middle class Japanese and American mothers, Caudill and Weinstein (1969) found that Japanese mothers spent more time both being with or in the presence of their baby, and carrying and rocking them more than American mothers. American mothers, on the other hand, emphasized verbal communication with the baby. Few changes in the maternal behavioral patterns were reported by Otaki and her colleagues (1986), who repeated the same procedure about 20 years later. Richman, Miller, and Levine (1992) examined mother-infant interactions in Kenya and the US and reported that Kenyan mothers were more physically responsive to infants (i.e., using methods of tactile contact such as holding and touching) while American mothers were more verbally and visually responsive. Concerning early child care practices, Vogel (1967) reported that Japanese mothers and children were rarely apart, and that the American custom of baby sitting practically did not exist in Japan. This trend is still prevalent in Japan, and

recently Peak (1989) pointed out that paid baby-sitters are rare in Japan and it is a cultural ideal that mothers remain at home with the child during the early years.

Overall, research indicates that mothers of interdependent cultures differ from mothers of independent cultures in employing more proximal modes of interaction (i.e., cosleeping, emphasizing physical contact, spending more time with children) while mothers of independent cultures employ less proximal modes of interaction (i.e., separate sleeping, emphasizing verbal communication, spending less time with children). It can be inferred, therefore, that the physical connectedness between parents and children is related to value acquisition. Children of interdependent cultures are constantly put into contexts to be with other people, whereas children of independent cultures spend more time being alone. For example, people of independent cultures tend to provide children with more child modified places, such as the child's own room, in which they can function without others' help. Consequently, children of interdependent cultures develop dependency on other people while children of independent cultures learn to become autonomous.

Besides physical connectedness, available data suggest that mothers of interdependent cultures encourage considerable emotional dependence in their children in contrast to an emphasis on independence normally found in

independent cultures (Doi, 1973). For example, the Japanese mother strives to establish a close emotional tie with her child by way of excessive indulgence (Vogel, 1967). The indulgence of mothers forms especially close connections between the mother and the child. This early connection between mother and child forms the basis for subsequent interdependency in later life.

The research on maternal control strategies and speech style also illustrates the relation between cultural values and child rearing. Conroy, Hess, Azuma, and Kashiwagi (1980) compared the regulatory strategies employed by mothers to get compliance from young children in Japan and the US. The rationale mothers offered as a basis for compliance in their negotiations with the child were examined. They found that Japanese mothers were more likely to utilize feeling-oriented appeals, such as mentioning other people's feelings, while American mothers relied more extensively on appeals to rules and their authority and power as mothers. Toda, Fogel, and Kawai (1990) compared the style and content of speech by American and Japanese mothers to their 3-months-olds. Their results showed that American mothers were more information-oriented and used more question forms, especially yes/no questions, than the Japanese. Japanese mothers, on the contrary, were more affect-oriented, and used more nonsense, onomatopoeic sounds, and baby talk.

These studies suggest that parents of interdependent cultures employ childrearing styles that rely on close personal/interpersonal ties and a climate of affection. They also tend to emphasize empathy by employing feeling-oriented parenting techniques. On the other hand, in independent cultures, child rearing is accomplished through more direct instrumental processes, with greater reliance on explicit rules instead of feelings. Children of interdependent cultures, therefore, learn to be sensitive to and concerned about others' feelings from an early age while children of independent cultures learn to focus on their own feelings.

Because of the close interpersonal ties and sensitivity to others' feelings, people of interdependent cultures are motivated to find a way to fit in with relevant others. Consequently, people in interdependent cultures put more emphasis on conformity and less on creativity and individuality than those of independent cultures. For example, Lebra (1976) argued that Japanese people are overly sensitive to others' disapproval and show an excessive tendency to conform. Azuma, Kashiwagi, and Hess (1981) provided evidence that these attitudes were reflected in parenting values. They reported that the developmental tasks mothers believe to be mastered before age 6 differed between Japan and the US. Japanese mothers were found to value emotional maturity, compliance to adult authority

outside the home and courtesy in social exchange, whereas American mothers were found to emphasize children's verbal assertiveness and social skills. Stopes-Roe and Cochrane (1990) compared the childrearing values of Asian-British (Hindus, Muslims, and Sikhs) and the native white British, and also reported that Asian parents valued conformity more and self-direction less than the native British.

In sum, child rearing in independent cultures can be described as encouraging independence, assertiveness, and individuation of the child, whereas child rearing in interdependent cultures can be characterized as encouraging physical and emotional dependence between caretaker and child. Parents in independent cultures value self direction and train their children to focus on their own feelings while parents of interdependent cultures value conformity and teach their children to be sensitive to others' feelings. The differences in parenting patterns reflect broader cultural differences. I expect, therefore, children of the US and Korea will experience different daily routines because of the different child rearing practices based on different cultural values and beliefs.

#### Social Class and Child Rearing

I have argued that people of the same society share the dominant socio-cultural values in general. However, at the same time they tend to develop different values which fit with their specific sub-cultural contexts. This may be more

evident in ethnically and racially diverse societies such as the US than in relatively homogeneous societies such as Korea. Yet both in the US and Korea within-society variation exists in terms of social class.

Social class is the most common and influential index for within-society differences across societies. Membership in the class system is related to every aspect of people's lives: political preferences, sexual behavior, church membership, and even the rate of ill health and death (Berelson & Steiner, 1964). Kohn (1963, 1969, 1979) stated that members of different social classes, by virtue of experiencing different conditions in life, come to see the world differently, and develop different conceptions of social reality, aspirations and desirable personality characteristics. That is, members of different classes form different cultures based on different values.

Kohn (1969, 1979) maintained that consistent relationships exist between social class and parental values and behaviors. Namely, social class differences are related to different parental values, and values are related to different parenting behaviors. He argued that middle and working class occupations are basically different in people's opportunities to exercise self-direction. Middle (particularly professional) class occupations are not routinized or supervised, and involve complex work with data or people. In contrast, working class jobs are somewhat

routinized, closely supervised, and relatively simple. As a result of this difference, different value orientations emerge. Middle-class people are more likely to emphasize values related to self-direction, such as freedom, individualism, initiative, creativity, achievement, and self-actualization; working class people, on the other hand, are more likely to stress values dealing with conformity such as manners, orderliness, neatness, and obedience.

These different occupational value orientations, in turn, are reflected in the child rearing beliefs. In fact, Kohn (1969) and others (Kohn & Schooler, 1973; Kohn & Slomczynski, 1990; Luster, Rhoades, & Haas, 1989) found that middle class parents tended to value in their children internal standards for governing their relations with other people and with themselves, such as consideration, curiosity, and self-control; while working class parents tended to stress characteristics concerning conformity to external constraints. Other scholars (Bronfenbrenner, 1958; Waters & Crandall, 1964) reported that middle class parents' emphasis on self-actualization lead them to value academic achievement of the child more than working class parents.

Kohn (1979) insisted that these different child rearing beliefs are reflected in actual parenting behavior such as parental discipline style. He maintained that middle class parents are more likely to discipline children based on their interpretation of children's intent, while working

class parents are more likely to react based on the consequences of children's behavior. That is, as self-direction is valued in the middle class, children's transgressions are judged in terms of the reasons why they misbehave, whereas, as conformity to external authority is valued in the working class, transgressions are judged in terms of violation of externally imposed prescriptions.

Several scholars (Kohn, 1969; Gecas & Nye, 1974) found evidence for his contention. For example, Kohn (1969) found that middle class parents (especially mothers) were quite discriminating in the use of physical punishment depending on whether the child's behavior was defined as wild play or loss of temper. They were much more likely to use physical punishment in the latter situation because this represents to the parents the child's loss of self-control, a valued characteristic. Lower class mothers, on the other hand, focused on the consequences of the child's behavior and used physical punishment with equal frequency in both situations. Gecas and Nye (1974) also found that middle class parents were more discriminating in physical punishment with regard to the circumstances of the child's behavior, i.e., when he/she accidentally breaks something versus when he/she intentionally disobeys, than were those of working class parents.

Kohn (1977) went further and argued that middle and working class parents evaluate the relative importance of



support and constraint in child rearing differently because of their value differences. Middle class parents feel a greater obligation to be supportive because of their concern about children's internal dynamics; while working class parents, because of their higher valuation of conformity to external rules, put greater emphasis on the obligation to imposed constraints. This relation has been confirmed by many scholars (Bronfenbrenner, 1958; Luster, Rhoades, & Haas, 1989). After reviewing several relevant studies, Bronfenbrenner (1958) summarized the findings as follows:

Parent-child relationships in the middle class are consistently reported as more acceptant and egalitarian, while those in the working class are oriented toward maintaining order and obedience. Within this context, the middle class has shown a shift away from emotional control toward freer expression of affection and greater tolerance of the child's impulses and desires (p. 425).

More recently, the study of Luster, Rhoades, and Haas (1989) also supported this position. They reported that middle class mothers, believing that infants should be given considerable leeway in their exploratory behavior, provided more supportive environments, whereas working class mothers, because of their belief in conformity, restricted the actions of their children and used physical punishment more often during home observation.

Kohn found the relationship between social class and values reflected in parenting behavior to be extremely

stable and relatively invariant. Analysis of US national survey data indicated that the relation was only slightly affected by such major structural variables as race, nationality, religion, size of community of residence, family size, age and sex of the child (Kohn, 1979; Wright & Wright, 1976).

Further cross-national findings also show that the reasoning that Kohn proposed applied outside the particular political and cultural context of the US which is capitalistic and independent. Slomczynski, Miller and Kohn (1981) compared Polish and US samples and found a causal impact of occupational self direction on values, child rearing norm, and intellectual functioning. The higher social stratification<sup>1</sup> positions were associated with the values of self direction, nonauthoritarianism, and achievement while lower positions related to values of conformity and authoritarianism. And these value differences were directly reflected in parental values. The effects of social stratification on job conditions, and of

---

<sup>1</sup> Recently, Kohn has begun to pay attention to the concept of social stratification. According to Kohn and Slomczynski (1990), social classes refer to "groups defined in terms of their relationship to ownership and control over the means of production, and their control over the labor power of others" (p. 2), whereas social stratification refers to "the hierarchal ordering of society in terms of power, privilege, and prestige" (p. 2). The criteria for social stratification are educational attainment, occupational status, and job income. Kohn has relied more on the concept of social stratification than social class in the process of cross-national testing of his theory.

job conditions on personality, therefore, were much the same in socialist Poland as in capitalist US.

Another study that tested the validity of Kohn's theory in a non-Western, interdependent society was done in Japan by Naoi and Schooler (1985). In the main, the findings for Japan were markedly consistent with those for the US and Poland. Occupational self-direction had similar effects on psychological functioning in Japan as in the West and it was also related to values and parental attitudes.

Because the US, Poland, and Japan are such diverse societies, this set of studies provides basic evidence that the psychological impact of social stratification is much the same across industrialized societies. Supporting this view, results consistent with the three nations have been reported in other countries such as Italy, Germany, Ireland, Peru, and Australia (Cashmore & Goodnow, 1986; Kohn, 1979).

In summary, studies on social class indicate that membership in social class influences parental values and practices, and the effect of social class is similar across societies. As Ogbu (1979) pointed out, the competencies needed in daily life vary from one social class to another, since members of the lower social class usually have limited access to social, occupational, political, and other valued roles. This restricted access to valued roles leads to differential needs for the competencies associated with them. Parents of different classes, therefore, adopt

different child rearing techniques which can aid children's learning of desired competencies of the social class to which they belong. In many cases, this is true regardless of societal differences. I expect, therefore, that children of both the US and Korea experience daily routines that are fashioned by their membership in social classes.

#### Summary

The focus of this study is on the child in activity. Children learn to make sense of their culture through participation in activities that their culture makes available and through interaction with people who are more competent in those activities. Adults engage in culturally meaningful activities and determine the extent and the manner of children's participation in those activities. The activities considered important vary widely across cultural communities. This variation in activities is determined by the values and beliefs of competent members, and the cultural and historical institutions of the community.

The main assumption of this study is that in different cultures children experience different daily life in terms of the type of available activities, the extent of participation in those activities, their partners, the respective roles taken by children and their partners, and the location in which the activities take place.

This assumption will be tested in two different societies: the US and Korea. Despite the similarity in

industrial structures, the dominant socio-cultural values of the US and Korea are radically different. Americans and Koreans have different self concepts, independent as opposed to interdependent, and different structures of interpersonal relationship, equal as opposed to hierarchal.

Researchers have indicated that child rearing styles in independent and interdependent cultures reflect the differences in the value systems. For example, mothers in independent cultures tend to use less proximal modes of interaction with their children (i.e., separate sleeping, emphasizing verbal communication, spending less time with children) and occasionally letting them to be alone, while those of interdependent cultures tend to employ more proximal modes of interaction (i.e., cosleeping, emphasizing physical contact, spending more time with children) and constantly putting children into contexts to be with other people (Caudill & Plath, 1966; Caudill & Weinstein, 1969; Crowell, et al., 1987; Morelli, et al., 1992; Otaki et al., 1986; Peak, 1989; Richman, et al., 1992; Vogel, 1967). At the same time, people in interdependent cultures put more emphasis on conformity and less on creativity and individuality in their children than those of independent cultures (Baker, 1979; Kuno, 1986; Lebra, 1976; Stopes-Roe & Cochrane, 1990). In particular, people with Confucian values stress the importance of learning proper interpersonal etiquette because of the hierarchal structure of interpersonal relationships (Baker, 1979; Kuno, 1986).

Not all the people in the US and Korea, however, employ the same child rearing practices. Within-society differences do exist in the two nations, particularly (though not exclusively) as a function of class differences. Researchers have reported that across a range of societies middle class people value self-direction and achievement while working class people value conformity, and this difference results in differences in child rearing styles (Cashmore & Goodnow, 1986; Kohn, 1979).

This study does not intend to access values and beliefs of people surrounding children directly, but access them rather indirectly through social practices. The purpose is thus to explore the variation in children's daily activities both within and across the US and Korea. Considering the effect of cultural values on child rearing practices, it is expected that middle and working class people of the US and Korea will design different daily routines for their new members that can help them to become competent members of their culture. The daily routine activities of children in the US and Korea, therefore, will vary as a function of class difference as well as societal difference.

#### Research Questions and Hypotheses

The following general questions and relevant specific hypotheses are drawn to explore the cultural variation in children's daily routines. Because different numbers of observations were taken across communities, all questions

and hypotheses of this study are proposed in terms of proportions rather than raw numbers of observations. In each case I am attentive to the ways in which any variation can be interpreted in the light of different cultural values.

1. To what extent do the types of activities available to young children differ across and within the US and Korea? Of the available activities, to what extent do children actually engage in the activities.

1-1. Of total observations, US children will be exposed to and engage in conversation proportionally more than Korean children.

1-2. Of total observations, Korean children will be exposed to and engage in interpersonal lessons proportionally more than US children.

1-3. Of total observations, middle class children will be exposed to and engage in academic lessons proportionally more than working class children both in the US and Korea.

1-4. Of total observations, middle class children will be exposed to and engage in play with academic objects proportionally more than working class children both in the US and Korea.

2. How do the types of partners engaged in children's activities differ in the US and Korea?

- 2-1. For each activity in which children engage, Korean children will be accompanied with partners proportionally more than US children.
  - 2-2. For each activity in which children engage, Korean mothers will be accompanied as partners proportionally more than US mothers.
  - 2-3. Korean mothers will be proportionally more engaged as partners in children's sleeping than US mothers.
3. How do the respective roles taken by children and their partners differ across and within the US and Korea?
- 3-1. For each activity in which children engage, US children will initiate activity and their involvement in the activity proportionally more than Korean children.
  - 3-2. For each activity in which children engage, middle class children will initiate activity and their involvement in the activity proportionally more than working class children both in US and Korea.
4. How does the location in which children's activities take place differ in the US and Korea?
- 4-1. Of total observations, US children's activities will occur in child modified locations proportionally more than those of Korean children.



4-2. Of total observations that take place in preschool (or other child care setting), Korean children will be exposed to and participate in academic lessons proportionally more than US children.

## CHAPTER III

## METHODOLOGY

Observation of Children's Life in Cultural Context

In industrialized and technologically complex societies, much of the data about young children's activities and adult-child interactions have been collected through structured or semi-structured laboratory, classroom, or home observations. Accordingly, observation of children's activities has often taken place in a context which is detached from everyday mundane activities.

Yet as Vygotsky (1978, 1987) insisted, human development cannot be separated from practical daily activities. Children gain knowledge required in their culture through interaction with others and through participation in everyday activities. Development of their thought and behavior patterns takes place only in natural environments. One needs to consider the whole context in which children are embedded in order to understand the processes of their development (becoming competent). For this reason, the method of observation of children's daily life in natural settings is adopted in this study.

This study involves observation of various activities in everyday social situations. An observer should be as familiar as possible with the cognitive rules, conceptual principles, values, and beliefs of the culture of interest

in order not to impose his/her theoretical predilection and cultural biases on the activities observed (Goodenough, 1981). Knowledge about the broad cultural milieu and language proficiency are essential to understand and/or determine the meaning of activities (e.g., lessons, play, work, conversation) and to code them appropriately. Natives of each culture, therefore, observed the daily routines of children in this study.

#### Participants

The participants of this study were preschool children (2 1/2 to 4 years old) and their families who resided in the US and Korea. Different cultures have different practices in dealing with new members beginning from their birth. However, children's responses to and ways of participation in the practices become more observable when they are able to engage linguistically and motorically in the routines. For this reason, 2 1/2- to 4-year-olds were chosen to be the focus of this study.

As many researchers have mentioned (Bornstein, Tal, & Tamis-LeMonda, 1991; Stevenson, 1992), in order to minimize possible confounds in cross-cultural research - for example, to be able to rule out possible competing explanations (such as to argue that differences in children's lives are due to different cultural values rather than other possible factors) - selecting participants from areas that are maximally similar in all variables other than those of

interest is essential. For this reason, a good deal of caution was paid in selecting the areas from which participants were drawn.

Since over 70% of people live in city areas both in the US and Korea, participants of this study were recruited in cities. Two prototypic medium sized cities, Greensboro in the US and Suweon in Korea, were selected. Greensboro is located in North Carolina, the southeast of the US, and Suweon is located in northwest South Korea. Both cities are situated within several hours drive from their respective capitals. The population of Greensboro is about 200,000 while that of Suweon is 700,000. Given the higher density of population in Korea, the population difference is acceptable. Both Greensboro and Suweon are mainly industrial cities but not far from agricultural areas. Each city has major universities and is expanding currently. The two are located at the same latitude and thus have similar weather conditions.

American data of preschool children were collected from January 1991 to June 1992, and Korean data were collected from September to November, 1993.

#### USA (Greensboro, NC)

The US participants were 20 preschoolers who ranged in age from 28 to 45 months ( $M = 36.7$  months,  $SD = 5.74$ ). The children were drawn from two white communities, Holden and Summit. Holden is a middle class community in which parents

tend to work in professional occupations. Summit is a working class community in which parents tend to work in the non-professional sphere. The Holden group of children consisted of six girls ( $\underline{M}$  = 38.3 months,  $\underline{SD}$  = 6.62) and five boys ( $\underline{M}$  = 34.4 months,  $\underline{SD}$  = 7.64), and the Summit group consisted of five girls ( $\underline{M}$  = 35.2,  $\underline{SD}$  = 4.15) and four boys ( $\underline{M}$  = 39.0,  $\underline{SD}$  = 4.55).

Participants were recruited in the following manner. "Community" was defined as an area of town bounded on all sides by relatively clear boundaries (major roads, railway line, etc.), with no major roads cutting through the area, relatively small in size (1 1/2 - 2 square miles), and judged to be fairly homogeneous in terms of types of housing and racial background. A list was then generated from the birth records of all children born in that area between two and four years earlier. Letters were sent to all families who appeared to still live in the area (information derived from the telephone book and/or city records), followed up by a screening call. In order to participate, the family still had to live in the area.

As Kohn (1969, 1979) mentioned, the level of education and occupation rather than income is more likely to determine parental values and behaviors. In this study, therefore, people with higher level of education, and professional jobs which enable them to exercise occupational self-direction were regarded as middle class, whereas those

with lower level of education, and non-professional or closely supervised jobs were considered as working class irrespective of income.

For the Holden community, at least one parent had to have a minimum of a college degree, and have an occupation judged to be middle class according to Hollingshead criteria (Hollingshead, 1975); for the Summit community neither custodial parent could have a degree (one non-residential, divorced father had a degree), and have a job that was judged to be no higher than skilled manual laborer by Hollingshead criteria.

Of the 28 families contacted in Holden, 10 declined to participate, seven were willing to participate but did not meet the requirements, and 11 participated. The minimum median family income (families responded to an income range rather than a precise amount) for Holden group was \$70,000 (ranging from \$40,000 to more than \$85,000), and the median Hollingshead ranking was 8 (administrators, lesser professionals), range 7-9 (excluding the six mothers who worked at home). The mothers' median educational attainment was a bachelor's degree (ranging from some college to graduate degrees), and their average years of full-time education after 14 was 8.1 ( $SD = 1.23$ ). The fathers' median (and minimum) educational attainment was also a bachelor's degree, but two had doctoral degrees, and their average length of full-time education after age 14 was 8.9 ( $SD = 1.70$ ).

Of the 18 families contacted in Summit, four declined to participate, five were willing to participate but did not meet the requirement, and 9 participated. The minimum median income for Summit group was \$25,000 (ranging from \$10,000 to 40,000), and the median Hollingshead ranking was 4 (skilled manual workers), range 2-5 (all mothers but one worked outside the home). The mothers' median and maximum educational attainment was "some college" and all had finished high school. On average, these mothers completed 4.9 years of full-time education after age 14 ( $SD = 1.54$ ). The fathers' median educational attainment was completion of high school, and ranged from "less than high school" to "some college" and their average years of education after age 14 was 4.6 ( $SD = 1.62$ ).

#### Korea (Suweon)

From two communities, Metan and Seryu, 12 children who ranged in age from 28 to 48 months ( $M = 36.9$  months,  $SD = 7.04$ ) were recruited. The two communities were different in terms of parental education and occupation. Metan is a middle class community in which parents tend to have professional occupations while Seryu is a working class community in which parents tend to have non-professional jobs. Each Metan and Seryu group of children consisted of three girls ( $M = 32.0$  months,  $SD = 1.00$  for Metan;  $M = 37.3$  months,  $SD = 8.02$  for Seryu) and three boys ( $M = 39.3$  months,  $SD = 10.26$  for Metan;  $M = 39.0$ ,  $SD = 8.66$  for Seryu).

"Community" was defined in the same way in Korea as in the US. Participants were located in the following manner. Since inspection of others' birth records is not available to the public, contacts to representatives of the communities were made to recruit the participants. Community representatives have detailed information about the people residing in their areas. Potential participants were located with their help. Letters, which briefly explain the purpose and method of this study, were sent to all potential participants, and screening calls were then made to gain information about parental education and occupation. Families had to meet the same educational and occupational criteria applied to American participants in order to participate.

In Korea, six children (3 boys and 3 girls) were drawn from each community. In order to locate 6, 36 families had to be contacted in Metan community. Since prior information about the family was available through community representatives, all the families met the educational and occupational criteria. Of the 36 families contacted, 23 declined to participate. The others were willing to participate, but 7 preschools in which children enrolled did not permit class observation.

For all the Metan families, the income was in the range of \$25,001 to \$40,000. The median Hollingshead ranking for fathers was 9 (higher executives, major professionals),



range 6-9. Except for one mother who worked as an executive in a finance company, all the mothers were housewives. Like the US group, the mothers' median educational attainment was a bachelor's degree (ranging from some college to bachelor's degree), and their average years of full-time education after 14 was 7.8 ( $SD = 0.41$ ). The fathers' median (and minimum) educational attainment was also a bachelor's degree, and their average length of full-time education after age 14 was 8.2 ( $SD = 0.41$ ).

In Seryu community, 16 families were contacted in order to locate 6 children. Of the 16, 9 declined to participate. The others were willing to participate, but one preschool in which a child enrolled did not permit class observation. For all the Seryu families, the income was in the range of \$10,001 to \$25,000. The median Hollingshead ranking for fathers was 3 (machine operators and semiskilled workers), range 3-5. All Seryu mothers were housewives. The mothers' median and maximum educational attainment was "completion of high school." On average, these mothers completed 3.5 years of full-time education after age 14 ( $SD = 1.12$ ). The fathers' median educational attainment was also completion of high school, and ranged from "less than high school" to "some college." Their average years of education after age 14 was 3.8 ( $SD = 1.46$ ).

### Instrument

The instrument adopted in this study was developed by Jonathan Tudge in cooperation with Sarah Putnam, Judy Sidden (UNCG), Barbara Rogoff (University of Utah), and Gilda Morelli (Boston College) during the 12-month period from October 1989 to September 1990. They tried to design a coding scheme that would both be exhaustive (i.e., cover all the activities going on around the child in everyday life) and applicable to children growing up in all types of cultural settings.

Lessons, work, play, and conversation were chosen as the focal activities (that is, activities that were the focus of observation), with the remaining activities classified into the "other" category. Each of the focal activities was divided into a number of sub-categories.

Lessons were defined as involving the deliberate attempt to impart or receive information in four areas: academic (information that related to schooling or preschool skills); interpersonal (information about culturally appropriate behavior, and etiquette); skill/nature (information about the workings of the material or natural world); and religious lessons (information on matters of religious or spiritual affairs).

Work was defined as activities that either had economic importance or contributed to the maintenance of life. Work was divided into two sub-categories: transparent or no

technology (where the technology used in work was clear to the child), and opaque technology (where the mechanics of the tool being used were not likely to be understandable by the child).

Play was defined as activities that were being engaged in for fun or for their own sake. Exploration was considered as play, since play with objects was not easily distinguishable from exploration. Play was broken down into three sub-categories: pretend/role play (any play activity that related to assuming the role of another); non-pretend play and exploration (play that did not feature taking on a role, including play with academic objects); and spectator of performance (any activity that related to watching or listening to a performance for entertainment, including watching TV).

Conversation was defined as talk that was not related to on-going activity and had a sustained and focused topic. Talking that accompanied play, work, or a lesson, therefore, was not coded as conversation.

"Other" activities involved sleeping, eating, bathing, being dressed and so on, being idle and non-focused, religious/spiritual activities, and any other activities that were uncodable.

Basically, therefore, all activities happening in children's daily life were codable with this coding scheme.

For an activity to be coded it must either have been potentially available to the child or be engaged in or observed by the child. Different cultural groups made certain activities available to children by doing them in children's presence, and made other activities unavailable. Availability referred to a potential for the child to observe or become involved in the activity. Engagement in activity, whether active involvement or careful observation, presupposed far more active participation of the child compared to availability. Children could be allowed or encouraged to become involved, or discouraged from being involved in different types of available activities.

In addition to the activities, the respective roles taken by the child, the initiator of the activity and the child's involvement in the activity, partners in activity with the child and their roles, location of the activity, and the presence/absence of parents were coded.

Roles were divided into seven categories: no role, trying to manage or direct the activity (actively trying to keep an activity going or impel it in a certain direction), trying to prevent, discontinue, or avoid an activity (actively trying to stop an activity or prevent it from happening, or trying not to engage in an activity), facilitating (trying to make it easier for the other participant to be actively involved in the activity), participating (actively involved in the activity), observing

(watching or listening to an activity which was being done by a person who was clearly aware of the other's presence or was modifying in some way the activity to allow the other to observe), and eavesdropping (watching or listening an activity which was being done by a person who was either unaware of the other's presence and was in no way modifying the activity).

Attention should be paid to the difference between engagement in activity and participation as a role. If a child has any of the six roles mentioned (except no role), he or she is engaging in an activity. If he or she is actively engaging an activity (but not trying to direct it, prevent it, or facilitate a partner's activity) his or her role was coded as "participation." Observing or eavesdropping were considered more passive ways of engaging in an activity.

The category of "no role" was employed if an activity was available to the child but he/she had no role in it. Partners other than the focal child were not coded unless they had roles in the activities; therefore, this category was applicable only to the focal child.

Initiator of the activity and the child's involvement in the activity were divided into four categories: unknown, target child, child with other person, and other person. If the activity continued over several "windows," the person who originally initiated the activity continued to be coded

until the activity changed dramatically or ceased altogether.

Partners were defined as people who were actively engaged in the activity that the focal child was engaged in. Partners were divided into three broad categories: related nuclear, related non-nuclear, and non-related, as well as coded by age and gender. Location of the activity was divided into four categories: children's own environments (i.e., their home, car, etc.), others' environments (i.e., someone else's home), preschool (or other type of childcare setting), and public place. Whether or not the location was modified for child's care/entertainment was also coded. Finally, the presence/absence of mother and father within child's hailing range was coded [See appendix for full details of coding scheme].

The observer not only provided the numerical codes for activities, partners, and roles, and so on, but also noted briefly the significant activities, roles, partners, and the like that were coded. These notes constituted the field notes, and enabled the observer to describe the situation in words as well as numerically. With the numerical codes and the brief field notes, therefore, the conditions of actual activities in real life could be reconstructed.

#### Procedure

The data were collected through the following procedure. The families were asked to keep their daily

routines unchanged as much as possible during the observation period. After selecting the potential subjects, an initial letter, explaining briefly the goals and methods of the study was sent. A telephone call and a meeting with all family members at home followed. At this point, full information about this project was offered, and parents provided a brief description of the child's daily routine. Finally, parents signed consent forms if willing to participate.

#### Method

In the days prior to observation, several short visits were made to the home in order to accustom the child and other family members to the observer's presence. Once the observation began, children were observed for two hours on the first two consecutive days. And then they were observed for four hours for the following four days.

Modified spot observations (Ellis, Rogoff, & Cromer, 1981; Whiting & Edwards, 1988), distributed so as to cover the entire waking hours of children, were used. The observer followed the target child everywhere he/she went, gathering data during 30-second "windows" every 5 1/2 minutes. Observations were continuous (to provide information on the context of the events) but the modified spot observations focused on what occurred during a 30-second "window."

The child wore a tiny microphone which enabled the observer to overhear conversations without being too intrusive. The observer recorded the following: the activities available to the child (within easy ear- and eye-shot); of the activities available, whether or not the child was involved; given the child's involvement, his or her role, who initiated the activity, who initiated the child's involvement in that activity, and whether there were any partners; given the presence of one or more partners, their relationship to the child (related or not, age, gender) and their role in that activity; the number and type of people potentially available (within easy ear-shot or eye-shot) as partners, the presence of parents, and the location of the activity.

#### Videotaping

On the final day of observation, the child's activities were videotaped for the final two hours to allow for assessment of reliability, and for more detailed analyses of the process of interaction. It was an optional procedure; however, all the participant families agreed to be videotaped.

To compensate families for the inconvenience, and as a measure of thanks to all participants, a financial contribution was made. American families received a \$10.00 savings bond for each hour of observation, plus an additional \$50.00 bond at completion, for total face value



of \$250.00, and Korean families received \$125.00 at completion of the observation procedure.

#### Reliability

The US data were collected by two white female US natives who had been involved in the development of the coding scheme. The reliability between the two had been checked before and after the observation procedure through coding of children's real life activities at home as well as videotaped activities. The overall interreliability was above 80 percent.

I, a female Korean native who had been working with the coding scheme for the last three years, collected the Korean data. Before and after the data collection, the interreliability between the Korean and American observers had been checked. Reliability was computed through the following procedure. First of all, the interreliability for the four major activities (lessons, work, play, and conversation) was calculated separately. Then, for each activity category, the proportion of agreement between observers for the following variables was computed; child's role, initiator of activity, initiator of child's involvement in the activity, partner in the activity, partner's role, location in which observation was taken, and mother's availability to the child. Non-occurrence of an activity was not used in the calculation of reliability, as this would have artificially boosted the likelihood of agreement.

Before the data collection, I reached above 80 percent interreliability with one of the US data collectors, through live coding of children's activities in a preschool as well as coding of videotaped daily routines at home. In detail, based on videotape coding, the overall agreement was 85.7% for major activities (ranging from 75% for conversation to 100% for lessons), 93.3% for child's role (ranging from 90% for play to 100% for other activities), 92.8% for initiator of activity (ranging from 90% for play to 100% for other activities), 89.3% for initiator of child's involvement in the activity (ranging from 75% for conversation to 100% for other activities), 91.3% for partner (ranging from 87% for play to 100% for other activities), 91.3% for the role of partner (ranging from 87% for play to 100% for other activities), 100% for location, and 100% for availability of mother.

After the data collection, I also reached an acceptable level of interreliability (about 80 percent) with the US coders, through coding of different US videotapes. The overall agreement was 80.9% for major activities (ranging from 67% for play and conversation to 100% for lessons and work), 84.2% for child's role (ranging from 71% for work to 100% for lessons and conversation), 87.5% for initiator of activity (ranging from 83% for play to 100% for lessons and conversation), 90.0% for initiator of child's involvement in the activity (ranging from 86% for conversation to 100% for

other activities), 75.0% for partner (ranging from 0% for play to 100% for other activities), 100% for the role of partner, 75.0% for location, and 70.8% for availability of mother.

#### Analytic Plan

The four major activities - lessons, work, play, and conversation - were considered and tested separately. The actual data reduction and analyses for the questions and hypotheses were conducted in the same way for the US and Korea.

The data gathered in this study were frequency data of nominal level. The questions, which were set up to obtain general information across communities, therefore, were tested and reported in terms of simple descriptive statistics such as proportions and frequencies.

Given the small number of participants and the recruiting method of participants based on nonprobability, inferential statistics - whether parametric or nonparametric - were not appropriate for this study. Nevertheless, there was a need to establish statistical criteria in order to determine to what extent a difference found could be accepted as meaningful. For this reason, following Whiting and Edwards (1988), the nonparametric phi coefficient, which tested the difference in proportions between two groups, was used to test each hypothesis and to determine whether the obtained proportion differences between US and Korea and/or

middle class and working class were statistically significant. However, this use of inferential statistics does not imply any wish to generalize the results of this study to the entire population of the US or Korea, since the randomness assumption was not met.

In addition, to check the variance of the data from an individual child, separate descriptive analyses of range, mean, and standard deviation concerning each activity and other variables that showed significant differences between nations and/or classes were calculated across communities.

## CHAPTER IV

### RESULTS

This study was designed to examine variability in activities and partners of children in different cultural communities. Data from 5725 observations of 32 preschool children were used in the analyses. The results for each question and hypothesis are reviewed in this section in order to illuminate cultural variations in children's daily routines.

#### Question 1

The first question focused on the availability of activities and children's engagement in those activities. The proportions and raw numbers of available and engaged activities of each community are presented in Table 1.

A total of 9023 activities occurred close enough for the children to see or hear, and were thus coded as being available to them. As can be seen in Table 1, available activities were distributed in a similar manner for all the communities. Regardless of cultural community, the most common activity for the child was play and the least common activity was lessons.

The activities in which I had primary interest were lessons, work, play, and conversation; however, it should be noted that the 'other' category (basically featuring physical needs such as sleeping, eating and other bodily functions) was coded fairly frequently.

If the children had any role in an available activity, they were coded as being engaged in it. A total of 6751 out of 9023 were rated as activities in which children were engaged. The proportional distribution of activities in which children were engaged was similar to that of available activities. Play was the activity in which children were most engaged and lessons was the activity in which children least engaged.

Regarding the engagement rate of each activity, a similar pattern was found across communities. Since the category of 'other' was coded only if the child had any role in it, by definition, the 'other' category showed a 100% engagement rate. Besides 'other,' children showed the highest engagement rate when lessons were available (85.7%), and the lowest engagement when work was going on (26.9%) across communities.

#### Hypothesis 1-1

According to Hypothesis 1-1, of the total observations, US children were expected to be exposed to and engaged in conversation proportionally more than Korean children. Results regarding conversation are provided in Table 3.

As was predicted, Korean children were less exposed to conversation than US children and the difference was statistically significant (US 19.9%, Korea 9.2%,  $p < .001$ ).

Table 1

Exposure to and Engagement in Activities, by Community

	USM	USW	KOM	KOW
<u>Exposure</u>				
Lessons	5.9 (185)	3.5 (94)	4.3 (69)	2.2 (36)
Work	16.7 (520)	21.3 (571)	16.7 (268)	20.7 (335)
Play	35.7 (1115)	44.3 (1190)	51.3 (821)	54.0 (872)
Conv	15.5 (485)	8.4 (227)	7.6 (121)	4.7 (75)
Other	26.2 (818)	22.5 (603)	20.1 (321)	18.4 (297)
Total	100.0 (3123)	100.0 (2685)	100.0 (1600)	100.0 (1615)
<u>Engage</u>				
Lessons	4.6 (145)	3.2 (87)	3.9 (63)	2.1 (34)
Work	4.7 (146)	4.9 (131)	4.8 (76)	6.4 (103)
Play	28.6 (892)	37.2 (999)	45.9 (735)	48.6 (785)
Conv	8.7 (271)	4.5 (122)	5.7 (91)	2.0 (32)
Other	26.2 (818)	22.5 (603)	20.1 (321)	18.4 (297)
Total	72.8 (2272)	72.3 (1942)	80.4 (1286)	77.5 (1251)

Note: Throughout the tables, a number without parenthesis represents a proportion whereas a number within parenthesis represents a raw number.

Also, throughout the tables, the abbreviation USM is used for US middle class, USW for US working class, KOM for Korean middle class, and KOW for Korean working class.

-----  
 Note: Among the 9023 "available" activities, 415 took place while the child was sleeping. In a strict sense, therefore, 8608 activities were available to children. However, all the activities, including those occurring while the children slept, were reported in Table 1 since a more complete sense of the environment in which the children were embedded can be gained by examining all on-going activities in a community.

Across communities, work and play (especially watching TV) were the main activities that occurred while the children were sleeping. Information regarding activities that occurred while the children were sleeping is presented in Table 2.

Table 2

Activities Coded While Children Were Sleeping, by Community

	USM	USW	KOM	KOW
Lessons	0.1(4)	0.0(0)	0.0(0)	0.0(0)
Work	2.5(79)	1.5(41)	1.3(20)	2.2(36)
Play	2.2(68)	2.4(64)	1.8(28)	1.6(26)
Conv	0.9(28)	0.7(19)	0.0(0)	0.1(1)
Total	5.7(179)	4.6(125)	3.1(48)	3.9(63)

Considering engagement in conversation, the result was similar though the difference was smaller (US 11.0%, Korea 5.7%,  $p < .001$ ). These findings support Hypothesis 1-1.

Though not stated in the hypothesis, it is worth noting that interesting results were found regarding class differences. Both the US and Korean middle class children were more exposed to conversation than working class children and the differences were statistically significant (US middle class 24.7%, working class 14.0%,  $p < .001$ ; Korean middle class 11.3%, working class 7.0%,  $p < .001$ ). Similarly, they were more involved in conversation than their counterparts across nations (US middle class 13.8%, working class 7.5%,  $p < .001$ ; Korean middle class 8.5%, working class 3.0%,  $p < .001$ ).



Table 3

Exposure to and Engagement in Conversation, by Nation

	US	Korea	Diff.
Exposure	19.9 (712)	9.2 (196)	10.7***
Engagement	11.0 (393)	5.7 (123)	5.3***
Total observations	100.0 (3584)	100.0 (2141)	

Note: Throughout the tables, the number in the Diff. column represents the proportion difference between the two compared groups.

No sign before the number in Diff. column indicates that the proportion difference is in the hypothesized direction, and a minus sign before the number indicates that the difference is in the opposite direction.

All tests of significance are based on phi tests. A two by two contingency table was created for each phi test conducted. For example, in the case of exposure to conversation, phi was calculated based on a contingency table relating proportional rate of exposure to conversation vs. exposure to all other activities, by nation. A similar procedure was employed for all such tests.

	US	Korea
Exposure to conversation	19.9 (712)	9.2 (196)
Exposure to other activities	80.1 (2872)	90.8 (1945)

All tests are two-tailed: \*  $p < .05$ , \*\*  $p < .01$ , \*\*\*  $p < .001$ .

Hypothesis 1-2

In Hypothesis 1-2, of the total observations, Korean children were expected to be exposed to and engage in interpersonal lessons proportionally more than US children. Table 4 presents the results concerning the child's exposure and engagement in interpersonal lessons by nation.

Contrary to expectations, Korean children were less exposed to interpersonal lessons than US children and the difference was statistically significant (US 3.3%, Korea 1.5%,  $p < .001$ ). Similarly, Korean children were less often engaged in interpersonal lessons (US 2.7%, Korea 1.5%,  $p < .001$ ). Hypothesis 1-2, therefore, was not supported.

Table 4

Exposure to and Engagement in Interpersonal Lessons, by Nation

	US	Korea	Diff.
Exposure	3.3 (118)	1.5 (32)	-1.8***
Engagement	2.7 (96)	1.5 (32)	-1.2**
Total observations	100.0 (3584)	100.0 (2141)	

Note: \*\*  $p < .01$ , \*\*\*  $p < .001$

Hypothesis 1-3 and 1-4

In Hypothesis 1-3 and 1-4, assumptions about the effect of social class on academic lessons and play with academic objects were tested. Data relevant to Hypothesis 1-3 and 1-4 are provided in Table 5.

In Hypothesis 1-3, of the total observations, middle class children were predicted to be exposed to and engage in academic lessons proportionally more than working class children across the US and Korea. As can be seen in Table 5, more academic lessons were available for middle class

children than working class children both in the US and Korea, and the differences were statistically meaningful (US middle class 2.8%, working class 0.9%,  $p < .001$ ; Korean middle class 3.2%, working class 1.4%,  $p < .01$ ). Similar results were found concerning engagement in lessons across nations (US middle class 2.1%, working class 0.7%,  $p < .001$ ; Korean middle class 2.6%, working class 1.2%,  $p < .05$ ). These findings support Hypothesis 1-3.

Hypothesis 1-4 stated that of the total observations, middle class children would be exposed to and engage in play with academic objects proportionally more than working class children both in the US and Korea. Table 5 shows that both the US and Korean middle class children were more exposed to play with academic objects than their counterparts (US middle class 5.5%, working class 3.7%,  $p < .05$ ; Korean middle class 14.6%, working class 5.1%,  $p < .001$ ). Similar results were found regarding the children's engagement in play with academic objects (US middle class 5.3%, working class 3.7%,  $p < .05$ ; Korean middle class 14.3%, working class 5.1%,  $p < .001$ ).

It is worth noting that the differences in proportions observed between Korean middle and working class were much greater than those of the US, with the Korean middle class children far more likely to be exposed to and engage in play with academic objects than children from any other community, though a consistent pattern for social class was

found in both countries. These results support Hypothesis 1-4.

Although no assumptions about societal differences regarding academic lessons and play with academic objects were made, it is worthwhile mentioning that Korean children were much more exposed to and engaged in play with academic objects than US children (for exposure, US 4.7%, Korea 9.9%,  $p < .001$ ; for engagement, US 4.6%, Korea 9.7%,  $p < .001$ ). By contrast, no major differences were found regarding academic lessons between the two countries.

Table 5

Exposure to and Engagement in Academic Lessons and Play with Academic Objects, by Class within Nation

	USM	USW	Diff.	KOM	KOW	Diff.
<u>Lessons</u>						
Exposure	2.8(55)	0.9(14)	1.7***	3.2(34)	1.4(15)	1.8**
Engage	2.1(41)	0.7(11)	1.4***	2.6(28)	1.2(13)	1.4*
<u>Play</u>						
Exposure	5.5(108)	3.7(60)	1.7*	14.6(156)	5.1(55)	9.5***
Engage	5.3(104)	3.7(60)	1.6*	14.3(153)	5.1(55)	9.2***
T. Obs.	100(1967)	100(1617)		100(1067)	100(1074)	

Note: \*  $p < .05$ , \*\*  $p < .01$ , \*\*\*  $p < .001$

Question 2

The second question explored the type of partners engaged with the children. Table 6 provides information about the partners who participated in the activities with

the children. Across communities, peers and mothers were the primary partners in children's activities. The least common partner was infants.

Table 6

Partners in Activities, by Community

	USM	USW	KOM	KOW
Mother	22.0 (456)	25.1 (412)	28.1 (394)	25.5 (336)
Father	5.0 (103)	9.2 (151)	0.5 (7)	1.8 (24)
Other adult	14.9 (309)	10.6 (174)	12.1 (170)	9.8 (129)
Youth	12.8 (265)	8.3 (136)	12.3 (172)	12.0 (159)
Peer	28.3 (586)	21.5 (352)	28.9 (405)	27.5 (363)
Infant	0.2 (5)	0.7 (12)	0.6 (8)	2.3 (31)
No partner	16.7 (346)	24.6 (404)	17.4 (244)	21.1 (278)

The results were somewhat similar when considering each activity category separately. Data on partners regarding each activity are presented in Table 7.

Without doubt, children's primary partner was the mother, who was the most frequent partner in lessons, work, and conversation across communities. In play, however, peers were the most common partner. It is also interesting to note that children were more likely to play alone (without accompanied by a partner) than was true for the other activities.

Besides peers and mothers, adults also often featured as partners in lessons, work, and conversation. Especially in work and conversation, adults were more likely to be

Table 7Partners in Each Activity, by Community

	USM	USW	KOM	KOW
<u>Lessons</u>				
Mother	34.2 (78)	36.5 (46)	42.6 (46)	57.2 (28)
Father	3.9 (9)	10.3 (13)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Other adult	27.2 (62)	24.6 (31)	16.7 (18)	20.4 (10)
Youth	6.6 (15)	6.4 (8)	0.9 (1)	0.0 (0)
Peer	27.2 (62)	22.2 (28)	39.8 (43)	20.4 (10)
Infant	0.9 (2)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	2.0 (1)
No partner	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
<u>Work</u>				
Mother	33.5 (61)	36.9 (62)	56.1 (55)	57.9 (81)
Father	11.5 (21)	16.1 (27)	1.0 (1)	0.7 (1)
Other adult	17.6 (32)	17.9 (30)	18.4 (18)	25.0 (35)
Youth	11.5 (21)	7.7 (13)	5.1 (5)	2.8 (4)
Peer	10.5 (19)	13.7 (23)	11.2 (11)	8.6 (12)
Infant	1.1 (2)	1.2 (2)	0.0 (0)	1.4 (2)
No partner	14.3 (26)	6.5 (11)	8.2 (8)	3.6 (5)
<u>Play</u>				
Mother	11.7 (145)	20.0 (238)	22.2 (235)	18.8 (204)
Father	2.5 (31)	7.1 (84)	0.2 (2)	1.7 (19)
Other adult	10.2 (127)	7.1 (84)	9.8 (104)	7.0 (76)
Youth	14.2 (176)	8.5 (101)	14.2 (150)	14.1 (153)
Peer	35.9 (445)	23.5 (279)	30.5 (322)	30.7 (333)
Infant	0.0 (0)	0.8 (10)	0.8 (8)	2.6 (28)
No partner	25.5 (317)	33.3 (393)	22.3 (236)	25.1 (273)
<u>Conversation</u>				
Mother	41.1 (172)	41.8 (66)	42.3 (58)	51.1 (23)
Father	10.0 (42)	17.1 (27)	2.9 (4)	8.9 (4)
Other adult	21.0 (88)	18.3 (29)	21.9 (30)	17.8 (8)
Youth	12.7 (53)	8.9 (14)	11.7 (16)	4.4 (2)
Peer	14.3 (60)	13.9 (22)	21.2 (29)	17.8 (8)
Infant	0.2 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
No partner	0.7 (3)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)

partners than peers across communities. Fathers were not frequently observed engaging in activities with their children, particularly so in Korea.

#### Hypothesis 2-1

According to Hypothesis 2-1, for each activity in which children engaged, Korean children were predicted to be accompanied with partners proportionally more than US children. Table 8 presents information regarding partner accompaniment.

Because of the nature of activities, the children were always involved with partners when engaging in lessons or conversation. As a result, no proportion difference was found between US and Korea in those activities. Korean children, however, were more accompanied with partners in work and play than US children, and the differences were statistically significant (for work, US 86.7%, Korea 92.7%,  $p < .05$ ; for play, US 62.5%, Korea 66.5%,  $p < .05$ ). These results provide some support for Hypothesis 2-1.

#### Hypothesis 2-2

In Hypothesis 2-2, for each activity in which children engaged, Korean mothers were expected to be partners proportionally more than US mothers. Table 9 presents the results about mothers' accompaniment as partners in children's activities.

Table 8

Activities Accompanied by Partners, by Nation

	US	Korea	Diff.
Lessons	100.0(232)	100.0(97)	0.0
Work	86.7(241)	92.7(166)	6.0*
Play	62.5(1181)	66.5(1011)	4.0*
Conversation	99.0(390)	100.0(123)	1.0

Note: \*  $p < .05$

For Table 8, phi tests were conducted by the following procedure. In the case of work, for example, phi was calculated based on a contingency table relating the proportional rate of work in which children engaged accompanied by partner vs. work in which they were engaged alone. A similar procedure was employed for all such tests.

	US	Korea
Work with partner	86.7(241)	92.7(166)
Work without partner	13.3(37)	7.3(13)

When children were involved in lessons, work, or play, those in Korea were more likely to be partnered by their mother than their US counterparts, and the differences were statistically significant (for lessons, US 53.4%, Korea 76.3%,  $p < .001$ ; for work, US 44.2%, Korea 76.0%,  $p < .001$ ; for play, US 20.3%, Korea 28.9%,  $p < .001$ ). Korean mothers were also more involved in conversation with children than US mothers though the difference was not statistically meaningful. The results support Hypothesis 2-1.



Table 9

Mothers' Engagement in Activities, by Nation

	US	Korea	Diff.
Lessons	53.4 (124)	76.3 (74)	22.9***
Work	44.2 (123)	76.0 (136)	31.8***
Play	20.3 (384)	28.9 (439)	8.6***
Conversation	60.4 (238)	65.9 (81)	5.5

Note: \*\*\*  $p < .001$

For Table 9, phi tests were conducted by the following procedure. In the case of lessons, for example, phi was calculated based on a contingency table relating the proportional rate of lessons in which children engaged accompanied by mother vs. lessons in which the mother was not a partner, by nation. A similar procedure was employed for all such tests.

	US	Korea
lessons with mother	53.4 (124)	76.3 (74)
lessons without mother	46.6 (108)	23.7 (23)

Regarding mother's involvement, additional analyses were conducted since the mother's extent of involvement may have simply reflected her degree of availability. To examine if the higher participation rate of Korean mothers was caused by their higher availability, conditional probabilities were calculated. At each observational window, we coded whether the mother was potentially available to the child, and used this information to assess the probability of involvement, given her availability.

Five out of eleven US middle class mothers and eight out of nine US working class mothers held jobs outside the home while all of the Korean mothers were homemakers except one middle class mother. As can be inferred from the rate of working mothers, Korean mothers were physically present with the children more than US mothers. The differences, however, were not as great as expected (70.9% of the observations in the US, and 75.3% in Korea).

Table 10 provides data on the probability of the mothers' engagement as partners given their availability. Proportionally Korean mothers were involved with children more than US mothers in work, play, and conversation, and the differences were statistically significant (for work, US 60.3%, Korea 88.3%,  $p < .001$ ; for play, US 28.6%, Korea 40.1%,  $p < .001$ ; for conversation, US 73.0%, Korea 88.0%,  $p < .01$ ). They were also more likely to participate in lessons with children more than US mothers, though the difference was not statistically significant. These results also support Hypothesis 2-2.

Additional data regarding mothers' and fathers' engagement in children's activities given their presence were presented in Table 11. Korean mothers were more likely to engage in children's activities than US mothers regardless of social class. It was hard to make valid comparisons about fathers' engagement since they rarely appeared in the observations, especially so in Korea. It is

Table 10

Mothers' Engagement in Activities Given Their Presence, by Nation

	US	Korea	Diff.
Lessons	83.8 (124)	87.1 (74)	3.3
Work	60.3 (123)	88.3 (136)	28.0***
Play	28.6 (384)	40.1 (439)	11.5***
Conversation	73.0 (238)	88.0 (81)	12.0**

Note: \*\*  $p < .01$ , \*\*\*  $p < .001$

interesting to note, though, that both in the US and Korea, working class fathers were more available to children than their middle class counterparts.

Table 11

Mothers and Fathers as Partners Given Their Presence, by Community

	USM	USW	KOM	KOW
<u>Mother</u>				
Lessons	86.5 (77)	74.6 (44)	85.2 (46)	90.3 (28)
Work	56.0 (61)	64.2 (61)	87.3 (55)	87.9 (80)
Play	22.7 (145)	33.7 (238)	45.3 (233)	35.2 (204)
Conv	74.3 (171)	68.8 (66)	87.7 (57)	85.2 (23)
<u>Father</u>				
Lessons	25.7 (9)	36.1 (13)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Work	42.0 (21)	45.0 (27)	100.0 (1)	25.0 (1)
Play	12.4 (30)	18.4 (84)	33.3 (2)	23.8 (19)
Conv	42.0 (42)	51.9 (27)	75.0 (3)	66.7 (4)

### Hypothesis 2-3

Hypothesis 2-3 was about the child's sleeping partner. Korean mothers were predicted to be engaged as partners in the child's sleeping proportionally more than US mothers.

Of the 20 US children, only one working class child occasionally slept with her mother. Conversely, of the 12 Korean children, only two middle class children did not sleep with their mothers on a regular basis. Therefore, 5.0% of US children and 83.3% of Korean children were accompanied by mother in their sleeping activity.

Hypothesis 2-3 was thus supported.

To be more specific, all the US middle class children and four out of nine working class children had their own bedrooms. The remaining children shared bedrooms with their siblings. By contrast, only two middle class Korean children had a separate "sleeping space" from their mothers; one slept alone in her bed in the living room and the other slept with his elder sister in their room. It is hard to say that the Korean mothers' habit of sleeping with their children was totally caused by the lack of space, however, since five out of six middle class families and four out of six working class families had one or more extra rooms - in many cases, the rooms were actually used as storage places for children's toys and books - in which the child could sleep alone.

### Question 3

The third question focused on the respective roles taken by the children and their partners. Six categories of the children's and partners' roles were examined: trying to manage or direct the activity; trying to prevent, discontinue, or avoid an activity; facilitating; participating<sup>2</sup>; observing; and eavesdropping. Table 12 provides data about the roles taken by the children.

Of the possible six roles, the first three were only rarely taken by the children (range 0.3% to 1.1% across communities). Of the remaining three, US children were more likely to take a rather active role, that is, participating, than Korean children (US 74.9%, Korea 69.4%). Conversely, Korean children were more likely to take rather passive roles such as observing and eavesdropping than US children (US 24.4%, Korea 30.2%).

The same pattern was found regarding social class difference. Middle class children in both societies were more likely to participate in the activities while working class children were more likely to observe or eavesdrop on the activities.

---

<sup>2</sup> It should be noted that engagement in the activity, and participation as a role, mean different things. If a child was involved in an activity in any way (that is, had any role in the activity), the child was said to be engaged in the activity. A participation refers to an active type of engagement, as opposed to more passive observing or eavesdropping, as I pointed out earlier.

In general, children were far more likely to actively participate (72.7%) in the activities than just passively observe or eavesdrop (27.3%) the activities. However, when work was going on, they tended to observe or eavesdrop (54.3%) rather than participate (44.4%) across communities.

Table 12

Children's Roles in Activities, by Community

	USM	USW	KOM	KOW
Manage/direct	0.8(11)	0.4(5)	0.1(1)	0.0(0)
Prevent/avoid	0.2(3)	0.1(2)	0.4(4)	0.1(1)
Facilitating	0.1(1)	0.1(1)	0.0(0)	0.2(2)
Participating	77.6(1128)	72.1(967)	73.2(706)	65.6(626)
Observing	8.5(124)	8.9(119)	10.7(103)	14.8(141)
Eavesdropping	12.9(187)	18.5(248)	15.6(151)	19.3(184)

Table 13 presents the data about roles taken by the partner. As in the case of the child, US partners were more likely to actively participate in the child's activities than Korean partners (US 76.5%, Korea 62.6%). Further, they played more active roles, such as directing, preventing, and facilitating, more than Korean partners (US 5.7%, Korea 1.6%). Korean partners tended to take rather passive roles such as observing and eavesdropping more than US partners (US 15.1%, Korea 35.0%).

Similar results were found for the social class difference. Middle class partners in both societies were more actively involved while working class partners were less actively involved in children's activities.

Table 13

Partners' Roles in Activities, by Community

	USM	USW	KOM	KOW
Manage/direct	3.1(53)	0.9(11)	0.0(0)	0.0(0)
Prevent/avoid	1.0(17)	2.1(26)	0.8(9)	2.1(22)
Facilitating	4.6(79)	5.3(66)	1.0(12)	1.0(10)
Participating	82.6(1424)	70.3(869)	64.5(746)	60.7(632)
Observing	4.2(73)	10.9(135)	21.7(251)	21.9(228)
Eavesdropping	4.5(78)	10.5(130)	11.9(138)	14.4(150)

Hypothesis 3-1

Hypotheses 3-1 and 3-2 relate to children's initiations of the activity itself and of their involvement in it.

Initiation was coded as follows: unknown, child or child with other person, and other person. In general, children were most likely to initiate play (65.7%) and least likely to start lessons (11.1%) by themselves across communities.

In Hypothesis 3-1, for each activity in which children engaged, US children were expected to initiate activities and their involvement in the activities proportionally more than Korean children. Information concerning initiation of activities and involvement is presented in Table 14.

As was predicted, proportionally US children initiated more lessons, work and play than Korean children, and the differences were statistically significant (for lessons, US 19.5%, Korea 6.2%,  $p < .01$ ; for work, US 23.6%, Korea 10.1%,  $p < .001$ ; for play, US 72.9%, Korea 61.5%,  $p < .001$ ). They also initiated more conversation though the difference was not statistically significant.

Compared to the extent to which the children initiated activities, they were far more likely to initiate their own involvement. Across all engaged activities, children initiated their own involvement in them almost three quarters of the time.

Accordingly, the differences between the US and Korean children in terms of initiation of involvement were far less striking. Proportionally US children initiated their involvement in lessons (US 44.4%, Korea 27.8%,  $p < .001$ ), and Korean children initiated their involvement in conversation (US 79.8%, Korea 89.4%,  $p < .05$ ) more than their counterparts. No differences were found in work and play.

In sum, US children exercised more initiation of activities than did Korean children. In terms of initiation of involvement, however, the differences were either nonexistent or inconsistent. Hypothesis 3-1, thus, was only partially supported.

#### Hypothesis 3-2

According to Hypothesis 3-2, for each activity in which children engaged, middle class children were predicted to initiate activities and their involvement in the activities proportionally more than working class children both in the US and Korea. Table 15 presents results concerning initiation of activity and involvement by class.

Proportionally US middle class children initiated more lessons, work, and conversation than working class children



Table 14

Initiation of Activities and Involvement in the Activities,  
by Nation

	US	Korea	Diff.
<u>Activity</u>			
Lessons	19.5 (45)	6.2 (6)	13.3**
Work	23.6 (65)	10.1 (18)	13.5***
Play	72.9 (1379)	61.5 (935)	11.4***
Conversation	48.9 (192)	47.2 (58)	1.7
<u>Involvement</u>			
Lessons	44.4 (103)	27.8 (27)	16.6**
Work	80.1 (222)	79.3 (142)	0.8
Play	90.8 (1714)	91.5 (1391)	-0.7
Conversation	79.8 (313)	89.4 (110)	-9.6*

Note: \*  $p < .05$ , \*\*  $p < .01$ , \*\*\*  $p < .001$

For Table 14, phi tests were conducted by the following procedure. In the case of initiation of lessons, for example, phi was calculated based on a contingency table relating the proportional rate of lessons initiated by children vs. lessons initiated by others, by nation. A similar procedure was employed for all such tests.

	US	Korea
lessons with mother	19.5 (45)	6.2 (6)
lessons without mother	80.5 (187)	93.8 (91)

(for lessons, MC 25.5%, WC 9.3%  $p < .01$ ; for work, MC 33.3%, WC 10.2%,  $p < .001$ ; for conversation, MC 52.0%, WC 36.2%,  $p < .01$ ). Korean middle class children initiated more play than working class children (MC 65.4%, WC 54.9%). No statistically meaningful differences were found in other activities.

Concerning initiation of involvement in activities, similar results were found. Proportionally, US middle class children initiated their involvement in lessons, work, and conversation more than working class children. Korean middle class children initiated their involvement in lessons more than working class children. Korean working class children, however, involved themselves in play more than did middle class children.

In sum, US middle class children exercised more initiation of activities and initiated their own involvement in activities more than working children. However, no consistent differences were found between Korean middle and working class children. In terms of the child's initiation of activities and their involvement in the activities, the class differences were more noticeable in the US than in Korea. Hypothesis 3-2, therefore, was only partially supported.

#### Question 4

The final question examined the location where the children's activities took place. Findings regarding location are provided in Table 16.

Location was divided into four categories: the children's own environments, others' environments, preschool (or other sort of child care setting), and public place. Across communities, most of the children's activities took place in their own environments (70.3%).

Table 15

Initiation of Activities and Involvement in the Activities,  
by Class within Nation

	USM	USW	Diff.	KOM	KOW	Diff.
<u>Activity</u>						
Lessons	25.5(37)	9.3(8)	16.2**	9.5(6)	0.0(0)	9.5
Work	33.3(48)	10.2(17)	23.1***	8.3(8)	7.2(10)	1.1
Play	71.0(635)	71.5(744)	-0.5	65.4(499)	54.9(436)	10.5***
Conv	52.0(143)	36.2(51)	15.8**	46.2(42)	48.5(16)	-2.3
<u>Involve</u>						
Lessons	55.2(80)	26.4(23)	28.8***	34.9(22)	14.7(5)	20.2*
Work	81.4(118)	62.7(106)	18.7***	56.3(54)	63.3(88)	-10.0
Play	88.8(793)	88.9(922)	-0.1	86.6(661)	91.9(730)	-5.3***
Conv	84.6(231)	60.3(85)	24.3***	90.1(82)	84.8(28)	5.3

Note: \*  $p < .05$ , \*\*  $p < .01$ , \*\*\*  $p < .001$

The amount of time that the child spent in preschool and public space varied as a function of nation and class. Proportionally US children spent more time in preschool than Korean children, and middle class children spent more time in preschool than working class children across US and Korea. The exact opposite was true in the case of public space. Namely, Korean children spent more time in public space than US children, and working class children spent more time in public space than middle class children across nations.

Table 16

Location of Activities, by Community

	USM	USW	KOM	KOW
Own Environs	66.2(1300)	67.2(1075)	75.0(794)	71.8(767)
Others'	4.8(95)	9.5(152)	2.1(22)	3.4(36)
preschool	20.4(400)	14.1(225)	9.8(104)	0.7(7)
Public space	8.7(170)	9.3(148)	13.1(139)	24.2(258)

Hypothesis 4-1

According to Hypothesis 4-1, of the total observations, US children's activities were predicted to occur in child modified locations (that is, in a space that has in some way been modified for their care and/or enjoyment) proportionally more than those of Korean children. Table 17 presents these data.

More of the US children's activities took place in child-modified space than those of Korean children across locations, and the differences were statistically significant (for own environs, US 32.6%, Korea 1.6%,  $p < .001$ ; for others' environs, US 29.1%, Korea 3.4%,  $p < .001$ ; for preschool, US 81.1%, Korea 57.7%,  $p < .001$ ; for public space, US 50.9% Korea 20.2%,  $p < .001$ ).

These data reveal that in both countries when children are in preschool they are likely to be in the environments that have been modified for them. However, when they are at home (either in their own home or in someone else's), US children are more likely to be in a space that has in some

way been modified for them. These results support Hypothesis 4-1.

Table 17

Activities Occurring in Child-modified Location, by Nation

	US	Korea	Diff.
Own Environs	32.6 (774)	1.6 (25)	31.0***
Others' Environs	29.1 (72)	3.4 (2)	25.7***
Preschool	81.1 (507)	57.7 (64)	23.4***
Public space	50.9 (162)	20.2 (80)	30.7***

Note: \*\*\*  $p < .001$

For Table 17, phi tests were conducted by the following procedure. In the case of own environments, for example, phi was calculated based on a contingency table relating the proportional rate of observations taken in child-modified places in children's own homes (or other places such as yard, car, etc.) vs. activities occurred in non child-modified places, by nation. A similar procedure was employed for all such tests.

	US	Korea
Child-modified own environs	32.6 (774)	1.6 (25)
non-modified own environs	67.4 (1601)	98.4 (1536)

Hypothesis 4-2

In Hypothesis 4-2, of the total observations that took place in preschool (or other childcare settings), Korean children were expected to be exposed to and engaged in academic lessons proportionally more than US children. The findings of academic lessons in preschool are presented in Table 18.

It was hard to make valid comparisons since Korean children were rarely observed in any type of institutional care (only 2 out of 12 children attended preschool on a regular basis). The available data, though, indicate that proportionally Korean children were more exposed to academic lessons in preschool than were US children. The difference, however, was not statistically significant. Concerning involvement, though, a statistically meaningful difference was found between US and Korea (US 3.5%, Korea 9.0%,  $p < .01$ ). The results provided only partial support for Hypothesis 4-2.

Table 18

Exposure to and Engagement in Academic Lessons in Preschool (or Other Childcare Settings), by Nation

	US	Korea	Diff.
Exposure	5.4 (34)	9.9 (11)	4.5
Engagement	3.5 (22)	9.0 (10)	5.5**

Note: \*\*  $p < .01$

Variance of the Data

To measure the individual variance of the data, the means, ranges, and standard deviations of the variables which showed significant differences between nations and/or classes were computed. The data are provided in Tables 19, 20, and 21.

Table 19 presents the data regarding available activities and sub-activity categories about which hypotheses were tested. Regarding all the activities, noticeable individual variations were found across communities.

The data regarding mother as a partner are provided in Table 20, and those regarding the child's initiation of activities are presented in Table 21. In general, similar results (noticeable individual variations) were found for all the variables examined.

These data clearly indicate that within-community differences exists across communities. Even within the group of same class membership and same nationality and race, significant variations were found in terms of children's daily activities. It would be interesting and necessary, therefore, to address the causes of these within-community variations, and to ascertain whether the differences remain consistent for subsequent years in future study.

Table 19

Variance of Data Regarding Available Activities, by Community

	USM			USW			KOM			KOW		
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>RANGE</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>RANGE</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>RANGE</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>RANGE</u>
<u>Lessons</u>	16.8	9.2	7-39	10.4	4.4	4-17	11.5	5.6	3-20	6.0	1.4	4-8
Academic	5.0	6.5	0-20	1.6	1.8	0-5	5.7	3.3	1-9	2.5	2.3	0-6
Interperson	6.4	2.9	1-12	5.3	3.5	1-12	3.7	2.0	1-7	1.7	1.0	0-3
<u>Work</u>	47.4	13.7	29-70	63.6	9.9	50-81	44.7	12.0	31-61	55.8	14.7	40-80
<u>Play</u>	101.4	20.6	71-132	132.2	17.0	101-154	136.8	12.6	118-150	145.3	13.7	122-162
Academic	9.8	7.3	4-29	6.7	6.5	1-21	26.0	8.5	18-39	9.2	5.4	1-16
<u>Conv</u>	44.1	10.9	28-62	25.2	7.4	14-39	20.2	10.5	10-38	12.5	3.5	7-16



Table 20

Variance of Data Regarding Mothers Partner, by Community

USM			USW			KOM			KOW		
<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>RANGE</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>RANGE</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>RANGE</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>RANGE</u>
41.4	16.9	19-70	51.3	29.6	14-106	72.3	37.8	15-116	63.0	28.9	21-89

Table 21

Variance of Data Regarding Children's Initiation of Activities,  
by Community

	USM			USW			KOM			KOW		
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>RANGE</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>RANGE</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>RANGE</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>RANGE</u>
Lessons	3.4	2.5	1-7	0.9	1.1	0-3	1.0	1.3	0-3	0.0	0.0	0
Work	4.4	4.7	0-14	1.9	1.1	1-4	1.3	0.8	0-2	1.7	1.2	0-3
Play	57.7	18.5	34-97	82.7	24.7	47-116	83.2	16.6	55-102	72.7	17.2	44-90
Conv	12.8	8.8	3-35	5.7	2.7	2-10	7.0	3.2	3-11	2.7	2.4	0-6

## CHAPTER V

## DISCUSSION

This study was designed to explore the variation in children's daily life in different cultures, that is, middle and working class communities of the US and Korea. The children of different cultural communities were predicted to experience different daily routines which help them to become members of their communities. Although there is no explicit research relating parental values to children's everyday activities, Vygotsky's and Bronfenbrenner's theories as well as the research of Kohn and his colleagues, postulate that cultural values and beliefs held by people of a community serve to regulate their youngsters' daily routines.

Specifically, US and Korean children were predicted to experience different activities that assist their learning of different socio-cultural values, i.e., independent and equal as opposed to interdependent and hierarchal. At the same time, middle and working class children were predicted to undergo different daily activities which were based on different social class values, i.e., self-direction as opposed to conformity. Based on these predictions, the questions and hypotheses of this study were drawn.

Of course, the values and beliefs of a cultural community are not visible; nevertheless, the children's

activities which could be affected by them are easily observable. For example, many scholars (Johnson, 1985; Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Marsella, et al., 1985; Miller, 1988) have suggested that people of independent cultures, such as Americans, are far more likely to value attending to the self and expressing one's own opinion, and less likely to appreciate social conformity, compared to people of interdependent cultures, such as Koreans. If this difference in the value systems is reflected in the children's activities, one should find that American children show more initiative in their activities and are more involved in daily conversation from an early age compared to Korean children. The results of this study confirm these predictions in addition to the others.

As was expected, differences were found in the children's activities across different communities. First of all, the different ways of defining self, namely independence and interdependence, in the US and Korea, seemed to influence many facets of the children's activities. In accordance with previous studies of independent and interdependent cultures (Caudill & Weinstein, 1969; Otaki, et al., 1986; Morelli, et al., 1992), Korean mothers were observed to use more proximal modes of interaction than US mothers. For example, Korean mothers spent more time with their children; that is, they were more likely to be involved with the children in their

activities, and to cosleep with them on a regular basis, than were US mothers. It is a cultural ideal in Korea that mothers should take care of children in their early years, and not surprisingly, therefore, Korean children seldom attended preschool or other kinds of childcare institutions. Koreans also appeared to be less verbally oriented than Americans and exposure to and involvement in daily conversation was much less frequent for Korean children than US children.

It should be noted, however, that the US children were not much less involved with partners in their activities than Korean children. The most striking difference that children of the two nations experienced in their daily life was the amount of time that they spent with their mothers. Clearly, Korean mothers and children did more things together than those of the US. The data of this study, therefore, indicate that this Korean socialization practice, which helps to build strong attachment between mother and children, may cause the children to develop an interdependent self concept in the first place. Above all else, the close physical connectedness and intimacy between Korean mothers and their children may blur the boundary between them and foster the belief of the fundamental connectedness among people. This feeling of connectedness may be reinforced by the fact that the Korean children were rarely in environments that were specifically modified for their functioning.

Compared to the US children, Korean children were more or less blended into the adult world rather than being provided their own world (i.e., sleeping with parents, living in parents' room, having few child-modified spaces, and so on). By contrast, the US children were often separated from the adult world (i.e., sleeping alone, having their own rooms and other sorts of child-modified spaces, and so on) from an early age, and frequently placed in their own environments which assist their own functioning. This initial separation and feeling of self-sufficiency, caused by the experiences of being in environments that they could manage, may foster a belief in the inherent separateness of people in American children, and a self-concept that includes independence.

Because of the interdependency and hierarchal nature of interpersonal relationships, I hypothesized that Korean children would be more exposed to and engaged in interpersonal lessons than US children. Contrary to what was expected, Korean children were less involved in interpersonal lessons than US children. The possible reasons for this finding could be the followings. First, considering preschoolers' developmental level - cognition, language, and even motor skills - they might be simply regarded too young to be taught the complex etiquettes required in interpersonal relationships in Korea. Second, considering the reticence of Koreans, Korean youngsters

might learn the ways of behaving in their culture through an implicit way such as observation rather than explicit teaching. Third, the unique tie that mother and child develop in Korea could be the reason for the fewer than expected interpersonal lessons. The Korean child rearing style establishes a close physical and emotional bond between mother and child. In their early years, Korean children are indulged to a degree so as not to harm that bond. The mother's indulgence and devotion sometimes encourages a child to be demanding and even tyrannical at home. This can cause a lack of discipline for Korean youngsters, represented as less exposure to interpersonal lessons than US children in this study. In Korea, it may be the case that children are more likely to get explicit lessons in how to behave correctly when they are older.

Besides societal difference, the daily routine activities of children also varied as a function of class differences. Kohn (1969, 1977, 1979) has suggested that middle class parents from various societies are more likely than their working class counterparts to value self-direction and achievement and less likely to appreciate conformity. Based on this argument, I hypothesized that middle class children in both the US and Korea would initiate more activities and have more opportunities to get academic lessons and to play with academic objects than working class children.

The results of this study support these hypotheses. As was predicted, middle class children showed higher levels of initiation in starting their activities both in the US and Korea. They had more chances to become involved in academic lessons and to play with academic objects, and were also more exposed to and engaged in daily conversation than their counterparts. These results provide additional evidence for Kohn's argument that the effects of class membership are experienced in similar ways in different types of societies. Both in the US, an independent society, and Korea, an interdependent society, relatively similar effects of class membership were found.

Another interesting fact to which one should pay attention is that in the case of initiation of activities, the difference between middle and working class children was more evident in the US than in Korea. The reason for this may be found in the short history of industrialization in Korea. In Korea, classes are in the process of formation, and not as rigidly established as in the US. The difference in value orientation between middle and working class people, therefore, might be smaller in Korea than in the US. For this reason, the lives of Korean middle and working class children could be observed to be more similar than those of US children.

In sum, the findings of this study indicate that children's daily activities varied as a function of class

differences as well as societal differences. Children of the US and Korea experience somewhat different types of activities that assist their learning of different socio-cultural values, i.e., independence in the US as opposed to interdependence in Korea. At the same time, middle and working class children undergo different daily activities that encourage their learning of different social class values, i.e., self-direction in middle class as opposed to conformity in working class. The data of this study provide evidence that the social reality experienced by children can be different as the result of values that members of their community hold within as well as across societies. It is clear, therefore, that before the age of four, children start to gain some degree of cultural knowledge which assists them to become members of their community.

Though the main purpose of this study was to examine the differences in the different worlds, it is worthwhile mentioning that the general conditions of the children's daily lives were in many ways similar in the US and Korea. The following describes the similarities.

Both in the US and Korea, about two-thirds of the observed activities took place in the children's own environments. Among observed activities, the most common was play and the least common was lessons. Besides play, the children frequently engaged in activities that met their physical needs.



In both the US and Korea, mothers and peers were the main partners in the children's activities. Mothers were the most frequent partner in lessons, work and conversation, and peers were the most frequent partner in play. Besides them, other adults often featured as partners in all activities but play.

Children started approximately one-third of the activities in which they were engaged, and they got involved by themselves in two-thirds of the activities. Further, children tended to actively participate in all activities (with the exception of work) rather than passively observe or eavesdrop on them. When work was going on, however, they were more likely to observe or eavesdrop than participate.

These data give a general picture of the children's daily life. Most of the children's daily routines consisted of activities directly related to their enjoyment, care, and comfort. In fact, about two-thirds of children's daylight hours were spent in play, exploration of surroundings, and satisfaction of their ongoing bodily needs such as sleeping, eating, bathing and so on. Other activities such as lessons, work, and conversation held rather subsidiary positions.

Work was the activity to which the children paid least attention. Although work went on around the children fairly frequently (see Table 1), they typically did not become involved in it, even passively as an observer or an

eavesdropper. Since this study was conducted in urban areas of technologically complex societies, the work going on in the children's vicinity was mostly related to housework (such as cooking, cleaning and shopping, etc.). The nature of housework, which is repeated continuously every day, might discourage the children's interest in work compared to other activities happening around them.

As was reported in research conducted in industrialized societies (Sidden, 1992; Whiting & Edwards, 1988), mothers were typically the major caretakers, teachers, and friends to their youngsters. Compared to mothers, fathers rarely appeared in the observations, since they engaged more frequently in paid employment outside the home and were less physically present with their children (See Table 11). Even when they were home, however, the Korean fathers seemed in particular to be more conscious of the observer's presence (maybe gender difference had some effects on fathers, given the fact that all the observers were females), and sometimes tried to avoid being observed (by way of staying in his room, and not interacting with children, etc.). Given fathers' presence, therefore, mothers were still much more likely to be involved with children in their activities than fathers (which might be true in everyday life, but possibly exaggerated).

Besides mothers, other adults and peers were the main partners for the children. Considering the nature of

activities in which adults and peers were mainly involved (for adults lessons, work and conversation; and for peers lessons and play), it was evident that adults, rather than the youth or older children, were the competent partners who mostly guided children and helped them learn the inventions and codes of their culture. On the other hand, peers were colleagues of the children who were grouped and guided together through institutions like preschool and daycare centers.

Another point of similarity, and one which was not expected, was that the children in each of the four communities spent some portion of their time without a partner at all. This was most clear with regard to play. This fact is noteworthy because one would expect that the US children would spend a greater proportion of their time alone, compared to Korean children, given that they are more likely to be encouraged to be independent. It may be the case, however, that the coding scheme of this study was insufficiently sensitive - a child would have been coded as having no partner even if another person was sitting next to the child, if that person was neither observing the child's activity nor being more actively engaged in it.

In sum, the daily routines of 2 1/2- to 4-year-old children showed some degree of transcultural similarities concerning the activities in which the children engaged, the partners with whom they were involved, the roles taken, and

the location where they spent most of their time. The main causes for this similarity, as scholars of the Six Cultures Projects (Minturn & Lambert, 1964; Whiting & Whiting, 1975; Whiting & Edwards, 1988) have argued, can be found in the similarity of the maintenance system of the US and Korea (not only the industrial structure, but also household composition, and educational system, and so on), and the universal nurturing needs of young children.

The results of this study are in line with Vygotsky's (Rogoff, 1990; Tudge & Winterhoff, 1993; Vygotsky, 1978, 1987; Wertsch, 1991) and Bronfenbrenner's (Bronfenbrenner, 1979, 1983, 1993; Tudge, et al., in press) theoretical positions. Vygotsky and Bronfenbrenner argued that the development of psychological functions depends on the environments (both immediate and remote) in which the person functions, and that development is inseparable from human social and cultural activities. They believed that the activities that adults engage in and give children most opportunity to practice are different across cultures, and through these activities children gain cultural knowledge such as proper ways of acting and thinking.

The findings of this study generally support the theorists' perspectives; the activities that different cultural communities made more available to their children were most likely the ones that fit with their cultural values. The influence of culture was clearly visible in the

way children interacted with others, the roles they took, the partners they had, and the locations in which they spent time, despite the similarities that the children of different communities had in common.

The data of this study portray child development as a process of co-construction. Children took very active roles in starting and participating in the activities, and in recruiting partners and getting involved with them. As Vygotsky and Bronfenbrenner indicated, child development was observed as a two-way process; that is, the children were not merely passive recipients but active appropriators of their culture.

Because of the research design, this study has several merits. First, the method of observation (conducted in natural and unstructured settings) made it possible and more reliable to explore the processes of development rather than just outcomes, since interactions between the children and their environments and people around them in their daily activities were observable. Second, the cross-cultural design made it possible to examine the links between different socio-cultural values and socialization processes of the children in different lands. And third, the cross-cultural design also made it possible to assess the universal validity of some psychosocial principles (i.e., the validity of Kohn's theory as well as Vygotsky's and Bronfenbrenner's assumptions).

At the same time, this study has several limitations.

First, considering the small number of participants and the nonprobability method of recruiting participants, the findings should not be generalized to the entire population.

Second, the presence of the observer might have had different effects upon the behaviors of the people of different personalities or gender even within the same community as well as across different communities. Of course, the cross-societal difference was most obvious in this case, since an observer was much more likely to be regarded as an intruder in the interdependent network of the Korean home than in the US home. For this reason, Koreans being observed may have been less at ease than their American counterparts. In fact, there was an obvious attempt by a middle class Korean father to avoid being observed by staying outside late.

Third, it is hard to say that socio-cultural values and beliefs are the exclusive factors that regulate children's daily life, since noticeable individual variations were found in children's activities across communities. This study, moreover, did not explore the other factors - such as personal values and beliefs of parents, personality and temper of children as well as people surrounding them, I.Q. of the children, and so on - which could affect the routine activities of children.

Fourth, both the dominant values and beliefs of the

societies (i.e., the US and Korea) and those of the classes (i.e., middle and working class) were assumed from previous literature rather than actually measured. In general, the findings of this study were in line with the assumptions. Nevertheless, it would be more than necessary to investigate the actual values and beliefs of people around children at both societal and social class levels since no explicit data are available.

And finally, one of the most important factors that regulates development, i.e., time, is not considered in this study. As Bronfenbrenner (Bronfenbrenner, under review) argued by posing the Person-Process-Context-Time model, developmental processes should be studied longitudinally since development necessarily occurs over a period of time. Age is a significant factor that brings changes to children's life. To examine whether the way of appropriating children to one's culture is a continuing and consistent process over time, therefore, a future follow-up study is needed.

## REFERENCES

- Azuma, H. (1986). Why study child development in Japan? In H. Stevenson, H. Azuma, & K. Hakuta (Eds.), Child development and education in Japan. New York: Freeman.
- Azuma, H., Kashiwagi, K., & Hess, R. (1981). The influence of maternal teaching upon cognitive development of children. Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press.
- Baker, H. D. R. (1979). Chinese family and kinship. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Barnlund, D. C. (1975). Public and private self in Japan and United States: Communicative styles of two cultures. Tokyo: Simul Press.
- Berelson, B., & Steiner, G. A. (1964). Human behavior: An inventory of scientific findings. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World.
- Bornstein, M. H., Tal, J., & Tamis-LeMonda, C. S. (1991). Parenting in cross-cultural perspective: The United States, France, and Japan. In Bornstein, M. H. (Ed.), Cultural approaches to parenting (pp.60-90). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1958). Socialization and social class through time and space. In E. E. Maccoby, T. M. Newcomb, and E. L. Hartley (Eds.), Readings in Social Psychology. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston (pp. 400-425).
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). The ecology of human development. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1988). Interacting systems in human development. Research paradigm: Present and future. In N. Bolder, A Caspi, G. Downey, & M. Moorehouse (Eds.). Persons in context: Developmental processes (pp. 25-49). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1993). The ecology of cognitive development: Research models and fugitive findings. In R. Wozniak & K. Fischer (Eds.), Development in context: Acting and thinking in specific environments (pp. 3-44). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.



- Bronfenbrenner, U. (under review). The process-person-context model in developmental research: Principles, applications, and implications. Unpublished manuscript, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY.
- Bronfenbrenner, U., Ceci, S. J., & Lenzenweger, M. F. (in press). Nature-nurture reconceptualized in developmental perspective: Toward a new theoretical can operational model. Psychological Review.
- Bronfenbrenner, U., & Crouter, A. C. (1983). The evolution of environmental models in developmental research. In P. H. Mussen (Ed.), Handbook of child psychology, Vol. 1: History, theory, and methods (pp. 357-414). New York: Wiley.
- Cashmore, J. A., & Goodnow, J. L. (1986). Influence of Australian parents' values: Ethnicity versus socioeconomic status. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 17, 441-454.
- Caudill, W., & Plath, D. (1966). Who sleeps by whom? Parent-child involvement in urban Japanese families. Psychiatry, 29, 344-366.
- Caudill, W., & Weinstein, H. (1969). Maternal care and infant behavior in Japan and America. Psychiatry, 32, 12-43.
- Clancy, P. M. (1986). The acquisition of communicative style in Japanese. In B. Schieffelin, & E. Ochs (Eds.), Language socialization across cultures (pp.213-250). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Conroy, M., Hess, R., Azuma, H., & Kashiwagi, K. (1980). Maternal strategies for regulating children's behavior. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 11, 153-172.
- Cousins, S. D. (1989). Culture and self-perception in Japan and the United States. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 56, 124-131.
- Crowell, J., Keener, M., Ginsburg, N., & Anders, T. (1987). Sleeping habits in toddlers 18 to 36 months old. American Journal of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, 26, 510-515.
- De Vos, G. (1985). Dimension of the self in Japanese culture. In A. Marsella, G. De Vos, & F. L. K. Hsu (Eds.), Culture and self (pp. 149-184). London: Tavistock.

- Doi, L. T. (1973). The anatomy of dependence. Tokyo: Kodansha.
- Gecas, V., & Nye, F. I. (1974). Sex and class differences in parent-child interaction: A test of Kohn's hypothesis. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 36, 742-749.
- Geertz, C. (1975). On the nature of anthropological understanding. American Scientist, 63, 47-53.
- Goodenough, W. H. (1981). Culture, language, and society. Menlo Park, CA.: Benjamin/Cummings.
- Gorer, G. (1964). The American people. New York: Norton.
- Hollingshead, A. B. (1975). Four-factor index of social status. Unpublished manuscript, Yale University, Department of Sociology, New Haven, CT.
- Hsu, F. L. K. (1985). The self in cross-cultural perspective. In A. J. Marsella, G. de Vos, & F. L. K. Hsu (Eds.), Culture and self (pp.24-55). London: Tavistock.
- Johnson, F. (1985). The Western concept of self. In A. Marsella, G. De Vos, & F. L. K. Hsu (Eds.), Culture and self. London: Tavistock.
- Kohn, M. L. (1963). Social class and parent-child relationships: An interpretation. American Journal of Sociology, 68, 471-480.
- Kohn, M. L. (1969). Class and conformity: A study in values. Homewood, Ill.: Dorsey Press.
- Kohn, M. L. (1977). Class and conformity: A study in values (2nd ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Kohn, M. L. (1979). The effect of social class on parental values and practices. In D. Reiss & H. Hoffman (Eds.), The American family: Dying or developing? (pp. 45-68). New York: Plenum.
- Kohn, M. L., & Schooler, C. (1973). Occupational experience and psychological functioning: An assessment of reciprocal effects. American Sociological Review, 38, 97-118.

- Kohn, M. L., & Schooler, C. (1978). The reciprocal effects of the substantive complexity of work and intellectual flexibility: A longitudinal assessment. American Journal of Sociology, 84, 24-52.
- Kohn, M. L., & Slomczynski, K. M. (1990). Social structure and self-direction. Cambridge, MA: Basil Blackwell.
- Kuno, S. (1986). The Japanese language. In H. Stevenson, H. Azuma, & K. Hakuta (Eds.), Child development and education in Japan. New York: Freeman.
- Lebra, T. S. (1976). Japanese patterns of behavior. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Luster, T., Rhoades, K., & Haas, B. (1989). The relation between parental values and parenting behavior: A test of Kohn hypothesis. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 51, 139-147.
- Marsella, A., De Vos, G., & Hsu, F. L. K. (1985). Culture and self. London: Tavistock.
- Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. K. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. Psychological Review, 98, 224-153.
- Miller, J. G. (1988). Bridging the content-structure dichotomy: Culture and the self. In M. H. Bond (Ed.), The cross-cultural challenge to social psychology (pp. 266-281). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Minturn, L., & Lambert, W. (1964). Mothers of six cultures. New York: Wiley.
- Morelli, G., Rogoff, B., Oppenheim, D., & Goldsmith, D. (1992). Cultural variation in infants' sleeping arrangements: Questions of independence. Developmental Psychology, 28, 604-613.
- Naoi, A., & Schooler, C. (1985). Occupational conditions and psychological functioning in Japan. American Journal of Sociology, 90, 729-752.
- Ogbu, J. U. (1979). Social stratification and the socialization of competence. Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 10, 3-20.
- Ogbu, J. U. (1981). Origins of human competence: A cultural-ecological perspective. Child Development, 52, 413-429.

- Okabe, K. (1987). Indirect speech acts of the Japanese. In D. Kincaid (Ed.), Communication theory: Eastern and western perspectives (pp. 127-136). New York: Academic Press.
- Otaki, M., Durrett, M. E., Richards, P., Nyquist, L., & Pennebaker, J. W. (1986). Maternal and infant behavior in Japan and America. Journal of Cross-cultural Psychology, 17, 251-268.
- Peak, L. (1989). Learning to become part of the group: The Japanese child's transition to preschool life. Journal of Japanese Studies, 15, 93-123.
- Richman, A. L., Miller, P. M., & Levine, R. A. (1992). Cultural and educational variations in maternal responsiveness. Developmental Psychology, 28, 614-621.
- Rogoff, B., Gauvain, M., & Ellis, S. (1984). Development viewed in its cultural context. In M. Bornstein & M. Lamb (Eds.), Developmental psychology: An advanced textbook (pp.533-571). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Rogoff, B. (1990). Apprenticeship in thinking: Cognitive development in social context. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sidden, J. (1992). The cultural ecology of preschool children and work. Unpublished master's thesis, University of North Carolina at Greensboro.
- 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, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Shweder, R. A., & Levine, R. A. (Eds.). (1984). Culture theory: Essays on mind, self, and emotion. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Slomczynski, K. M., Miller, J., & Kohn, M. L. (1981). Stratification, work, and values: A polish-United States comparison. American Sociological Review, 46, 720-744.
- Stevenson, H. (1992, March). A long way to being number one: What we have to learn from East Asia. Paper presented at the Science and Public policy Seminar, Federation of Behavioral, Psychological and Cognitive Sciences, Washington, DC.

- Stigler, J. W., Shweder, R. A., & Herdt, G. (Eds.). (1990). Cultural psychology: Essays on comparative human development. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Stopes-Roe, M., & Cochrane, R. (1990). The childrearing values of Asian and British parents and young people: An inter-ethnic and inter-generational comparison in the evaluation of Kohn's 13 qualities. British Journal of Social Psychology, 29, 149-160.
- Toda, S., Fogel, A., & Kawai, M. (1990). Maternal speech to three-month-old infants in the United States and Japan. Child Language, 17, 279-294.
- Triandis, H. C. (1989). The self and social behavior in differing cultural contexts. Psychological Review, 96, 506-520.
- Tsujimura, A. (1987). Some characteristics of the Japanese way of communication. In D. Kincaid (Ed.), Communication theory: Eastern and western perspectives (pp. 115-126). New York: Academic Press.
- Tudge, J. Gray, J., & Hogan, D. (in press). Ecological perspectives in human development: A comparison of Gibson and Bronfenbrenner. In J. Tudge, M. Shanahan, & J. Valsiner (Eds.), Comparative approaches in developmental science. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Tudge, J., Putnam, S., & Valsiner, J. (in press). Culture and cognition in developmental perspective: Reading as a co-constructive process. In B. Cairns and G. Elder (Eds.), Developmental science. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tudge, J., & Winterhoff, P. A. (1993). Vygotsky, Piaget, and Bandura: Perspectives on the relations between the social world and cognitive development. Human Development, 36, 61-81.
- Valsiner, J. (1989). Human development and culture: The social nature of personality and its study. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Vogel, E. (1967). Japan's new middle class: The salaryman and his family in a Tokyo suburb. Berkeley: University of California Press.

- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). Mind in society. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1987). The collected works of L. S. Vygotsky, Vol. 1. New York: Plenum.
- Waters, E., & Crandall, V. (1964). Social class and observed maternal behavior from 1940-1960. Child Development, 35, 1021-1032.
- Wertsch, J. V. (1991). Voices of the mind: A sociocultural approach to mediated action. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Whiting, B. B., & Edwards, C. P. (1988). Children of different worlds: The formation of social behavior. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Whiting, B. B., & Whiting, J. W. M. (1975). Children of six cultures: A psycho-cultural analysis. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Wright, J. D., & Wright, S. R. (1976). Social class and parental values for children: A partial replication and extension of the Kohn thesis. American Sociological Review, 41, 527-537.
- Yum, J. (1987). Korean philosophy and communication. In D. Kincaid (Ed.), Communication theory: Eastern and western perspectives (pp. 71-86). New York: Academic Press.

**APPENDIX A  
Coding Manual and Sheet**

**The Cultural Ecology of Young Children**

**Coding Manual**

**(May 1993 edition)**

**Jonathan Tudge, Judy Sidden, and Sarah Putnam**

**Department of Human Development and Family Studies  
University of North Carolina at Greensboro  
Greensboro, NC 27412-5001**

## DEFINITION OF ACTIVITY

The unit of study is the child in activity. The focal child, any partners, and roles of all participants are coded as they relate to the activities under consideration. There are four "focal" activities: lessons, work, play, and conversation; in addition, other activities are coded, but in less detail. The focal child's activities and the activities going on around him or her are monitored continually (apart from the time taken to enter the codes), but are not continually coded. Rather, the coding is of the focal activities that occur during a timed "window". The window is open for 30 seconds in every 6-minute period. For an activity to be coded it must either (a) be engaged in or observed by the focal child or (b) be potentially available to the child by virtue of being (1) within easy ear- or eye-shot and (2) a focus of attention by another person during this 30-second window. (An exception to this rule, is that when the TV, radio, or related things are going on "under their own steam" within easy ear- or eye-shot of the focal child, they can be coded as potentially available even if no-one is focusing attention on it.)

Write down, briefly, the significant activities, roles, partners, etc. that are going to be (or just have been) coded (i.e., those on-going during the window) in the space at the bottom of the coding sheet. In addition, non-window activities (those occurring outside the 30 second window) may be noted at the side of the coding sheet if they are deemed interesting/relevant. The window notes and the non-window anecdotal notes will be the equivalent of field notes, and will serve to furnish examples of the activities, roles, etc. that go on--the "flesh" to cover the bare bones of the raw codes.

To be coded, an activity need only occur for a portion of the window; that is, if it has been the focus of attention prior to the window and continues into the window, even if by only a second or two, it should be coded. Similarly, if an activity gets underway a short time prior to the closing of the window and continues afterwards, it should be coded.

Any activity can change over the course of the 30 seconds, for example from generic pretend to emulation of an adult role. Code whichever appears to have occupied the greatest time during the window.

For an activity to be considered a focus of attention, it must be more than a momentary activity, or a shift in attention. Compare the following examples:

Sarah, a toddler, is helping her mother prepare food during the window. Her attention and that of her mother are clearly focused on that activity. During the window, Sarah's mother moves a knife out of her easy reach, but says nothing and Sarah pays no attention. There is no sense that either participant were focusing their attention on the movement, and so "lesson" should not be coded.

Contrast this with a second example:

Jonathan, a toddler, is helping his mother prepare food during the window. His attention and that of his mother are clearly focused on that activity--"work." During the window, Jonathan tries to pick up a knife. His mother says: "That's not a good knife to use: it's too sharp and will cut you" and she moves it out of his reach. Despite the brevity of the comment, it constituted a focus of attention and should be coded as "skill/nature lesson."

Similar points can be made with regard to observation of an activity. Again, momentary shifts in attention do not qualify as a focus. For example:

Judy is playing with some toys. Her mother is working nearby. Judy looks up momentarily to see what her mother is doing, but continues to play and does not appear to have focused attention on her mother's work. Code "play", and Judy's role in it, and code "work" but give Judy no role in it.



Contrast this scenario with another:

Sarah is playing with some toys prior to the window opening. As the window opens, and for all of the 30 seconds she is looking at her mother working, however, and only goes back to her play after the window has closed. As her attention is focused on her mother's work, code "work" and Sarah's role as "observer" or "eavesdropper" (see role codes).

If, on the other hand, Sarah had returned to her play even if only for a few moments before the window closed but continued playing thereafter, both activities could be coded and Sarah would have a role in each. Play can be coded because it was occurring prior to the window opening and because it continued after the window closed. So, although it did not occupy much time during the window itself, knowledge of the broader context of Sarah's activities allow us to realize that this is an activity on which Sarah is focused.

Suppose that Judy is playing, and looks up at what her father is working on during the window. Play is coded, as is work, and Judy has a role in play. However, the decision must be made about whether the "look up" is sufficient for Judy to be coded as a partner. A decision must be made about whether or not Judy was really focused on her father's activity. Look for non-verbal cues that suggest that she is doing more than simply gazing around before giving her a role (as eavesdropper or observer) in work.

#### Coding the focal activities

For one of the focal activities to be coded, it clearly does not have to be engaged in by the focal child. If he or she is not engaged in it, she is given no role (code 0) and the participants are not coded at all. The activity must be "available" to the focal child, however. That is, it must be an activity that is on-going within easy ear- or eye-shot of the focal child; it is something upon which the child could focus attention or in which she could participate (or try to participate). The only exception to this is if the focal child is asleep, in which case code on-going focal activities, participants, etc., even though the child could not actually participate.

#### Coding the non-focal activities

If the child has a role in any of the focal activities, but is also engaged in one of the non-focal activities (sleep, eating, bodily functions, idle, or "other"), simply provide the code for that activity but do not code the child's role, the partners or their roles for that non-focal activity.

If the child has no role in any of the focal activities, but is either engaged in one of the non-focal activities or is observing someone who is engaged in one of them, code the activity, the partners, and the respective roles in the same manner as for the focal activities.

If people other than the focal child are engaging in non-focal activities, do not code them--they are available as people but their non-focal activities can be ignored.

If the activities are really un-codable (following in car and can't tell what's happening, or if you've "lost" the focal child), code "Other" as 5 and indicate the problem in the window notes. Then go on to next window.

## ACTIVITIES

### Lessons

To count as a lesson, there must be an attempt to impart information (albeit implicit) or to receive information (in the case of a child asking a question). Note that lessons may be shorter-lived than other activities, and that interpersonal lessons may be implicit.

#### 1. **academic**

Information that relates to schooling or pre-school skills, abilities, etc. This includes labelling colors, getting the child to count, help read a story, more/less information, clear attempts to get the child to remember some event (where the goal is not for the partner to get information, but rather to help the child develop memory skills). Note that the focus must be on trying to impart or receive information; playing a game with academically related objects (where there is no such focus) would be coded under "play with academic object."

#### 2. **interpersonal**

Conveying or requesting information about culturally appropriate behavior, etiquette, values, etc. Getting a child to say "please" or "thank you" counts, as does commenting on poor eating habits, not interrupting other people, spitting, etc. Note that simple discipline commands ("stop," "don't do that" etc.) should not be coded, but "stop that; it's not polite" when it's clear that the person speaking is commenting about appropriate etiquette, values, etc. would be coded as an interpersonal lesson.

#### 3. **skill/nature lessons**

Conveying or requesting information about the workings of the material or natural world--lessons on how to tie shoe laces, use a mortar and pestle, how to sew clothes, weave, operate a TV or computer, etc., or information about the natural world, seasons, time, behavior of animals, etc. The focus here is upon a skill to be learned or facts about nature. Include here lessons on health and safety.

#### 4. **religious/spiritual lessons**

Conveying or requesting information on matters of religious or spiritual affairs, or rituals associated with these matters. If simply participating in such rituals, with no lesson involved, code under "religious/spiritual activities" (other--code 6).

### Work

Tasks, errands, chores which may be assigned to children, but also work that typically is not done by children--ironing, washing dishes, fixing the car, saddling a horse, caring for a child (but not the focal child), shopping, washing clothes, using the computer to write (rather than play), etc. In general, activities that either have economic importance or contribute to the maintenance of life. Note the difference between "play-emulation of adult role" and "work"; the latter must at least be intended to be of economic or subsistence-related importance, even if an adult has assigned it as a task when it would be easier for the adult to do it him/herself.

#### 1. **transparent or no technology**

Transparent technology is technology the workings of which are clear to the child--sweeping with a broom (but not with a vacuum cleaner), fixing a torn page with tape (but not fixing a car), etc. No technology includes such things as running an errand, undressing a child, etc.

##### 1. **child-modified**

some technological device is being used, but it has been purposefully modified for use by a child--a miniature hammer, broom, etc.

- 2. **adult**  
some transparent technological device being used, but not modified for use by a child.
- 3. **not applicable**  
where no device is being used at all
- 2. **opaque technology**  
Where the mechanics of the tool being used are not likely to be understandable by the child
  - 1. **child-modified**
  - 2. **adult**

Play, exploration and entertainment

Activities that being engaged in for fun, their own sake, or to master some skill--but not because they have economic value or contribute to the maintenance of life, which would be "work."

- 1. **pretend/role play**  
Any play activity that has the child assuming the role of another, whether other person, thing, creature.
  - 1. **generic pretend or role play**  
Any pretend or role play not in 2 below.
  - 2. **emulation of adult roles**  
Role play in which typical roles from normal human situations are adopted, and in which at least one of the participants is taking on a more competent role--playing mother/father, whether working or not, mother/baby, teacher at school, etc.. Do not include playing heroic roles (Batman, etc.) which are not "typical" adult roles. To be included here the role being taken must be clear.
- 2. **non-pretend play and exploration**  
Play or exploration that does not feature taking on a role. Play with objects is not well distinguishable from exploration, so do not try to distinguish them.
  - 1. **with academic object**  
Learning is inherent to both play and exploration; hence include play with academic object here. Academic materials include anything typically used in school or preschool and that have been designed for learning purposes; leaves, etc., may be used but have not been designed for academic purpose, and so do not code here. Include here reading a story, if the focus is not on naming objects, colors, filling in the missing words, etc.
  - 2. **with child-oriented (non-academic) object**  
Any object that is designed, modified, or prepared with the child in mind except objects that have been designed with an academic purpose. Include blocks, tea-sets, balls, dolls, cars, miniature versions of adult tools (unless better coded as "work"--in which case there must be a clear attempt to accomplish something of economic or subsistence-importance). Look for evidence that the object has been either brought in or prepared in some way for a child to use (painted, cleaned, no sharp-edges) rather than has been simply discarded and the child is playing with it.
  - 3. **with adult-oriented object**  
Any object from the adult world that has not been designed, modified, or prepared for children (if so prepared, should be coded as child-oriented). Include materials that have been taken by children (unbeknownst to adults) or discarded from the adult world--old tires, pieces of machinery, etc.

4. **with natural object**  
Any natural object--sticks, mud, sand, plants, etc. irrespective of where they are found (ie, even if inside the classroom). Include in this category animals (pets, etc.) If using any child-modified object in addition to the natural object (such as a shovel in the sand), code under "child-modified".
  5. **with no object**  
Any play (except role play) that does not involve the use of an object--games of chase, etc. Include here word or verbal play, if it's being done for sense of pleasure--rather than noises to bother someone.
3. **spectator of performance**  
Any activity in which the individual is watching or listening to a performance, for entertainment or relaxation. Movies, plays, videos, puppet plays, listening to music 3or the radio or on tape, watching (not participating in) sports events, etc. would be counted. If singing along, or being a more active spectator, code role as participant. If simply watching a performance, code as eavesdropping on it.
1. **academic**  
Performances that have clear academic (school or preschool) material--a focus on counting, letters, etc.
  2. **child-oriented**  
Performances that are produced with children (<10) in mind, but which do not have an academic focus at the time of watching. Look for programs that have a predominance of child or puppet actors, or adults deliberately speaking to children, such as cartoons (with the exception of some adult-oriented cartoons), Sesame St., Mr Rogers, etc. If there is a mix of academic and non-academic parts embedded within a child-oriented program, code "academic" if that portion is a focus during the window.
  3. **adult-oriented**  
Performances that do not have children in mind, even if the content may appear childish. Look for a targeted population > 9.

### Conversation

To code this, conversation must be the focus of activity, and it should not be talk about some on-going activity. Look for 2 or 3 exchanges, that are sustained or focused--and the focus must be clear. That is, if people are talking about something that they are doing at the time (whether play, work, etc.) this does not count as conversation--it's part of the on-going verbal accompaniment to the action. However, if people are engaged in one task (playing bridge) but talking about something unconnected with that immediate activity (the fact that they like bridge better than tennis, how poorly a mutual friend plays bridge or something totally unconnected--what they're going to eat for dinner) both play and conversation can be coded. If, on the other hand, they are talking about their bidding, this is part of the activity of playing, and conversation should not be coded. If two people are talking, but you can't detect what they're talking about don't code as conversation--it could be talk about work, play, be a lesson, etc.

1. **child-child (<10) conversation only**  
Count "peers" (<6) and "children" (6-9-year-olds) as children for the purposes of conversation.
2. **child-adult conversation**  
Include youths (>9) as adults for the purposes of conversation.
3. **adult-adult conversation**  
Include youths (>9) as adults for the purposes of conversation. Moreover,

if the child is not engaged in conversation, but both adult-adult conversation and child-child conversation are available to the child, code the adult-adult conversation.

### Other

#### 1. **Sleep**

If the focal child is sleeping, code the other activities going on (that would have been potentially available to the child were s/he to be awake) and the people engaged in them, but do not code the child as having a role in them.

#### 2. **Eating**

Do not include here food preparation (which should be coded as "work"), but code this if the focal child (or a potentially available partner) is eating food or engaging in related meal-time activities.

#### 3. **Bodily functions**

Code this if the focal child is getting or being dressed, using the toilet, being washed/bathed. Giving a child medicine, putting a band-aid on, etc. Note, however, that if another person is being bathed, etc., and the focal child is watching or participating in this activity, code as "Work" and give the focal child and all participants roles as would normally be the case

#### 4. **Idle, hanging out**

No focus of attention on any activity--gazing into space, walking round kicking dirt, etc. Also code transition times if the child is not on his/her way to do a new activity--in which case code the activity the child is going to. However, if the child is simply unfocused, taking a time-out from the previous activity and has not yet fixed on a new one, you may code as "idle/hanging out."

#### 5. **Other or Uncodable**

Anything that cannot be fitted into any other activity, activities that cannot be made sense of, or cases in which the focal child has been "lost" (for example, when following him/her by car, and can't tell what's happening) or when the child is engaging you at the window. In this case, simply code 5 under "other" and write notes on why it was uncodable.

#### 6. **Religious/spiritual**

Participating in any religious or spiritual ritual, for example prayers, ancestor-related rituals.

## ROLES, INITIATIONS, AND PARTNERS

### FOCAL CHILD'S ROLE

If the role changes over the course of the activity, and each constitutes a "legitimate" role (i.e., not momentary) choose in the order (1, 2, or 3) before 4, and these before 5 or 6.

**0. no role**

Activity simply available to the child, who has no part in it.

**1. trying to manage or direct the activity**

Look for evidence of actively trying to keep an activity going or impel it in a certain direction. Note: this is more than simply initiating the activity, and it's more than just participating in it; there must be evidence of trying to keep it going or change it in some clear way. Look for evidence of the person occupying this role trying to overcome the inertia of the person being managed.

**2. trying to prevent, discontinue, or avoid an activity**

The opposite of 1, above--actively trying to stop an activity or prevent it from happening, or trying not to engage in an activity. If there is evidence of trying to direct it in some way (rather than stop it altogether), code 1.

**3. facilitating**

Look for evidence that the person being coded is trying to make it easier for the other participant (whether focal child or other person) to be actively involved in the activity, helping him or her to hold a knife, pushing on the swing set, etc. Look for evidence that the person occupying this role is altering the activity or altering the situation in such a way so as to make possible what otherwise would be difficult or not be possible at all for the person being helped to do alone. (For example, pulling up a chair to allow a child to observe, encouraging the child to bring up the chair to allow her to see, bringing the mortar and pestle down to the child's level, etc.) The person being helped must be actively involved, for person being coded to be coded as facilitating.

**4. participating**

There must be evidence of active involvement in the activity--more than observing it. If watching a performance, look for singing along, answering the performer's questions, etc.

**5. observing**

A less active type of participation--watching or listening to an activity which is being done by a partner who is clearly aware of child's presence or is modifying in some way the activity to allow the child to observe. This degree of modifying on the part of the partner does not count as facilitation. Look for evidence that the person engaged in the activity is open to the child's participation (at least as an observer).

**6. eavesdropping**

Watching or listening to an activity which is being done by a partner who is either unaware of the child's presence and is in no way modifying the activity. If the partner is clearly modifying the activity to allow the child to see or listen, code the child as "observing". Examples of watching or listening as an eavesdropper include watching TV, listening to the radio. or watching some spectator sport.

**WHO INITIATED THE ACTIVITY?**

The activity in question is the one that is currently being coded--if a lesson is embedded within play, code the person who initiated the lesson, not the play. If the activity continues over several "windows" continue to code the original initiator unless the child moves away from the activity for an appreciable time (sufficient for the intervening activity to be counted as a focused activity). When the child returns to the former activity you need to make a new decision about who initiated it--it could be the original initiator (who is still involved) or the child could now constitute the initiator.

0. unknown
1. target child
2. child with other person (include person's ID, for example 2-1121 for child with nuclear adult female single person)
3. other person (include person's ID)

**WHO INITIATED CHILD'S INVOLVEMENT?**

as for initiator of activity

0. unknown
1. target child
2. child with other person (include person's ID)
3. other person (include person's ID)

**PARTNERS IN ACTIVITY WITH FOCAL CHILD**

Partners are people who are actively engaged in the activity that the focal child is engaged in. A person can be involved for only a portion of the window to be counted as a partner. For example, a sibling who contributes to an interpersonal lesson after it began can be counted as a partner. Coding is slightly different when the focal child's role is "eavesdropping" in which case code the partners as those who are engaged in the activity being eavesdropped on, their roles in that activity, etc. If one or more people are also eavesdropping and are doing so in conjunction with the focal child (that is, it is clear that the group or dyad members are mutually involved in this activity), they may also be coded as the focal child's partners.

1. **related nuclear**  
Count mother, father, siblings, and include surrogate nuclear family here.
2. **related non-nuclear**  
Grandparents, cousins, uncles/aunts, and people who are considered to occupy a "related" position in the family. If uncertain, ask an informant.
3. **non-related**  
Anybody else.

cross with

1. adult (16 and above)
2. youth (10-16)
3. child (6-9)
4. peer (1 1/2 -5)
5. infant (0- 1 1/2)

cross with

1. male
2. female
3. mixed gender

Only to be used in cases when partners of different genders are occupying precisely the same role and are being coded together (see next section).

cross with

1. single
2. 2 or more (if 2 or more people of same age occupying same role as child).

**PARTNER'S ROLE**

As for child's role, except no 0.

**PARTNER'S OTHER ACTIVITY**

0. no other focused activity
1. yes

Partner is simultaneously dividing attention between target child and someone or something else. The partner may be shifting focus back and forth between two or more activities, or simultaneously engaged in two or more activities.

**PARTNERS POTENTIALLY AVAILABLE**

Within easy eye or ear-shot and within child's social space. Social space is determined by a sense that the child could, if he or she wanted to, engage that person; it could be a teacher on the other side of a room, it could be a child working within ear-shot. The person must be within easy eye- or ear-shot. To code this requires attending to what the focal child is focused on. For example, if the focal child is looking around a classroom or playground, and people are spread throughout, the social space is necessarily much larger than if the child is intently focused on one particular thing. Note that if the people around are strangers to the child, look for evidence of any prior indication that the child considered them to be available as partners (had previously engaged them in some way) before coding them as available.

Need to also focus on what the other people in the environment are doing, to ascertain whether they are behaving in some way that appears to make them available to the child. For example, a teacher may be aware of what is going on in the classroom or on the playground and would be ready to engage the child or intervene in some activity even if she is not particularly close to the child and the child does not appear aware of her presence. Similarly, other children in the classroom may be walking by the focal child, looking at what he is doing, and thereby could be coded as being in the child's social space, even if the child does not engage them.

Note that this code is designed to pick up people who could be partners of this child during this window but who are not in fact taking on that role during the window. Do NOT code the observer as potentially available, despite all indications to the contrary.

1. adult
  1. one
  2. two
  3. three
  4. four
  5. five or more
2. youth (as above)
3. child (as above)
4. peer (as above)
5. infant (as above)



**LOCATION****1. own environs**

In own home, car, or yard, or in any other place that is the private domain of the child's family.

**2. other's environs**

The private domain of another individual, family, or organization (except school--see below). "Private" means not accessible to the public for use or visit without some form of permission. Family day care should be coded here, but if the child is in family day care write this in the field notes.

**3. school**

Any institutional place that has been explicitly set up for school-related purposes, whether public or private.

**4. public space**

Any area accessible to the public without some form of permission, or to which entry is possible by payment.

**cross with****0. not modified for child's care or entertainment****1. modified for child's care or entertainment**

Location modified for the child, either in its entirety (building or room designed for the child, with children's pictures, things at child's level, etc.) or the part of the area which the child is using--sitting in a high chair, on a swing set, etc.

**MOTHER'S LOCATION****0. not within hailing range****1. within hailing range**

Could be called for. Note that this distance is further than "available".

**FATHER'S LOCATION****0. not within hailing range****1. within hailing range**

Could be called for. Note that this distance is further than "available".

**WEATHER AND APPROXIMATE TEMPERATURE (in Fahrenheit)**

1. sunny
2. cloudy
3. rainy
4. snow/ice
5. dark

**DAY**

1. Monday
2. Tuesday
3. Wednesday
4. Thursday
5. Friday
6. Saturday
7. Sunday

## Abbreviation of Coding Manual

**ACTIVITIES**Lessons

1. academic **A**
2. interpersonal **I**
3. skill/nature **S/N**
4. religious spiritual **R**

Work

1. transparent or no technology
  1. child-modified **Tc**
  2. adult **Ta**
  3. not applicable **N/A**
2. opaque technology
  1. child-modified **Oc**
  2. adult **Oa**

Play, exploration and entertainment

1. pretend/role play
  1. generic pretend and imaginary **Pg**
  2. emulation of adult roles **Pem**
2. non-pretend play and exploration
  1. with academic object **AC**
  2. with child-oriented (non-academic) object **CO**
  3. with adult-oriented object **AD**
  4. with natural object **NO**
  5. with no object **O**
3. spectator of performance
  1. academic **Sac**
  2. child-oriented **Sc**
  3. adult-oriented **Sad**
  4. TV acad **TVa**
  5. TV child **TVc**
  6. TV adult **TVa**

Conversation

1. child-child (<10) **CC**
2. child-adult (>9) **CA**
3. adult-adult (>9) **AA**

Other

1. Sleep **S**
2. Eating **E**
3. Bodily functions **B**
4. Idle/hanging out **I**
5. Other **O**
6. Religious/spiritual **R**

**FOCAL CHILD'S ROLE**

0. no role **O**
1. trying to manage or direct the activity **M**
2. trying to prevent, discontinue, or avoid an activity **A**
3. facilitating **F**
4. participating **P**
5. observing **O**
6. eavesdropping **E**

**WHO INITIATED THE ACTIVITY?**

0. unknown ?
1. target child **C**
2. child with other person (include partner's ID) **C+part**
3. other person (include partner's ID) **part** [put partner]

**WHO INITIATED CHILD'S INVOLVEMENT?**

0. unknown ?
1. target child **C**
2. child with other person (include partner's ID) **C+part**
3. other person (include partner's ID) **part**

**PARTNERS IN ACTIVITY WITH TARGET CHILD**

1. related nuclear **Can use: F M FF FM MF MM** (parents/grandps)
2. related non-nuclear **B (age) S (age)** (siblings)
3. non-related **Un Au Cs (m age) Cs (f age)** (other rels)

cross with

1. adult (16 and above) **A (m) A (f)**
2. youth (10-16) **Y (m) Y (f)**
3. child (6-9) **Ch (m) Ch (f)**
4. peer (1 1/2 -5) **P (m) P (f)**
5. infant (0- 1 1/2) **I (m) I (f)**

cross with

1. male **GA (m) GA (f) GA (mf)** (group of adults)
2. female **GY (m) GY (f) GY (mf)** (group of youths)
3. mixed gender **GC (m) GC (f) GC (mf)** (group of children)

cross with

1. single **GP (m) GP (f) GP (mf)** (group of peers)
2. 2 or more **GI (m) GI (f) GI (mf)** (group of infants)

**PARTNER'S ROLE**

[as for child's role, except no 0]

**PARTNER'S OTHER ACTIVITY**

0. no other focused activity **No**
1. yes **Yes**

**PARTNERS POTENTIALLY AVAILABLE**

1. adult [code 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5+]
2. youth [code 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5+]
3. child [code 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5+]
4. peer [code 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5+]
5. infant [code 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5+]

**LOCATION**

1. own environs **Own**
2. other's environs **Oth**
3. school **S**
4. public space **P**  
cross with
  0. not modified for child's care or entertainment **no**
  1. modified for child's care or entertainment **mod**

**MOTHER'S LOCATION**

0. not within hailing range **no**
1. within hailing range **yes**

**FATHER'S LOCATION**

0. not within hailing range **no**
1. within hailing range **yes**

**WEATHER** (Include approximate temperature, in F)

1. sunny **S**
2. cloudy **C**
3. rainy **R**
4. snow/ice **SN**
5. dark **D**

**DAY**

1. Monday **M**
2. Tuesday **Tu**
3. Wednesday **W**
4. Thursday **Th**
5. Friday **F**
6. Saturday **Sa**
7. Sunday **Su**

Coding Sheet

Case # \_\_\_\_\_

Case # \_\_\_\_\_

Day \_\_\_\_\_ Sheet \_\_\_\_\_

COMMUNITY \_\_\_\_\_ CHILD'S ID \_\_\_\_\_ OBSERVER \_\_\_\_\_ DAY \_\_\_\_\_ DATE \_\_\_\_\_ WEATHER \_\_\_\_\_ TEMP \_\_\_\_\_

	lesson	work	play	conv.	other	lesson	work	play	conv.	other
TIME										
Avail activities										
Child's role										
Initiator of activ										
Init of child inv.										
Partner #1										
P #1 role										
other activity										
Partner #2										
P #2 role										
other activity										
Partner #3										
P #3 role										
other activity										
Partner #4										
P #4 role										
other activity										
Partner #5										
P #5 role										
other activity										
Avail adult (>16)										
Avail youth (10-16)										
Avail child (6-9)										
Avail peer (1.5-5)										
Avail infant (<1.5)										
Location										
Mother's location										
Father's location										

NOTES HERE

NOTES HERE

APPENDIX B  
Parental letter

Dear :

We would like to invite [child] and you to participate in a study looking at the daily activities of young children. Your names and address were selected from the list of all parents in your community who had a baby in 1987 and 1988, and we hope that you are interested in participating in this study of children in different parts of the world (Western Samoa, Nepal, Kenya, and the Soviet Union in addition to the United States). Surprisingly little is known about how young children spend their days, yet this information would be valuable in helping scientists understand how children develop the behavior, skills, and values that we expect them to use and understand.

The study is being conducted by Dr. Jonathan Tudge of the Department of Child Development and Family Relations at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro, and his assistants, Sarah Putnam and Judy Sidden. We would like to list [child]'s day-to day activities by following her wherever she goes--in the home, day care, shopping, playground, and so on. In order to hear [child]'s activities without hovering over her, we will ask her to wear a wireless microphone tucked in a belt-pack. Since we are interested in documenting an entire day, we would like to observe her for a total of 20 hours distributed throughout the course of one week. If you have no objections, we would like to videotape the final 4 1/2 hours of observation. This is optional, and if you would prefer that [child] not be taped we will not do so. Moreover, should you want any portions of the tape erased, we will erase them. You will receive a copy of the tape.

There is no need for your family members to alter their routines; indeed, we want everyone to do exactly what they normally would do while observation is taking place. If an observation is scheduled at a time that is inconvenient for your family, we will schedule another day; we will of course respect family members' requests for privacy.

We realize that families lead very busy lives, and to express our appreciation to the participants we will offer a \$250.00 saving's bond in [child]'s name (\$10.00 per hour, plus \$50.00 for completion). This saving bond will be issued approximately 2 weeks after completing the study. In the event that you decide not to complete the study (you may withdraw from it at any time) you will receive a \$10.00 bond for each completed hour.

We will contact you by phone in 3 or 4 days to find out if you would like to take part in this study. If you decide to participate, we will schedule to meet the entire family 1 and ask you a few questions about [child]'s daily routine. At this meeting we will also familiarize you and [child] with the procedure. All information collected will be handled confidentially, and will be used for research purposes only. We will send you the findings of the study when it is complete.

Your participation in this important work on young children's activities is critical, since your family is part of a small sample representing your community. We hope that you will agree. If you have any questions about the study, please feel free to call us at 334-5307.

Sincerely yours

Jonathan Tudge PhD  
Assistant Professor

Sarah Putnam  
Research Assistant

Judy Sidden  
Research Assistant

**APPENDIX C**  
**Telephone Protocol**

[The telephone protocol will not be read verbatim in order to accommodate individual differences in style of communication. However, all callers will provide the same basic information and ask the same questions.]

Hello, this is \_\_\_\_\_ calling. Is this Mrs. (Mr.) \_\_\_\_\_?

I'm a graduate student at UNC-G working with Dr. Jonathan Tudge, and I'm calling to follow-up a letter which we sent to you recently about our study of toddlers. Is this a good time for you or do we need to arrange another time to talk?

[If answer negative]: That's fine; when would be a good time for you?

[If answer positive]: Fine. Did you receive our letter?

[If no]: I'm sorry; we sent you a letter [n] days ago in which we gave you a brief overview of the study we are going to be conducting here in Greensboro. I'll just run over the points that we made there. [then continue as below]

[if yes]: Fine. What I'd like to do is take a few minutes to tell you some more about our study and ask you a few questions. We are carrying out a study of toddlers, children aged from between 2 1/2 to 4, looking at how they spend their time. We will be studying toddlers in several different countries, and the children in the United States will be from here in Greensboro. What we're really interested in is what a typical day is like for toddlers. Although there is a lot of popular knowledge about toddlers, in fact we really know very little about how they spend their time, who they spend that time with, and the kinds of things they do. And one of the questions that interests us is in what ways does a toddler's typical day in the US differ from that of toddlers in other countries and in what ways is it the same. Basically, we'd just like to observe your child in [his/her] everyday activities.



Child's name \_\_\_\_\_ ID \_\_\_\_\_

Before we go any further, we need to make sure that you meet our requirements, and I'd like to ask you a few questions just to get some information about your family's length of residence in this area, schooling, and work. If there are any questions that you would prefer not to answer, just ask me to go on to the next question, or to stop altogether. Is that alright?

1. Does [child] live with you?  yes  no  sometimes
2. Any siblings? Age\_\_ M/F Age\_\_ M/F Age\_\_ M/F Age\_\_ M/F
3. How long have you lived at your current residence? \_\_\_\_\_  
3a. If less than 1 year: Did you move from within the same community or from some different community? \_\_\_\_\_
4. Were you born in the USA, or in some other country? If other, where?  
4a. Was your spouse born in the USA, or in some other country? If other, where?
5. What is your occupation? \_\_\_\_\_ (M/F answering)
6. What is your spouse's occupation? \_\_\_\_\_
7. What is the highest level of education you have completed?  
 less than high school,  high school,  some college,  Bachelor's,  some graduate school,  Master's,  PhD.
8. What is the highest level of education your spouse has completed?  
 less than high school,  high school,  some college,  Bachelor's,  some graduate school,  Master's,  PhD.
9. Does [child] attend day care?  yes  no

OK, that's all the questions I have. Do you have any questions for me, or could we schedule a time when we could get together with you and the other members of your family to introduce ourselves, get to know [child], and answer any more questions you might have?

[If asks for more info.]: As I said, what we want to study is a typical day in the life of toddlers. This means that we wouldn't want you to change anything you normally do. What we would do,

if you choose to participate in the study, is to come to your home and watch observe [child]'s various activities, [his/her] daily routines, who [s/he] spends time with, and so on. If [child] goes to day care, we'd like to observe there, too. Basically, we'd like to go everywhere s/he does, so as to get the most accurate picture we can of everyday life.

If declines to participate, please give reasons (over):

APPENDIX D  
Initial Home Interview

[There are three goals for the first meeting with the family; to become acquainted with all family members, begin their acclimation to the researcher's presence, and to obtain some information. Present at this initial interview will be all researchers who will be in direct contact with the family. The interview will take place in the family's home. Approach the interview in a relaxed, sociable manner, beginning with introductions and social niceties.]

**Interview**

To give me an idea of a typical week in [child]'s life, could you tell me what typically happens—for example, the time s/he usually gets up, whether s/he goes to day care and if is so when, do some people come regularly to the house to spend some time with [child], and so on. I'd also like to know about typical evening activities, what time s/he goes to bed, etc.

Thanks, that's really useful. There are a another few points I'd like some information about—[prompt for the following if they haven't come up spontaneously:

waking time \_\_\_\_\_

regularly scheduled nap times \_\_\_\_\_

bedtime \_\_\_\_\_

daycare schedule \_\_\_\_\_

regularly scheduled trips (shopping, visit friends, etc.) \_\_\_\_\_

people coming regularly to the house (relatives, friends, child-minder or babysitter, etc) \_\_\_\_\_

[If the child goes to daycare:]

Obviously, we'll need to get permission from [child]'s day care for me to be able to observe him/her there. Do you have the name, address, and phone number? \_\_\_\_\_

Are there any other places s/he is likely to go to that might require permission in advance?

\_\_\_\_\_

When you take [child] shopping or to daycare, do you typically walk or drive? [If drive] Will there be room in the car for me to accompany you?

How are the weekend days different from weekdays for [child]

\_\_\_\_\_

OK, thanks for all that information. Let me tell you a few general things about what will happen. First, I want to be as unobtrusive as possible, not hovering around [child] all the time. Think of me as a fly on the wall, if at all possible! But it's also important to be able to hear what [child] is saying. So I'd like [child] to wear a small wireless transmitter in one of these packs. [Get out a number of packs and show to the child.] Do you like these? Which is your favorite color? Like to try it on for size? [To parents:] [Child] can keep it once the study is over, but I'd like him/her to wear it while I'm observing, because in it there'll be a tiny transmitter, and I'll attach a mike. That way, I won't have to be too close but will still hear what s/he's saying.

Could I take a brief tour of the house? I'd like to draw a plan of the layout, so that I'll know where [child] is going, whether there's any other way out, and so on.

Let me stress that I'd really appreciate it if you would not change your plans or do anything differently from what you would normally do in order to accommodate me. We really are interested in getting as accurate and natural a picture as we can of a complete day in [child]'s life. So treat me as if I weren't here, if you can manage that. Of course, there may be some things that you would prefer to be strictly private; for example, you may prefer me not to observe while [child] is using the bathroom. Feel free to tell me not to observe, and I won't. And if you go into a room with [child] and shut the door behind you I'll treat that as an indication that you would prefer me not to observe. Finally, please don't include me in any meal plans, or anything like that—I'll bring a little snack with me.

As we wrote in the letter you received, [child] will receive a savings bond for participating in the study. When we purchase it, we'll need to have his/her social security number, and the number of another family member.

Finally, here's a consent form for you to sign, assuming that you would like to participate in the study.

APPENDIX E  
Parental Consent Form

Participants' names (please print):

Date:

I hereby consent to participate in the research project entitled: "Socio-cultural contexts of children's activities." The aim of this research project is to describe the daily activities of your child by observing him or her for 20 hours over the course of one week. Observations will be conducted in the morning, afternoon, and evening in 2 2-hour blocks and 4 4-hour blocks, the last of which will, if you agree, be videotaped. Your child will be watched wherever he or she goes—at home, in child care, in the playground, or shopping. The researcher will respect family members' requests for privacy. Videotapes will be seen only by researchers involved in the project—if we wish to show any portions of the tape at scientific meetings or to anyone who is not a member of the research team we will only do so after receiving written permission from you. If you wish us to stop videotaping we will do so upon request, and any portions of the videotape that you wish erased will be erased. The data will be destroyed after coding and analyses have been completed.

To express our appreciation to the participants we will offer a \$250.00 saving's bond in your child's name (\$10.00 per hour, plus \$50.00 for completion). This saving bond will be issued approximately 2 weeks after completing the study. In the event that you decide not to complete the study (you may withdraw from it at any time) you will receive a \$10.00 bond for each completed hour.

An explanation of the procedures to be followed and their purpose, including any experimental procedures, was provided to me by Dr. Tudge. I was also informed about any benefits, risks, or discomforts that I might expect. I was given the opportunity to ask questions regarding the research and was assured that I am free to withdraw my consent to participate in the project at any time without penalty or prejudice to myself or my child. I understand that I will not be identified by name as a participant in this project. I also understand that any new information that developed during the project will be provided to me if that information might affect my willingness to continue participation in the project.

I have been assured that the explanation I have received regarding this project and this consent form have been approved by the University Institutional Review Board which ensures that research projects involving human subjects follow federal regulations. If I have any questions about this, I have been told to call the Office of Research Services at (919) 334-5878.

I would like a copy of the results of this study.

I would like a copy of the videotape.

Child is  years old, and unable to sign.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Parents' Signatures

Witness to Presentation and Signatures: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Please return this sheet in the enclosed envelope.

Please check one of the following statements, and sign below.

I have no objections with you showing any portions of the videotape that was made as part of the Cultural Ecology of Young Children project, with the following provisos: First, anonymity will be preserved by not showing any sections in which people are referred to by name, and second, that portions will only be shown at scientific meetings or for research-related purposes.

I have no objections with you showing some portions of the videotape that was made as part of the Cultural Ecology of Young Children project, with the following provisos: First, anonymity will be preserved by not showing any sections in which people are referred to by name, and second, that portions will only be shown at scientific meetings or for research-related purposes. The portions that you may not show are listed below (please indicate the times of the sections that you do not want shown):

I do not want you to show any portions of the videotape that was made as part of the Cultural Ecology of Young Children project.

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Please indicate below the number of years of full-time education since age 14 for you and your spouse, and your occupations:

Husband: Years of full-time education after 14 \_\_\_\_\_.  
Occupation: \_\_\_\_\_

Wife: Years of full-time education after 14 \_\_\_\_\_.  
Occupation: \_\_\_\_\_

Please indicate below your approximate annual family income:

- Less than \$10,000  
 Between \$10,001 and \$25,000  
 Between \$25,001 and \$40,000  
 Between \$40,001 and \$55,000  
 Between \$55,001 and \$70,000  
 Between \$70,001 and \$85,000  
 More than \$85,001  
 I would prefer not to answer this question

Finally, please sign the following statement (if you have not done so previously):

I \_\_\_\_\_, the legal guardian of \_\_\_\_\_, hereby acknowledge that I received savings bonds (face value of \$250.00) from Jonathan Tudge (purchased by the University of North Carolina at Greensboro), and that I understand that these bonds will be subject to IRS 1099 reporting requirements as income to my child.

Signed \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Many thanks for your help!

APPENDIX F  
Child Care Center Consent Form

\_\_\_\_\_, the child care setting where \_\_\_\_\_ attends hereby grants permission for \_\_\_\_\_ to be observed by Dr. Tudge or a member of his research team. We are aware that \_\_\_\_\_'s parents have knowledge of this study and have also granted their permission for him/her to be observed in this center. Further, it is agreed and understood that failure to participate in or complete this study will in no way affect the services this center provides to the family, nor would it affect any services that this family or center might now or in the future receive from the University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Center Director's signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Parent's signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Witness of parental signature