Topic Review

Parents' Goals for Children: The Dynamic Coexistence of Individualism and Collectivism in Cultures and Individuals

Catherine S. Tamis-LeMonda, Niobe Way, Diane Hughes, *New York University*, Hirokazu Yoshikawa, *Harvard University*, Ronit Kahana Kalman and Erika Y. Niwa, *New York University*

Abstract

Current scholarship on the cultural value systems of individualism and collectivism, and the associated developmental goals of autonomy and relatedness, has moved beyond grand divide theories to emphasize variation within individuals and cultures. We present a theoretical model on the dynamic coexistence of cultural value systems (at the macro level) and parents' developmental goals (at the micro level). We contend that cultural values and developmental goals that have largely been classified as polar opposites may be viewed as conflicting, additive, or functionally dependent. Parents may view the developmental goal of autonomy as interfering with the goal of relatedness (and vice versa); parents may endorse both autonomy and relatedness; and parents may consider the developmental goal of relatedness to be a path to the goal of autonomy and/or autonomy to be a path to relatedness. These forms of coexistence are themselves dynamic, changing across situations, developmental time, and in response to social, political, and economic contexts.

Keywords: culture; parenting; individualism; collectivism

Introduction

A universal task of parenting is to support children's acquisition of the skills necessary to function adaptively in their local communities. Parents transmit values, rules, and standards about ways of thinking and acting, and provide an interpretive lens through which children view social relationships and structures (McGillicuddy-De Lisi & Sigel, 1995; Ogbu, 1988; Super & Harkness, 2002). Parents' beliefs and practices reflect the norms and expectations of the cultures in which they are embedded and are core conduits for perpetuating 'systems of cultural priorities' (Kagitcibasi, 1996; Keller, 2003). Therefore, although transmission of beliefs and practices from parents to children is universal, the content of such beliefs and practices varies widely across cultures (Harwood, Miller, & Irizarry, 1995).

Correspondence should be addressed to Catherine S. Tamis-LeMonda, Center for Research on Culture, Development and Education, New York University, 246 Greene St., 5R, New York, NY 10003. Email: *catherine.tamis-lemonda@nyu.edu*

Perhaps the most influential framework for conceptualising cultural variation in parental beliefs and practices is the distinction scholars have made between 'collectivism' and 'individualism' (e.g., Hofstede, 1980; Triandis, 1988; see Oyserman, Coon, & Kemmelmeier, 2002 for review). The terms collectivism and individualism have been used to refer to value systems existing within and across large cultural groups as defined by nationality, race, or ethnicity (e.g., Asian) and small subcultural communities (e.g., Anglo, middle class, and American) (Rothbaum & Trommsdorff, in press). The collectivism–individualism distinction has a long history that is rooted in western philosophy (see Triandis, 1995 for discussion) as well as in writings on collectivity vs. self-emphasis (Parsons & Shils, 1951), community vs. agency (Bakan, 1966), dependent vs. independent cognitive styles (Witken & Berry, 1975), and relationship-oriented vs. independent orientations (Markus & Kitayama, 1991). The developmental literature is also replete with theories and research that draw on the constructs of individualism and collectivism, with most writings emphasizing the psychological and behavioral goals of autonomy and relatedness. Attachment theory, for example, highlights the parent's role as a 'secure base' (relatedness) from which infants venture out and 'explore' (autonomy); theories on social relationships point to the continual tensions that exist between 'co-operation' (relatedness) and 'competition' (autonomy) (Johnson & Johnson, 1989); and theories of moral development highlight the tension between the goals of autonomy and relatedness in the development of moral reasoning (e.g., Gilligan, 1982; Kohlberg, 1981).

At the most general level, social scientists have portrayed parents in 'western' cultures as promoting developmental goals that are autonomy-oriented or, at the more macro or community level, individualistic, and parents in most Asian, Latin, African, and rural, indigenous societies as promoting developmental goals that are relationship-oriented or, at the more macro level, collectivistic (e.g., Harwood, Schoelmerich, Schulze, & Gonzalez, 1999; Hofstede, 1980; Kohn, 1969; Lieber, Yang, & Lin, 2000; Triandis, 1995, 2000). Triandis' extensive empirical work with college students and adults from various countries, including the USA, Hong Kong, and China, identified 64 attributes that were hypothesized to contrast collectivistic vs. individualistic cultures (e.g., Triandis, 1994; Triandis, McCusker, & Hui, 1990).

There is growing recognition, however, that dichotomous depictions of value systems and developmental goals are theoretically and empirically limiting (e.g., Kagitcibasi, 1996; Rothbaum & Trommsdorff, 2007). A common critique has been that an individualist–collectivist framework is overly simplistic, especially during the current era of increased globalization and more complex conceptualizations of child development. Worldwide, macro-level changes in immigration, political and economic trends, and technological advances mean that cultures cannot be neatly classified as collectivist or individualist just as any given person cannot be described as valuing *either* relatedness *or* autonomy. Thus, a dichotomous framework that pits individualism against collectivism, or autonomy against relatedness, is neither accurate nor useful in understanding parents' socialization of their young (Keller, 2003; Shweder et al., 1998). Furthermore, different cultural environments can endorse similar developmental goals (e.g., Harkness, Super, & van Tijen, 2000; Killen, McGlothlin, & Lee-Kim, 2002) just as different developmental goals can be found in subgroups of a given culture (e.g., Bornstein, Venuti, & Hahn, 2002).

Although there has been widespread recognition of the limitations of this dichotomous framework, few scholars have proposed an alternative framework beyond stating that orientations toward individualism and collectivism (and associated developmental

goals of autonomy and relatedness) exist to some degree in all communities and individuals. The aim of the present article is to propose a typology for understanding the ways in which communities maintain the values of individualism and collectivism, and likewise how individuals experience the developmental goals of autonomy and relatedness. In our discussion, we focus specifically on these issues as they are manifested in parents' socialization goals and practices. We use the terms individualism and collectivism to refer to macro-, overarching value systems, and the term developmental goals to refer to specific psychological and behavioral qualities that parents wish their children to develop (e.g., self-esteem and respect).

The article is divided into three main sections. The first section briefly describes components of individualism and collectivism, and highlights the specific developmental goals that have traditionally been classified under these two orientations, including personal choice, intrinsic motivation, self-esteem, and self-maximization as values associated with autonomy; and connection to family, group harmony, and respect and obedience as values associated with relatedness. In the second section, we propose a new typology for conceptualizing relations between group orientations toward individualism and collectivism, as well as parents' specific developmental goals of autonomy and relatedness. This typology is grounded in our national and international research on hundreds of parents of infants, preschoolers, and adolescents from a variety of ethnic, racial, and economic backgrounds, including low-income African-American, Mexican-American, Puerto Rican, Dominican-American, and Chinese-American mothers (and sometimes fathers) living in New York City (NYC); middle-income, Anglo-American mothers from the USA (Boston and NYC), Greece (Athens) and Taiwan (Tainan), and Chinese mothers and fathers living in Nanjing, China. Over the past five years, these parents have spoken at length about the values they wish to instill in their children and the immediate and long-term goals they have for their children and themselves as parents.

In the third section, we address the dynamic nature of individualism and collectivism, and the developmental goals of autonomy and relatedness, by focusing on how forms of association change over time, at micro and macro levels. We move beyond static conceptualizations to show that parents shift in the goals they endorse for their children across situations (including immigration) and developmental periods. At the more macro level, economic and political changes in countries are reflected in shifting value systems of parents across generations. Once more, we draw upon parents' narratives to illustrate micro-level changes as well as evidence for the influence of macro-level contexts on micro-level processes.

Individualism and Collectivism

The concept of individualism can be traced to the Protestant work ethic first proposed by Max Weber (1904–1905/1958) as an economic theory to account for the evolution of capitalism (Jones, 1997). At its core, Weber's theory proposed that the seeds of capitalism lay in the Protestant ideals of personal responsibility, pushing aside distractions in order to achieve goals, hard work, and innovation. These values are assumed to undergird American ideals and are the foundations of an individualistic orientation.

In line with the Protestant work ethic, parents in individualistic cultures have been described as encouraging their children to develop into independent, autonomous individuals who have fragile social ties to the larger group. Four key values are

associated with the overarching developmental goal of autonomy, as expressed by the parents in our studies: (1) personal choice ('That's why I'll let them decide what they want to do. If I like something but they don't, they won't have to do it'); (2) intrinsic forms of motivation and persistence ('You know, no matter what happens, just kind of have that positive, you know optimism'); (3) self-esteem ('That's the way you learn . . . Love what you are'); and (4) self-maximization ('I don't want him to think that he can't have or he can't do or he can't accomplish') (e.g., Bridges, 2003; Hofstede, 1980; Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Rothbaum & Trommsdorff, 2007; Ryan & Deci, 2000a, 2000b; Sampson, 1977; Smetana, 2002, Smith & Schwartz, 1997; Triandis, 1995).

The first value, *personal choice*, is common in many cultures that are considered to emphasize individualism, such as the USA (see Deci, Ryan, & Koestner, 1999 for review). Iyengar and Lepper (1999) note that for individuals in the USA, the act of making a personal choice provides opportunities to both assert personal preferences and establish a unique identity. These personal choices are associated with enhanced motivation and achievement.

A second common value in cultures thought to be individualistic is *intrinsic motivation*, that is, being internally driven to achieve one's goals. This value is often implicitly linked to other traits such as optimism about one's chances of success. In the USA, for example, optimism is viewed as a critical precursor to happiness, psychological well-being, health and longevity (e.g., Mesquita & Walker, 2003). Intrinsic motivation and personal choice are also thought to be intimately related, with personal choice facilitating motivation. Studies with primarily Anglo-American children have found that children's intrinsic motivation and interest in a task declines when they are externally rewarded for their task engagement or completion (Deci et al., 1999). A primary goal for families and schools in many cultures that are considered to be individualistically oriented is to raise children who are intrinsically motivated to learn (Iyengar & Lepper, 1999).

A third value common in cultures considered individualistic is *self-esteem*, which arises out of the belief that feeling good about oneself is the key to successful outcomes. Self-esteem is considered to be fundamental to happiness and the achievement of personal goals. Numerous studies have highlighted the greater value that European-American parents, typically described as emphasizing individualistism or autonomy, place on self-esteem compared to their Japanese, Chinese, and Puerto Rican counterparts, who have often been described as more collectivistic (Harwood et al., 1995; Stevenson et al., 1990). European-American mothers uniformly note the importance of self-esteem in children's healthy development and feel responsible for inculcating it in their children (Miller, Wang, Sandel, & Cho, 2002).

Finally, *self-maximization*, another common value in cultures considered to be more individualistic refers to achieving one's full potential as an individual, a term introduced in Harwood's highly influential study of parental socialization goals (Harwood et al., 1995). In this study, Anglo-American mothers were more likely than Puerto Rican mothers to mention the importance of their children reaching their full potential. The emphasis in cultures considered to be individualistic is on reaching one's full potential, which is also evident in the clinical (e.g., Maslow, 1943, 1948) and developmental (e.g., Vygotsky, 1978) literatures and is, perhaps, the most important component of an individualistic orientation.

Together, these four values reflect parents' beliefs about the fundamental requirements for children's successful achievement of autonomy: children who make their

own choices, are intrinsically motivated, feel good about themselves, and realize their full potential will ultimately develop into unique, autonomous beings.

In contrast to the emphasis on the autonomous self in cultures that are characterized as more individualistic, parents in cultures considered to be more collectivistic are thought to promote relatedness and interdependence in their children (Grotevant, 1998). The values implicit in the developmental goals of relatedness are: (1) connection to the family and other close relationships ('I want him to be an active person who loves his family very much and does not forget about his mother'); (2) orientation to the larger group ('And just be able to get along with kids, and be able to share, to socialize . . . Help each other'); and (3) respect and obedience ('If there's no respect, that's a bad thing, you know? Listening, and obeying, that's important'). Together, this constellation of developmental goals highlights both 'horizontal' collectivism, in which the self is part of a collective group that is characterized by equality, as well as 'vertical' collectivism, in which there exist inequalities in power within the collective that require obedience and respect (Triandis, 1995).

Connection to the family is frequently described as a distinguishing characteristic of rural, indigenous, and East Asian cultures, as well as of various ethnic minority groups in the USA who are considered to be more collectivistic, including East Asian, Hispanic, and African/African-American communities (Cortes, 1995; Fuligni, Tseng, & Lam, 1999; Spencer & Dornsbusch, 1990). Constructs such as 'familism' among Latino families, 'family obligation' and 'filial piety' among Asian families, and 'extended kin' for African-American families each encompass feelings of closeness, allegiance, and mutuality with family members, as well as notions of the self as an extension of the family (e.g., Cortes, 1995; Gonzalez-Ramos, Zayas, & Cohen, 1998; Sabogal, Marin, Otero-Sabogal, & Marin, 1987). A strong family orientation is believed to be linked to preindustrial agrarian societies in combination with influences from religion and Confucianism in the case of East Asian families. In its broader application, connection to the family also extends to other people with whom an individual shares close relationships. This aspect of collectivism has been referred to as 'relational collectivism' and is distinguished from 'group collectivism' in which the group is a depersonalized social category (Brewer & Chen, in press).

Orientation to the larger group, also considered a key socialization goal among parents in cultures considered to have a collectivist orientation, has been the focus of much research (e.g., Chen, Cen, Li, & He, 2005). Whereas individualistic-oriented communities are thought to emphasize self-growth and individual well-being, collectivistic-oriented communities are thought to emphasize the good of the larger community of which one is a member. Thus, researchers contend that individuals in collectivist cultures such as China, conscious that their actions reflect upon the larger group, consider the repercussions of their actions for the family or larger community before acting. In contrast, those in more invidividualistic communities primarily consider the consequences of their actions for the self.

Respect and obedience are considered central to many collectivist-oriented communities. To achieve harmony within the group—whether it be with other children, parents, or relatives—children must learn to be respectful of others as well as obedient to authority. The emphasis on obedience is the outgrowth of a hierarchical or vertical social structure, in which parents and elders of the community make decisions for the young (Kagitcibasi, 1996; Keller, 2003; Triandis, 1995). Such hierarchical social structures present clear boundaries of authority that function to prevent dissent in the group, which in turn facilitates harmony among group participants. In Latino families,

the construct of 'respeto' and the associated importance of raising a child who is 'bien educato' (Gonzalez-Ramos et al., 1998; Harwood et al., 1995) are examples of the emphasis on respect and obedience for the purposes of group harmony. In Harwood and colleagues' (1995) study, Puerto Rican mothers described ideal children as those who were obedient to elders, calm in order to attend to the needs of others, and polite and kind. In contrast, Anglo-American mothers emphasized qualities that highlighted self-maximization. A comprehensive review of over 20 studies indicates greater parental control and exercise of authority, and less encouragement of autonomy and personal choice, in Asian families (Indians, Filipinos, Japanese and Vietnamese, as well as Chinese) as compared to White families (Chao & Tseng, 2002).

Summary

According to current scholarship, personal choice, intrinsic motivation, self-esteem, and self-maximization have been described as laying the foundation for children's development of autonomy. In contrast, connection to the family, orientation to the group, and respect and obedience are thought to promote a strong sense of relatedness or interdependence. Although autonomy and relatedness are often contrasted in the literature, current research suggests that these value systems and developmental goals coexist in most cultures and within most parents. In the next section, we present a typology of how these value systems and developmental goals may coexist, followed by discussion of how forms of coexistence may change over time.

Forms of Coexistence of Individualism and Collectivism in Individuals and Societies

Despite a plethora of studies on the contrasting developmental goals of parents from different cultural communities, many scholars note that the boundaries between collectivistic and individualistic orientations are blurred. For example, Triandis (1995) asserts that collectivistic vs. individualistic value systems are probabilistic rather than deterministic, and recommends that these values be viewed as central tendencies in which it is *more likely* that an individual of a certain culture will subordinate personal goals to the group's goals, or the group's goals to personal goals, rather than be guided by a single orientation. Moreover, he describes a number of variables that increase the probability of collectivism or individualism, including an individual's affluence and educational level. Similarly, Smetana (2002) notes that although European-American children expect and assert earlier autonomy than Mexican, Asian-American and African-American children, *children in all cultures* value autonomy. Kagitcibasi (1996, 2005) observes that developmental goals such as emotional interdependence can coexist with developmental goals such as economic independence within a given family system, which led her to propose the construct of an 'autonomous relational self'. Weisner (2002) points to US parents' simultaneous socialization of dependence and independence in their young, referring to these seeming contradictions as the 'US dependency conflict'. Others point to the pervasiveness of sports teams and school clubs that emphasize goals of relatedness as being inconsistent with the overarching orientations of cultures that are considered to be individualistic, such as the United States (Bugental & Goodnow, 1998). Finally, Confucianism, which is typically described as a set of principles that advance collectivist goals, emphasizes hard work and achievement in order to uncover one's innate nature. This more individualistic side

of Confucian principles is often excluded from descriptions of East Asian cultures, thereby resulting in selective treatment of value systems that serve to reify the collectivistic–individualistic dichotomy.

Together, these ideas challenge the bifurcation of value systems and associated goals, and instead highlight their coexistence both within individuals and societies. The next step is to identify the ways in which developmental goals of autonomy and relatedness, and the superordinate value systems of individualism and collectivism relate to one another at micro and macro levels. In this section, we present a typology of these relations that is grounded in the ongoing research at our center (http://steinhardt.nyu.edu/crcde/). We distinguish among three forms of association: (1) *conflicting*, in which collectivistic value systems and associated developmental goals are seen as interfering with individualistic value systems and goals, and/or the reverse (2) *additive*, in which both collectivistic and individualistic value systems and developmental goals are endorsed in the absence of an explicit connection between the two, and (3) *functional dependence*, in which the value system of collectivism and associated developmental goal of relatedness are thought to be a path to individualism and autonomy, and/or vice versa.

Conflicting Associations

At a societal and individual level, collectivism or individualism or autonomy and relatedness may be viewed as conflicting; that is, the characteristics or developmental goals of one orientation are constructed as inhibiting or interfering with the characteristics or developmental goals associated with the other. Conflicting associations most closely align with the dichotomous conceptualization of individualistic and collectivistic communities as anchored at opposite poles. There is evidence that individualism and collectivism may at times be inversely related, such that societies high in one tend to be low in the other (Triandis, 1995). To date, however, little research has explored the ways in which parents view goals of relatedness as potentially interfering with goals of autonomy and vice versa.

In terms of *relatedness interfering with autonomy*, parents may view children's close relationships with others as detrimental to children's personal success. In our research,[1] this wariness of relatedness often took the form of concerns that children would 'follow' their friends, and therefore, compromise children's chances of attaining autonomy-oriented goals such as leadership and personal choice. One Puerto Rican mother of a two-year-old girl was fearful that her daughter would copy other children rather than be herself:

> *That's what I want Cora to be. Herself. Without having to look at another person, another kid, and say, 'I wanna be like that'. You know? 'I wanna do that' . . . You do what's natural, you know, what comes natural. Because I know when she does it naturally, that's being herself . . . But when she starts observing, you know . . . I know she's doing it, you know, because she saw it from another kid, you know? I just want her to be herself.*

Similarly, an African-American mother of a 12-year-old girl spoke with pride about her child's *lack* of sociability and friends. This mother was pleased with her daughter's ability to think for herself and to be independent, and perceived close friendships as threats to her daughter's individuality:

> *So that is why I'm proud of her too . . . She's not a, um, follower. She don't care about, she's could come home and don't talk to nobody, she don't beg-friend. Like, she don't care*

you could be her friend today, tomorrow. She's not like, she's not, um, sociable a lot. She's not highly sociable.

Similarly, immigrant Chinese mothers revealed concerns about friends interfering with their children's self-maximization, and ultimately autonomy. One mother of a two-year-old boy spoke about what it meant to be 'rebellious'. To her, being rebellious meant spending time with friends rather than doing homework or following rules—activities though to promote individual achievement:

> *For example [being rebellious means], the child doesn't do the homework assigned by the teacher. He/she doesn't go home by the time he/she should, instead, he hangs out with friends.*

Youth in our studies were aware of their parents' views that relationships with others might interfere with individual achievement. In interviews with Chinese-American youth (Way, Becker, & Greene, 2005; Way, Greene, & Pandey, in press), adolescents noted that their parents believed that relationships would get in the way of individual achievement or self-maximization:

> *My mom thinks that friendships are not that important. Yeah, because she said that being yourself is important, not that you have friends.*
>   *My dad thinks that friendships are not important because all he thinks about is school. He said a book is better than a friend.*

It is also possible for parents to view *autonomy as interfering with relatedness*, as illustrated in Miller and colleagues' (2002) research on Taiwanese and US parents' views about self-esteem. In contrast to the individualistic emphasis on the importance of self-esteem, Miller notes that the term 'self-esteem' does not exist in the Chinese language. When probing Taiwanese mothers about this construct, she relied on the closest translation—'self-respect in heart and mind'. She found that although US mothers spoke at length about the importance of self-esteem when asked about their child-rearing views, Taiwanese mothers rarely spoke of self-esteem, and when they did, they spoke of it as an undesired quality that would interfere with their children's social adjustment.

Parents' fears about the adverse consequences of children's personal success for family relations presents another way in which individualistic goals might be viewed as interfering with relatedness. Parents may feel that children who attain high levels of success might ultimately reject their family background as they move on to live at a new tier of society. Such concerns might be especially salient in immigrant families who are wary of US American ideologies. In our work, immigrant parents from the Dominican Republic, Mexico, and China often expressed concerns that the individualistic orientation of the USA would result in high success for their children, but would also lead to increased selfishness and decreased care for parents. These parents expressed clear sentiments that the goals of autonomy would create barriers to relatedness. As noted by one Chinese mother of an adolescent male:

> *When you were born in the US, educated in the US, you would become independent when you are 18, and don't like to talk to your parents, and don't want to live with your parents, just like this.*

This same mother spoke of the different expectations she had for her younger children who were born in the USA vs. her older child who was born in China. She described a conversation she had with her husband in which they spoke of the future

trajectories of their children. They believed their children's outcomes would depend on how much exposure they had to the individualistic culture of the USA:

> *[He told me], you see how you spoiled the younger ones? They will become even worse than I am, and they won't give you the money, even if they are making money in the future. He said the older one [who was not raised in the US] will be the one who treats us nice, and the younger ones who were born in the US will run away in the future.*

Additive Relations

In contrast to conflicting patterns of association, *both* collectivism and individualism at the cultural level and autonomy and relatedness at the individual level might be viewed as fundamental, yet independent, aspects of successful child development. This view builds on the notion that individuals must both assimilate to and distinguish themselves from the larger communities of which they are members (Brewer, 1991; Brewer & Chen, in press). Parents' role, therefore, is to simultaneously socialize children to integrate themselves with others and differentiate themselves from others (Dennis, Cole, Zahn-Waxler, & Mizuta, 2002; Kagitcibasi, 1996, 2005).

The additive coexistence of individualistic and collectivistic goals has a longstanding history dating back to John and Beatrice Whiting's (1974, 1978) seminal cross-cultural research, which emphasized the seemingly contrasting goals that parents endorse for their children. Their work in Kenya, for example, indicated that mothers simultaneously wished their children to be obedient, generous, respectful, and connected to the family as well as capable of developing skills such as independence, so as to better function in a market economy. In their observations of American family life, they noted that middle-income European-American parents stressed independence and self-reliance in interactions with their infants, while fostering strong affective bonds and dependencies. Two decades later, Kagitcibasi (1996) pointed to problems with the assumption that the development of autonomy necessarily requires separation from others, especially the family. As a result, she suggested two orthogonal dimensions to capture family socialization of children: autonomy vs. heteronomy and relatedness vs. separation. From these dimensions, Kagitcibasi identified three patterns of socialization: (1) traditional, characterized by high material and emotional interdependence, (2) independent, characterized by high autonomy and individualism, and (3) a synergy of the two. Others have also observed that although autonomy is a fundamental attribute of individualism, it does not necessarily involve separation or detachment (Smith & Schwartz, 1997).

Recent empirical work demonstrates that both parents and youth emphasize the dual goals of autonomy and relatedness. For example, studies of Korean parents indicate that although Koreans have historically placed greater emphasis on collectivist values such as in-group obligations, parents stress individualism when their children's personal improvement or pleasure is compromised (Cha, 1994). In another study, Chinese and Chinese-American parents placed more emphasis on obedience to authority than did their Anglo-American counterparts (Lin & Fu, 1990). However, they *also* rated encouragement of independence higher than Anglo-American parents, a seeming contradiction if obedience and independence are viewed as opposing developmental goals. The findings on Korean and Chinese-American parents suggest that hierarchical relationships, including respect and obligation, can harmoniously coexist with individualistic goals such as self-maximization and independence.

The additive coexistence of the value systems of individualism and collectivism is also evidenced in a study of college students in Northern India (Sinha & Tripathi, 1994). Students were presented with a set of 22 situations or dilemmas (e.g., career choice and health concern), and were asked to select what they considered to be a desirable behavioral response to each situation. Three behavioral options were offered for each situation, which aligned with an individualist, collectivist, or mixed orientation. Despite India being considered a highly collectivist culture, students preferred the response that blended both collectivistic and individualistic orientations for virtually every situation.

In our own work with middle-class mothers from Taiwan, Greece, and the USA, many mothers embraced both autonomy and relatedness when speaking about the qualities they wished to instill in their four-year-old children. (Tamis-LeMonda, Wang, Koutsouvanou, & Albright, 2002; Wang & Tamis-LeMonda, 2003). Mothers in all three societies endorsed developmental goals of assertiveness, independence, curiosity, sharing, and getting along with others, although the Anglo mothers from the USA were especially likely to endorse developmental goals of both autonomy and relatedness. Similarly, parents of Mexican, Dominican, Chinese-American, and African-American descent in our studies in NYC highlighted *both* autonomy and relatedness. Specifically, the mothers that we interviewed endorsed over 20 specific qualities that they hoped to see in their children, including being affectionate, co-operative, well-mannered, and obedient as well as being assertive, diligent, a leader, and attaining personal success. The additive coexistence of autonomy and relatedness is illustrated in the following four quotes by mothers of infants and toddlers who were asked to describe the qualities they would like to see in their very young children:

> Mother #1: '[I wish for him to be able] to talk with everybody . . . [and be sociable]. [Also] that in the future he can have a career, that he can be independent'.

> Mother #2: 'She needs to respect other people and if she believes in something, she needs to stand up for it'.

> Mother #3: 'As long as he always respects his elders and trusts his instincts, and know when something is wrong and you know be a leader, not a follower'.

> Mother #4: '[I want her to] respect people, and respect humanity. Um, know her spirit, you know, love herself'.

In each of these statements, mothers simultaneously emphasized qualities that have traditionally been classified at opposite ends of the individualistic–collectivistic or autonomy–relatedness spectrum. The juxtaposition of the goals of sociability and independence (mother #1), respect and assertiveness (mother #2), respect and leadership (mother #3), and respect and self-esteem (mother #4) within single statements suggests that parents indeed view developmental goals as harmoniously coexisting. In summary, although social science scholars have represented the developmental goals of autonomy and relatedness as separate, the reflections of parents from diverse communities suggest that parents do not perceive a contradiction between encouraging both autonomy and relatedness in their children.

Functional Dependence

Patterns in which developmental goals are viewed as additive can be contrasted with patterns in which the developmental goals of autonomy and relatedness are viewed as causally connected or *functionally dependent* on one another. Functional dependence

refers to a type of means–end relationship in which one value system or developmental goal is thought to serve the function of promoting the other. Parents may view relatedness as a path to autonomy and/or view autonomy as a path to relatedness. Specifically, positive relationships with others (relatedness) might be viewed as promoting individual success (autonomy), just as individual success (autonomy) might be viewed as promoting positive relations with others (relatedness). To date, there has been little consideration of the functional connections between parents' developmental goals.

In terms of *pathways from relatedness to autonomy*, although closeness to the family, connection to others, and respect or obedience may be end goals in themselves, they may also be viewed as foundational to individual achievement and personal growth. Our research with both middle-income European–American mothers and immigrant families in the USA supports the idea that goals of relatedness may be viewed as promoting goals of autonomy. One area in which this functional dependence was especially evident concerned connection to the family *vis-à-vis* personal acheivement and success. Parents noted that promotion of family values enables children to work hard and ultimately become successful. This functional dependence is illustrated in the sentiments of a Dominican-American father of an adolescent girl who spoke about the importance of family respect and support as a way for his child to excel as an individual:

> Well it's important for me to know that she recognize already that she's respecting the background that she has because if she don't respect where she's coming from, I don't think she could respect what she could become.
>   I'm her mentor because if you don't . . . assure them that you are there for them whether it's good or bad, the kid won't succeed in life . . . and just be yourself. Then you're going to do well.

Parents also expressed the view that the developmental goal of family obligation (relatedness) serves to promote personal development and success (autonomy). One Chinese mother in our study required her 13-year-old to assist her with small tasks, such as stringing beads, as a way to teach her child the skills necessary for individual achievement:

> Interviewer (upon seeing young child on mother's bed stringing beads): 'Always does that for you?'
> Mother: 'Yeah. Since he has nothing to do, so I asked him to help. . . . My friends open their own restaurants, their kids always help in restaurants. Since I don't have a restaurant, they help what I am doing now. We must teach them to work, so that they will understand life is not easy and they will study harder.'

Connection to social networks outside the family, especially friends, was also viewed by many parents as promoting individual autonomy and success. In our study of parents' childrearing goals among Taiwanese and US mothers of preschoolers (Wang & Tamis-LeMonda, 2003), one US mother noted that it was important for her preschooler to share, display compassion, and get along with others. At first glance, this set of goals reflected a relationship-oriented stance. However, she subsequently noted that if her daughter displayed these qualities, she would have many friends, which would in turn foster the development of her self-esteem—an autonomy-oriented stance. The sentiment that by having friends and being connected to groups children would develop as individuals was expressed by mothers in all the ethnic groups we studied, as reflected in the following two statements:

And why [do] we bring them to the parks? Because we want them to get in touch with other kids, so that they won't be afraid of other kids, so that they have confident personality, and get to know more stuff. (Chinese mother of a two-year-old boy)

So I was like, maybe if she's around kids. More so her age, but you know, be around more kids. She might pick up on things she's supposed to pick up faster. You know, now she's learning the shapes. And how to put them into the right slots. (African-American mother of a 17-month-old girl)

These perspectives highlight the benefits of social relationships and connection to others, a core pillar of collectivism and the developmental goal of relatedness, for individual development. These mothers of preschoolers believed that contact with other children would facilitate cognitive development and learning (e.g., 'knowing more stuff' and 'learning the shapes') and self-development (e.g., 'confident personality' and 'better adaptational skills').

Connection to others and friendship was seen as important to personal achievement well beyond the preschool years. Parents of adolescent children in our studies often spoke about the importance of children's selection of appropriate friendships for children's ultimate success.

If he has good friends the friends could help him. [They] could speak with him and communicate with him . . . [The friends] could help him learn to be good. (Chinese mother of a 13-year-old boy)

Parents may also view *autonomy as a pathway to relatedness*. For example, parents might feel that by letting children express themselves (autonomy goals), children will in turn confide with their parents and remain close to the family (relatedness goals). One Dominican parent of an adolescent girl noted '[Because] I let her voice her thoughts, I believe she trusts me more and speaks with me about anything'. Parents also often noted that children's self-esteem (autonomy) promoted children's social skills (relatedness). In their words, by feeling good about themselves, children would become more aware of how to treat others and would also in turn receive respect from others:

I think that . . . once you learn how to be good to yourself, love yourself, you will definitely learn how to treat others. (African-American mother of an adolescent girl)

It depends on you, what you want, but always have the pride of who you are. You are unique for what you are and it depends on how you project yourself to people. That's the kind of respect you're going to get back [from others]. (Dominican father of an adolescent girl)

In these examples, relatedness was founded on principles of individual growth and self-maximization.

Finally, individual achievement may be regarded as an important, and perhaps necessary, part of collective success, and personal success may feed back to the family in the form of family obligations, financial support, and responsibility. Children who achieve in school and the workplace bring pride to the family and are able to support their family financially in the future. Chinese parents, for example, have been described as encouraging their children's high levels of individual achievement as a means for giving back to or sharing success within their family, group, or society (Wilson & Pusey, 1982; Yu & Yang, 1994).

Parents may view children's unique skills and competencies as enabling children to contribute meaningfully to family tasks and fostering independence. Parents of

adolescents in our study noted proudly that they let their children cook meals, and so forth, and noted how these steps toward independence in turn assisted the family:

> *Mmhm, she already makes eggs . . . She makes her eggs. Um, on Saturday she wanted to make a 'cake' But there weren't any eggs. She went to get the eggs, but didn't find them here or there. Later I went out for them. I left her alone. She takes good care of [her little brother], um, I just go and do what I have to do, and then I come back. I don't take long.*
> (Mexican mother of an 11-year-old girl)

For many of the parents in our studies, fostering independence in children was thought to lead to the enhancement of relational skills and to ultimately feed back into benefits for the family.

Summary

Current scholarship acknowledges that the value systems of individualism and collectivism, and developmental goals such as autonomy and relatedness, albeit distinct can coexist within communities and individuals. Thus far, however, efforts to document the precise nature of associations among these goals is absent. We suggest that parents' goals for their children can be conflicting, additive, or functionally dependent. Qualitative interviews with participants in our studies lend support to each of these patterns of association. Although these forms of coexistence were discussed at the individual level, similar forms of association might also be observed at a broader, cultural level, a point that is addressed below. This final section of the article builds on these patterns of coexistence by exploring the dynamics of cultural value systems and parents' developmental goals across settings and time. As such, the assumption that cultural value systems and parents' developmental goals are static or homogeneous is directly challenged.

Dynamic and Changing Values

An implicit assumption of much of the literature on individualism and collectivism is that parents' goals for children are uniform across settings and time. This static treatment of value systems and associated developmental goals has recently come under scrutiny (Fiske, 2002). Fiske notes that a person may be individualistic at work or while playing chess, but highly collectivistic at home or in church. Triandis (1988) states that an individual's responses to questionnaires probing for individualistic vs. collectivistic values depend on the situation, the specific behavior, and the group that is present. These works underscore the dynamic, changing nature of individualism and collectivism, and of autonomy and relatedness. Missing from this work, however, is a discussion of how the *coexistence* of individualism and collectivism or autonomy and relatedness changes over time and context.

There are at least two types of change that may occur in the coexistence of societal-level value systems and individual-level developmental goals. Firstly, the *relative balance* of autonomy and relatedness may shift over settings and/or time. For example, parents may endorse both autonomy and relatedness (additive coexistence), yet change in the extent to which one or the other developmental goal is prioritized. Secondly, the *form of coexistence* may change over settings and/or time, that is, in whether relations

between autonomy and relatedness are additive, conflicting or functionally dependent. These two types of changes in the coexistence of autonomy and relatedness may occur at micro levels in response to different settings and children's development or at macro levels in response to changes in political and economic contexts.

Change across Settings

Changes in the *balance* of autonomy and relatedness within a particular form might be especially evident across public vs. private settings (e.g., school vs. home) or across settings that contain adults vs. peers. For example, parents who endorse both individualistic and collectivistic goals in an additive manner might stress goals associated with collectivism in public settings (e.g., being well-mannered and deferent to authority in school) yet emphasize goals associated with individualism in private settings (e.g., expressing personal choices and assertiveness at home). Here, individualistic and collectivistic goals are both considered important albeit unrelated goals, but their relative importance shifts across settings.

In our study, participants who discussed autonomy and relatedness in additive ways indicated that the balance of the two goals continually shifted across settings. One Mexican mother of an 18-month-old boy and an 11-year-old girl noted that she often asked teachers about her children's behaviors at childcare and at school, to be sure they were well-behaved. This mother endorsed obedience and respect for others at school but noted that it was okay for her children to be somewhat disobedient at home, suggesting that expectations for behavior conducive of relatedness shifted across these settings:

> At school they behave. They don't fight over there. Well, I say, on the one hand it's all right for them to misbehave here at home. It's not so bad.

Another African-American mother of an adolescent boy also noted that her expectations of her child's behaviors depended on the situation:

> A kid's place is supposed to be his place. You know, if something is wrong and he knows something about it, then he's supposed to speak up. Otherwise, if your family is having some visitors or whatever, you know, don't interrupt them.

Mothers in each of the examples above were consistent in maintaining an additive view of autonomy and relatedness in that both goals were present. For the first mother, relational goals were preeminent in public settings (school) but not in private ones (home). For the second mother, whether or not her child should assert his individuality vs. respect others varied across situations.

In addition to the relative importance of different priorities shifting across situations, the *form of coexistence* between developmental goals may change across situations. Parents might shift from endorsing multiple goals (additive) to viewing different goals as conflicting or functionally related. For example, in a peer context, parents might encourage their children to both assert their personal interests (autonomy) and to share with and help their peers (relatedness), expressing an additive view of autonomy and relatedness. However, in school situations where children are exposed to unfamiliar children from diverse backgrounds and neighborhoods, parents may shift to viewing relatedness as conflicting with autonomy. Peers who are unknown to parents may be considered 'risky' because they may impede the chances of their own children's individual accomplishments. It is also possible, however, that parents will shift from an

additive or conflicting perspective to a functional one when their children have opportunities to mingle with other children who are deemed to be more knowledgeable or 'connected'. Under such circumstances, parents may believe that relatedness will enhance their children's possibilities for individual success.

The relative emphases placed on autonomy vs. relatedness might change across macro contexts, such as country of residence. For example, Pessar (1995) found that in couples who had moved to the USA from the Dominican Republic, women took on more independent or autonomous roles outside the family (specifically, employment) and, as a result, men took on more household duties. Here, the relative balance of autonomy and relatedness-oriented activities were adapted to the demands of the new country. Similarly, the statements of a Ghanaian mother in our study suggest that the balance between autonomy and relatedness shifted toward autonomy and personal choice with her move to the USA from Ghana. As a result, she sought to promote collectivist values through her children's contact with their Ghanaian heritage so that the two developmental goals might be equalized. In the following quote, this mother notes the differences she observed in her children after they had returned from a visit to relatives in Ghana:

> *With the kids being away, they, they, they come back good. They still kids, but they come back with respect. Everything is 'Thank you much, Aunt Efua. Okay, Auntie. Please, Auntie Efua. Excuse me, Auntie Efua.' You know, everything is so, he has manners. He has lots of manners . . . please and thank yous, and all the time.*

Although this mother spoke admiringly of the emphasis within Ghanaian culture on manners and respect for elders as powerful influences on her daughter (and, at other points of the interview, on herself as a child), she also noted that her kids were 'still kids', alluding to the fact that they should have the freedom to act like children. She valued both autonomy and relatedness and wanted her daughter to strive to attain both these goals.

The *forms* of coexistence between autonomy and relatedness may also shift in new, unfamiliar contexts. For example, immigrant families may endorse both autonomy and relatedness in an additive manner in their home country, but be more likely to view these goals as conflicting upon arrival to the USA. Researchers, for example, have observed that parents of immigrant youth often send their children back to their native country when they are perceived as acting too 'selfishly', or as making the wrong personal choices about their friends, similar to the Ghanaian example above. Parents in these situations feel that their children should learn manners or respect in their larger extended families and country of origin (Smith, 2005; Suarez-Orozco, Todorova, & Louie, 2002). They may explicitly or implicitly believe that the goals of collectivism are being subverted or challenged by the goals of personal choice and individualism. Although these parents might not have experienced conflicts between autonomy and relatedness in their home country, the values and behavior of the host country might highlight such conflict.

One Dominican–American father spoke of the tension between the two goals of autonomy and relatedness that he experiences as a result of living in the USA:

> *We [Dominicans] are very friendly people. We like to bring joy to other peoples' life. We like to brighten up the day of somebody who is probably having a hard time . . . We like to touch and give hugs to someone. We express ourselves with our hands and I think that is unique . . . As a Dominican we are giving, showing what we are to this person with food, music, the way we speak, the way we laugh. It gives us that part of where we are coming*

from [Dominican Republic] and this is what we offer . . . Respectful, caring. We want to continue in the same way, but in the new society that we live in you have to be a little more flexible, be a little more understanding and let the kids be themselves . . . To be in the US you have to be number one.

Implicitly, this father suggests that the goals of being respectful and caring are not always consistent with the goals of flexibility, personal choice, and 'being number one'. Although his statements suggest that he hopes to promote both sets of values, he views them as conflicting with one another. However, over time, as immigrant families acculturate to the host country, goals once viewed to be in conflict may come to be viewed as complementary.

Change across Developmental Time

Changes in the balance and form of coexistence between autonomy and relatedness are rendered even more complex in the context of developmental time. Parents' developmental goals are constructed, negotiated, and renegotiated not only from situation to situation, but also as children develop (Tamis-LeMonda, 2003). If developmental goals coexist in all parents, the salience of individualistic vs. collectivistic goals might shift in balance at different periods in children's growth. Some families may shift from emphasizing relatedness in infancy to promoting autonomy as their children develop; other families will show less relative change in their emphases over time; still others might emphasize increasing interdependence with children's age—expecting older children to take on greater family responsibilities as they move beyond the 'selfish' tendencies of childhood. Thus, both the *relative balance* between autonomy and relatedness as well as *forms* of coexistence might change with development.

One example of the *relative balance* of autonomy and relatedness changing over time includes changes in the expression of warmth in East Asian parents over the course of early childhood (Rothbaum & Trommsdorff, 2007). Although personal responsibility and hard work are core Confucian principles that are stressed at all ages by Chinese parents, early childhood is also a time when individualistic values are blended with high levels of closeness and warmth in parent–child relationships. Parents exert little control in response to young children's dependency. Yet, these patterns change as children enter school, with parents exhibiting a decline in displays of warmth and increased authoritarian control with older children (e.g., Rothbaum & Trommsdorff, 2007; Rothbaum, Weisz, Pott, Miyake, & Morelli 2000).

Research on Turkish families also illustrates shifts in the balance of autonomy and relatedness in parents' goals across children's development (Kagitcibasi, 1996). In the Turkish language, the word *uslu* refers to a combination of highly valued characteristics, including the display of good manners, obedience, and being quiet rather than boisterous. This term is reserved for young children and shifts to a more inclusive term—*akilli-uslu*—when referring to adolescents and young adults. *Akilli* adds the quality of 'intelligence' to the construct of *uslu*, thereby indicating a shifting emphasis toward qualities that are associated with personal and cognitive growth with age. Here, the form of coexistence does not necessarily change, but the relative balance of autonomy and relatedness changes in response to the development of the child.

Similarly, the popular US term—'terrible twos'—captures the child's change from a coddled, dependent infant to an autonomous, incorrigible child. As children transition

from infancy to toddlerhood, parents often remark on the need to let their children make more choices and assert themselves. Moreover, the notion that two years of age is a turning point in children's independence is not limited to US mothers. As one Chinese mother of a two-year-old boy observed:

> *I found that in this half month, he started, 'Mommy, I eat by myself'. He must have learned that from the nanny, 'Now you are big, you are no longer a little baby. Little babies need people to feed them because they are so little. But you are (a) big (boy), you should eat by yourself.'*

Adolescence presents another period during which mothers observe their children's growing autonomy and may shift in their emphasis toward individualistic goals. Parents often define their early role as one in which they are guides to children's development, but by adolescence they remark that children are now 'on their own'. One Chinese mother of a 13-year-old boy noted that once you are older (a big boy), the choice to obey or not becomes the purview of the child, 'He will listen to me if he wants to but if he doesn't, there is nothing I can do about it. He is a big boy now'. Similarly, a Mexican mother of an 18-month-old boy noted that although her role is currently to guide her young child, she recognized that by adolescence, her influence would be diminished as her son come to make his own choices: 'Our purpose is to teach and guide them along a good path. If they want to get lost, that is their problem'. Each of these examples reveals the ways in which the relative balance between relatedness and autonomy changes over developmental time.

The *form of coexistence* between autonomy and relatedness may also change with children's development. Parents may view the developmental goals of autonomy and relatedness as additive early in children's development and begin to view them as conflicting during adolescence. For example, parents increasingly encourage toddlers' autonomy with the emergence of developmental milestones such as walking and talking, but also foster toddlers' social skills (relatedness) through play interactions with peers and participation in organized group activities such as music classes, gymnastics, and sports. However, as children enter adolescence and the choice of friends is no longer the purview of parents, relatedness may be viewed as a threat to their adolescents' individual achievement. Friends may be seen as influencing choices and fears that children will become 'followers' heighten, as reflected in the following quotes from mothers in our study:

> *I want him to be himself, to take his own decisions, to not get carried away by others.*
>
> *I don't want her to feel like she's doing it because somebody wants her to do it. Don't be easily misled or persuaded to do things. If anything else is to be a leader and not a follower.*
>
> *She's her own person. She don't let nobody influence her to do anything.*

These statements reflect views of autonomy and relatedness as being in conflict among these parents of adolescents, and the question that remains is whether these views have shifted from an earlier emphasis on more balanced forms of coexistence. Although researchers have suggested that the relative balance of parents' emphases on autonomy and relatedness shifts over the course of development, no research has longitudinally explored how the form of coexistence may change over time. Research on dynamics to forms of coexistence between value systems and parents' developmental goals is needed to adequately understand how both the balance *and* form of

coexistence between autonomy and relatedness in parents' socialization beliefs and practices change over the course of children's development.

Change across Political and Economic Contexts

The relative balance of autonomy and relatedness and their forms of coexistence are also shaped by larger macro-level contexts such as political and economic trends (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 1998). One example of macro-level influences on the coexistence of autonomy and relatedness is evidenced in Kagitcibasi and Ataca's (2005) historical account of the developmental goals of Turkish parents over the past three decades. When comparing Turkish families in the present to those in 1975, they found that high-income, urban Turkish parents valued autonomy more so than did their similar counterparts in prior generations. However, these parents simultaneously exhibited an increase in the 'psychological value of the child', which comprised expectations of joyfulness and closeness with their child (Kagitcibasi & Ataca, 2005). The authors ascribe these changes in parents' values for children to the economic growth and educational opportunities in Turkey that arose over the three decades of the study. As children in Turkey spend more time in school and as parents no longer rely on children for the material and economic sustenance of the household, there is a decline in children's utilitarian value and a concomitant increase in their psychological value.

Research on social and economic transformations in Eastern European countries and China more specifically offer another example of macro-level influences on the value systems of individualism vs. collectivism as well as the developmental goals of autonomy and relatedness. Over time, as countries transform from planned to market economies, workers' beliefs about autonomy and relatedness, and the balance and forms of coexistence between these goals, change as well (Chen et al., 2005; Guthrie, 1999, 2006).

An example of this process is reflected in the transformation of the Chinese concept of *guanxi* over the past two decades (Guthrie, 1998, 1999, 2006). The construct of *guanxi* emphasizes the functionally dependent coexistence between autonomy and relatedness. *Guanxi* is a form of social connection or relationship that is mutually beneficial to each partner in the dyad or network. Thus, relationships or connections serve, in essence, a utilitarian function to enhance individual success or achievement (i.e., relatedness as a path to autonomy). According to scholars (e.g., Guthrie, 1998; Walder, 1986), conceptions of relationships that rely heavily on social networking as a means for meeting individual needs (i.e., *guanxi*) are evident in shortage economies with weak legal infrastructures. In such economies, workers will rely on their social connections to address their individual needs as they believe it is their only route to meeting their individual needs. In our own research with Chinese-American immigrant youth in NYC (see Way et al., 2005; Way, et al., in press), we have seen evidence of the belief in *guanxi* in adolescents' descriptions of their parents' views about friendships (most of their parents immigrated to the USA during or before the early 1990s):

> *My dad thinks friends use each other to get benefits from each other.*

> *My mom thinks its good to have lots of friends cause it's like connections with people . . . like benefits you can have from having friends . . . She told me that when she was small she had some friends that were like poor like she was and right now that one of those friends has a Porsche and she like makes a lot of money. And like they still talk to each other and now she's trying to help my mom start her own business.*

Recently, however, social scientists have noted that this understanding of relationships or social connections as primarily utilitarian is losing significance in business and personal transactions as the economy in China moves from a planned to a market economy (Guthrie, 1998, 1999, 2006). With the emergence of a western-style legal infrastructure (a fundamental aspect of market economies), the reliance on *guanxi* becomes less necessary. In its place, our pilot studies in China over the past year suggest that Chinese workers have begun to view autonomy and relatedness as additive or conflicting, rather than as functionally dependent.

In interviews with parents during the winter of 2006, parents of infants in Nanjing, China spoke of the importance of *both* autonomy and relatedness in the socialization of their children. Their statements indicated that their beliefs about autonomy and relatedness were changing from being functionally dependent (that in which relationships with others promote individual ends) to viewing interpersonal relationships and individual achievement as both valuable in their own rights (additive). Mothers often not only indicated that they valued individual academic accomplishments and wanted their children to be leaders, but also strongly valued their children having good social skills so that they would be able to get along, have a lot of friends, and feel emotionally supported. Their narratives suggested that they sought both relatedness and autonomy for their children, but that one was not necessarily dependent on the other. A young Chinese mother of a two-year-old indicated that friendships are as important as academic achievement because in 'friendships you are learning as much about the world as you are in school'. This mother valued her child's learning about relationships as much as she valued her child's academic achievement.

Middle-school principals in our studies in Nanjing, China, however, discussed the conflicting nature of the goals of autonomy and relatedness. They noted that students who have a lot of friends are often those who do the least well in school. The principals often felt conflicted about the extent to which they should emphasize quality relationships (a key part of the government's current five-year education plan) vs. high academic achievement. In this example, the form of coexistence between relatedness and autonomy in China appears to be changing from viewing relationships as necessary for individual success (*guanxi*) to viewing relationships as potentially interfering with individual success (from the perspectives of principals).

Developmental psychologists studying Chinese children and parents have also indicated that the *relative balance* of autonomy and relatedness is dynamic, with changes in parents' views resulting from economic and political transitions. Chen and colleagues (2005) conducted a multiple cohort study of elementary school children in China in 1991, 1998, and 2002. In each cohort, parents', teachers', and peers' evaluations of shy children were obtained in classrooms in Shanghai and Bejing. In 1991, shy children (as assessed by observations of children's behaviors in the classroom) were rated as extremely competent, popular, and as having the greatest potential to become leaders. At that time, because accommodating to the group was highly valued, shy children were considered to be particularly good 'citizens'. In 1998, as China was fully entering the transition to a market economy, in a new cohort of elementary school children from the same districts, shy children were ranked by their teachers, parents, and peers as neither highly competent nor incompetent. By 2002, when China was fully embedded in market economy that strongly valued individual initiative, in a third cohort of elementary school children, shy children were ranked by teachers, peers, and parents as incompetent, the least likely to become leaders, and the least popular among their peers (Chen et al., 2005). Thus,

by 2002, students who distinguished themselves from others by taking initiative in positive ways were strongly valued, reflecting a shift in the balance between autonomy and relatedness.

The Implications of Dynamic Values and Developmental Goals for Parenting Practices

In light of the dynamic nature of cultural value systems and parents' developmental goals, what are the implications for parenting practices and children's development? There is a growing body of empirical evidence connecting cultural value systems, parents' goals, and parents' everyday practices, yet much of this work is grounded in the assumption that cultural differences in parenting practices are stable across time and settings. For example, US mothers endorse self-feeding and infants sleeping in their own rooms at earlier ages than Puerto Rican mothers (Feng, Harwood, Leyendecker, & Miller, 2001). German mothers respond more frequently to infant smiles than do mothers of the Cameroonian Nso, in efforts to promote infants' displays of positive emotions. In contrast, mothers of the Cameroonian Nso vigorously stimulate their infants' motor development so as to prepare children for manual labor within the family (relatedness goals; Keller, 2003). Japanese mothers more often encourage their five-month-old infants to look at them and engage in dyadic interactions (behaviors associated with relatedness), whereas US middle-income mothers encourage extra-dyadic interactions by pointing out features of the environment to their infants (behaviors associated with autonomy) (Bornstein, Miyake, & Tamis-LeMonda, 1985–1986). With infants of slightly older ages, Japanese mothers are more likely to engage their toddlers in other-directed pretend play (behaviors associated with relatedness) (e.g., by prompting their children to feed a baby doll) whereas US mothers are more likely to promote independent, concrete forms of play such as placing shapes in shape-sorters (behaviors associated with autonomy) (Tamis-LeMonda et al., 1992). Similarly, Chinese mothers engage in proportionally more elicitations of affiliation and connection when their toddlers confront unfamiliar challenge tasks in a laboratory setting (behaviors associated with relatedness) whereas Canadian mothers engage in proportionally more behaviors that encourage initiation and exploration (behaviors associated with autonomy) (Liu et al., 2005).

Together, these findings suggest that parenting practices are shaped by cultural values and developmental goals. However, what is missing from these accounts is a dynamic perspective of the changing nature of both parenting goals and practices across situations and time. If parents' goals and the associations between goals are dynamic, it is reasonable to expect *discontinuities* in parenting practices across situations and time. Parents most likely alter their expectations and behaviors in line with the current situation, selecting the appropriate times to emphasize the needs of the group vs. the needs of the child. Moreover, these shifting parenting practices are likely to be evidenced at nested time frames, with parents varying in their views and practices from moment-to-moment, within the course of a day, and across weeks, months, years, and decades. Consequently, discontinuities in parenting across settings and time might reflect adaptive reactions to environmental demands, rather than random noise. Thus, in revisiting parenting practices surrounding feeding, play, and sleep discussed above, researchers might begin to document when and how parents *change* their practices to align with their dynamic value systems and developmental goals.

Summary

Both the balance and forms of coexistence between individualism and collectivism, autonomy and relatedness, are dynamic. The salience of autonomy and relatedness in parents' developmental goals varies across settings and immigration as well as across developmental time in response to situational demands and children's growing abilities and expanding social relationships. Narratives from parents in our studies consistently underscore the ways in which the forms of coexistence between autonomy and relatedness changed as a result of immediate and larger context (e.g., from additive to conflicting), and immigrant parents in particular spoke of the need to adjust to the unequal balance between autonomy and relatedness in the host country. The dynamic nature of parents' developmental goals will likely be reflected in discontinuities in actual parenting practices across situations and developmental time, and if so, researchers should reconceptualize parenting discontinuities as potentially adaptive responses to changing task demands rather than as inconsistent ways of acting.

At macro levels, social, economic, and political changes might lead to shifts in the balance and forms of coexistence between autonomy and relatedness across generations. As one example, our ongoing research in Nanjing, China highlights these changes by suggesting that the functional associations between relatedness and individual success are shifting toward additive associations as relationships come to be esteemed in their own right in new market economies. However, these shifts are also producing conflicting associations in some instances, as reflected in the expressed wariness that strong friendships might interfere with the academic achievement of Chinese children.

Conclusions

Current scholarship on the value systems of individualism and collectivism has moved beyond grand divide theories to emphasize the coexistence of these values or developmental goals within individuals, families, and cultures. Our aim was to present a theoretical framework of the ways in which the values of individualism and collectivism, and developmental goals of autonomy and relatedness may coexist within individuals and within and across cultural contexts, and the ways in which these forms of coexistence may change over time. Drawing upon our work with parents from different ethnic and cultural groups, we identified a typology of three patterns of association between individualism and collectivism, autonomy and relatedness. Specifically, developmental goals that have largely been classified at opposite ends of a collectivism–individualism continuum might be conflicting, additive, or functionally dependent. Moreover, these forms of association are not static, but rather change from situation to situation, with children's development, and in response to social, political and economic contexts.

What factors might explain these dynamic patterns of association? At the most general level, trends of increased globalization, immigration, and technology expose parents and children to different values and behavioral systems in unprecedented ways. Some scholars have proposed that societies are converging toward greater individualism as a function of these global changes (Ghoshal & Bartlett, 1998), but it is also likely that changes in forms of coexistence between individualism and collectivism are heightened during periods of rapid change. As parents are faced with a multitude of options about the behaviors and attitudes that might help their children function in

local and extended communities, traits that they deem to be important (or threatening) are likely to shift from situation to situation. At times, parents may interpret autonomy vs. relatedness as conflicting with family traditions and values, and these threats may become more salient as children expand their social networks, transition to adolescence, or when parents move to new countries or communities. At other times, parents may embrace both individualistic and collectivistic value systems, and view children who are autonomous, successful, maintain ties to the family, respect others, and display good manners to reflect the ideal. Finally, parents may view different developmental goals as functionally related, and consider certain goals as the means to other end goals. This latter form of association is reflected in widespread beliefs that children who are kind to others will in turn benefit from others' friendship, feel good about themselves, and be successful (relatedness as a path to autonomy); as well as beliefs that children who attain personal success will be better able to give back to the family and larger group both emotionally and instrumentally (autonomy as a path to relatedness). At the more macro level, periods of rapid social, political, and economic change, as occurred in the case of China, might lead to shifts in the balance of developmental goals and patterns of associations in workplace and family, in ways that highlight both benefits (functionality) and costs (conflicts) of new ways of thinking and acting.

Our discussion of the dynamic patterns of association between autonomy and relatedness sheds light on the limitations of current scholarship. Although a growing body of research acknowledges that autonomy and relatedness coexist in some form, there is a clear need to examine the precise nature of these forms of coexistence. To what extent do parents endorse different goals for their children? How and why do parents shift in their relative emphases on autonomy and relatedness across situations, time, and macro-structural change? How do the patterns of association change in response to both micro and macro contexts? We contend that parents are continually shifting in their developmental goals (and associated parenting practices) from day-to-day, week-to-week, and year-to-year. On a given day, the demands for individual achievement in a school setting might evoke conflicting or functional dependencies between relatedness and autonomy (e.g., peers at school may be viewed as harming or helping chances at individual success) that might be absent in the family setting. Across developmental time, as children transition from home to childcare settings, collectivistic goals might become subordinate to individualistic goals, as parents seek to support children's independence and ability to separate from the comforts of attachment figures. Some years later, there may be yet another shift toward greater emphasis on autonomy as children become adolescents and then young adults. Across historical time, changes to economic opportunity and market economies (as in the cases of China and Turkey discussed previously) might lead to shifts in the balance of autonomy-related goals as well as the form of association between autonomy and relatedness.

Finally, what might the dynamic coexistence of developmental goals (and associated parenting practices) mean for children? As a start, it is time to acknowledge that children are unlikely to be reared in environments that uniformly endorse individualistic or collectivistic ways of thinking and acting. Rather, children will be expected to be quiet, assertive, respectful, curious, humble, self-assured, independent, dependent, affectionate, or reserved depending on the situation, people present, children's age, and social–political and economic climates. Children will be told that friends are impediments to achievement and that friends are instrumental to learning and

personal growth; that they should know that their parents will always be there for them, yet learn how to fend for themselves; that they should feel confident and proud of who they are, but that boasting is to be avoided and humility is a virtue; that they should always make their own choices, but be sure to respect others' wishes. This exposure to multiple ways of acting and thinking, and seemingly contradictory expectations, is what enables children to adapt to changing situations, lifestyles, people, and times. In short, the dynamic coexistence of autonomy and relatedness means that children are socialized to flexibly respond to the daily demands of their ever-changing cultural communities.

In closing, although research has moved beyond dichotomous characterizations of individualism/collectivism, autonomy/relatedness, there continues to be a relatively static portrayal of these value systems and developmental goals. As we have argued, not only are cultural values and developmental goals dynamic in and of themselves, but also the form of their coexistence is dynamic and depends on both micro and macro contexts. Exploring the ways in which these values or goals coexist and how their coexistence changes over time is critical to advancing a richer and more nuanced understanding of child development and parenting in diverse cultural contexts.

References

Bakan, D. (1966). *The duality of human existence*. Chicago: Rand Mcnally.

Bornstein, M. H., Miyake, K., & Tamis-LeMonda, C. S. (1985–1986). A cross-national study of mother and infant activities and interactions: Some preliminary comparisons between Japan and the United States. *Research & Clinical Center for Child Development*, *9*, 1–12.

Bornstein, M. H., Venuti, P., & Hahn, C-S. (2002). Mother-child play in Italy: Regional variation, individual stability and mutual dyadic influence. In C. S. Tamis-LeMonda, & R. Harwood (Guest Editors), Special Issue of *Parenting: Science & Practice: Parental Ethnotheories: Cultural Practices and Normative Development*, *2*, 273–301.

Brewer, M. B. (1991). The social self: On being the same and different at the same time. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *17*, 475–482.

Brewer, M. B., & Chen, Y.-R. (in press). Where (Who) are collectives in collectivism? Toward conceptual clarification of individualism and collectivism. *Psychological Review*, *114*, 133–151.

Bridges, L. J. (2003). Autonomy as an element of developmental well-being. In M. H. Bornstein, L. Davidson, C. M. Keyes, & K. A. Moore (Eds.), *Well being: Positive development across the life course* (pp. 167–189). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Bronfenbrenner, U., & Morris, P. A. (1998). The ecology of developmental processes. In W. Damon (Series Ed.) & R. M. Lerner (Vol. Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology: Theoretical models of human development* (5th ed., Vol. 1, pp. 993–1028). New York: Wiley.

Bugental, D. B., & Goodnow, J. J. (1998). Socialization processes. In W. Damon (Series Ed.) & N. Eisenberg (Vol. Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology: Social, emotional, and personality development* (5th ed., vol. 3, pp. 389–462). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Cha, J. (1994). Aspects of individualism and collectivism in Korea. In U. Kim, H. C. Triandis, C. Kagitcibasi, S. Choi, & G. Yoon (Eds.), *Individualism and collectivism: Theory, method, and applications* (vol. 18, pp. 157–174). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Chao, R., & Tseng, V. (2002). Parenting of Asians. In M. H. Bornstein (Ed.), *Handbook of parenting: Social conditions and applied parenting* (2nd ed., Vol. 4, pp. 59–93). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Chen, X., Cen, G., Li, D., & He, Y. (2005). Social functioning and adjustment in Chinese children: The imprint of historical time. *Child Development*, *76*, 182–195.

Cortes, D. E. (1995). Variations in familism in two generations of Puerto Ricans. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, *17*, 249–255.

Deci, E. L., Ryan, R. M., & Koestner, R. (1999). A meta-analytic review of experiments examining the effects of extrinsic rewards on intrinsic motivation. *Psychological Bulletin*, *125*, 627–668.

Dennis, T. A., Cole, P. M., Zahn-Waxler, C., & Mizuta, I. (2002). Self in context: Autonomy and relatedness in Japanese and U.S. mother-preschooler dyads. *Child Development*, *73*, 1803–1817.

Feng, X., Harwood, R. L., Leyendecker, B., & Miller, A. M. (2001). Changes across the first year of life in infants' daily activities and social contacts among middle-class Anglo and Puerto Rican families. *Infant Behavior & Development*, *24*, 317–339.

Fiske, A. P. (2002). Using individualism and collectivism to compare cultures—A critique of the validity and measurement of the constructs: Comment on Oyserman et al. (2002). *Psychological Bulletin*, *128*, 78–88.

Fuligni, A. J., Tseng, V., & Lam, M. (1999). Attitudes toward family obligations among American adolescents from Asian, Latin American, and European backgrounds. *Child Development*, *70*, 1030–1044.

Ghoshal, S., & Bartlett, C. (1998). *The individualized corporation*. London: Random House.

Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Gonzalez-Ramos, G., Zayas, L. H., & Cohen, E. (1998). Child-rearing values of low-income, urban Puerto Rican mothers of preschool children. *Professional Psychology Research and Practice*, *29*, 377–382.

Grotevant, H. D. (1998). Adolescent development in family contexts. In W. Damon (Series Ed.) & N. Eisenberg (Vol. Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology: Social, emotional, and personality development* (5th ed., Vol. 3, pp. 1097–1149). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Guthrie, D. (1998). The declining significance of guanxi in China's economic transition. *The Chinese Quarterly*, *154*, 254–282.

Guthrie, D. (1999). *Dragon in a three-piece suit: The emergence of capitalism in China*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University press.

Guthrie, D. (2006). *China and globalization: The social, economic, and political transformation of Chinese society*. Great Britain: Routledge Press.

Harkness, S., Super, C. M., & van Tijen, N. (2000). Individualism and the 'western mind' reconsidered: American and Dutch parents' ethnotheories of the child. In S. Harkness, C. Raeff, & C. M. Super (Eds.), *Variability in the social construction of the child. New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development*, *87*, 23–29.

Harwood, R. L., Miller, J. G., & Irizarry, N. L. (1995). *Culture and attachment: Perceptions of the child in context*. New York: Guilford Press.

Harwood, R. L., Schoelmerich, A., Schulze, P. A., & Gonzalez, Z. (1999). Cultural differences in maternal beliefs and behaviors: A study of middle-class Anglo and Puerto Rican mother-infant pairs in four everyday situations. *Child Development*, *70*, 1005–1016.

Hofstede, G. H. (1980). *Culture's consequence: International differences in work-related values*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Iyengar, S. S., & Lepper, M. R. (1999). Rethinking the value of choice: A cultural perspective on intrinsic motivation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *76*, 349–366.

Johnson, D., & Johnson, R. (1989). *Cooperation and competition: Theory and research*. Edina, MN: Interaction Books.

Jones, H. B. (1997). The Protestant ethic: Weber's model and the empirical literature. *Human Relations*, *50*, 757–778.

Kagitcibasi, C. (1996). *Family and human development across cultures: A view from the other side*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Kagitcibasi, C. (2005). Autonomy and relatedness in cultural context: Implications for self and family. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *36*, 403–422.

Kagitcibasi, C., & Ataca, B. (2005). Value of children and family change: A three-decade portrait from Turkey. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, *54*, 317–337.

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

Killen, M., McGlothlin, H., & Lee-Kim, J. (2002). Between individuals and culture: Individuals' evaluation of exclusion from social groups. In H. Keller, Y. H. Porringa, & A. Schoelmerich (Eds.), *Between culture and biology: Perspectives on ontogenetic development* (pp. 159–190). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kohlberg, L. (1981). *The meaning and measurement of moral development*. Worcester, MA: Clark University Press.

Kohn, M. L. (1969). *Class and conformity: A study in values*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Lieber, E., Yang, K. S., & Lin, Y. C. (2000). An external orientation to the study of causal beliefs: Application to Chinese populations and comparative research. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *3*, 160–186.

Lin, C. C., & Fu, V. R. (1990). A comparison of child-rearing practices among Chinese, immigrant Chinese, and Caucasian-American parents. *Child Development*, *61*, 429–433.

Liu, M., Chen, X., Rubin, K., Zheng, S., Cui, L., Li, D., et al. (2005). Autonomy- vs. connectedness-oriented parenting behaviours in Chinese and Canadian mothers. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, *29*, 489–495.

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

Maslow, A. H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*, *50*, 370–396.

Maslow, A. H. (1948). 'Higher' and 'lower' needs. *Journal of Psychology: Interdisciplinary and Applied*, *25*, 433–436.

McGillicuddy-De Lisi, A. V., & Sigel, I. E. (1995). Parental beliefs. In M. H. Bornstein (Ed.), *Handbook of parenting* (Vol. 3, pp. 333–358). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Mesquita, B., & Walker, R. (2003). Cultural differences in emotions: A context for interpreting emotional experiences. *Behavior Research and Therapy*, *41*, 777–793.

Miller, P. J., Wang, S., Sandel, T., & Cho, G. E. (2002). Self-esteem as folk theory: A comparison of European American and Taiwanese mothers' beliefs. In C. S. Tamis-LeMonda, & R. Harwood (Guest Editors), Special Issue of *Parenting: Science & Practice: Parental Ethnotheories: Cultural Practices and Normative Development*, *2*, 209–239.

Ogbu, J. U. (1988). Cultural identity and human development. *New Directions for Child Development*, *42*, 11–28.

Oyserman, D., Coon, H. M., & Kemmelmeier, M. (2002). Rethinking individualism and collectivism: Evaluation of theoretical assumptions and meta-analyses. *Psychological Bulletin*, *128*, 3–72.

Parsons, T., & Shils, E. A. (1951). Values, motives, and systems of action. In T. Parsons, & E. A. Shils (Eds.), *Toward a general theory of action*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Pessar, P. R. (1995). *A visa and a dream: Dominicans in the United States*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Rothbaum, F., & Trommsdorff, G. (2007). Do roots and wings complement or oppose one another: The socialization of relatedness and autonomy in cultural context. In J. Grusec, & P. Hastings (Eds.), *Handbook of socialization* (2nd ed., pp. 461–489). New York: Guilford Press.

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

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000a). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations: Classic definitions and new directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, *25*, 54–67.

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000b). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist*, *55*, 68–78.

Sabogal, F., Marin, G., Otero-Sabogal, R., & Marin, B. V. (1987). Hispanic familism and acculturation: What changes and what doesn't? *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, *9*, 397–412.

Sampson, E. E. (1977). Psychology and the American ideal. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *35*, 767–782.

Shweder, R. A., Goodnow, J., Hatano, G., LeVine, R., Markus, H., & Miller, P. (1998). The cultural psychology of development: One mind, many mentalities. In W. Damon (Series Ed.) & R. M. Lerner (Vol. Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology: Theoretical models of human development* (5th Ed., Vol. 1, pp. 865–938). New York: Wiley.

Sinha, D., & Tripathi, R. C. (1994). Individualism in a collectivist culture: A case of coexistence of opposites. In U. Kim, H. C. Triandis, C. Kagitcibasi, S. Choi, & G. Yoon (Eds.), *Individualism and collectivism: Theory, method, and applications* (Vol. 18, pp. 123–136). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Smetana, J. (2002). Culture, autonomy, and personal jurisdiction. In R. Kail, & H. Reese (Eds.), *Advances in child development and behavior* (Vol. 29, pp. 52–87). Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Academic Press.

Smith, P., & Schwartz, S. (1997). Values. In J. Berry, M. Segall, & C. Kagitcibasi (Eds.), *Handbook of cross-cultural psychology: Social behavior and applications* (2nd ed., Vol. 3, pp. 78–118). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Smith, R. (2005). *Mexican New York: Transnational lives of new immigrants*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Spencer, M. B., & Dornsbusch, S. M. (1990). Challenges in studying minority youth. In S. Feldman, & G. R. Elliott (Eds.), *At the threshold: The developing adolescent* (pp. 123–146). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Stevenson, H. W., Lee, S., Chen, C., Stigler, J. W., Hsu, C., & Kitamura, S. (1990). Contexts of achievement: A study of American, Chinese, and Japanese children. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, *55*, i–119.

Suarez-Orozco, C., Todorova, I. L., & Louie, J. (2002). Making up for lost time: The experience of separation and reunification among immigrant families. *Family Process*, *41*, 625–643.

Super, C. M., & Harkness, S. (2002). Culture structures the environment for development. *Human Development*, *45*, 270–274.

Tamis-LeMonda, C. S. (2003). Cultural perspectives on the 'Whats?' and 'Whys?' of parenting. *Human Development*, *46*, 319–327.

Tamis-LeMonda, C. S., Bornstein, M. H., Cyphers, L., Toda, S., & Ogino, M. (1992). Language and play at one year: A comparison of toddlers and mothers in the United States and Japan. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, *15*, 19–42.

Tamis-LeMonda, C. S., Wang, S., Koutsouvanou, E., & Albright, M. (2002). Childrearing values in Greece, Taiwan, and the United States. *Parenting Science and Practice*, *2*, 185–208.

Triandis, H. C. (1988). Collectivism and development. In D. Sinha, & H. S. R. Kao (Eds.), *Social values and development: Asian perspectives* (pp. 285–303). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Triandis, H. C. (1994). Theoretical and methodological approaches to the study of collectivism and individualism. In U. Kim, H. C. Triandis, C. Kagitcibasi, S. Choi, & G. Yoon (Eds.), *Individualism and collectivism: Theory, method, and applications* (Vol. 18, pp. 41–51). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Triandis, H. C. (1995). *Individualism & collectivism*. Boulder, CO: Western Press.

Triandis, H. C. (2000). Culture and conflict. *International Journal of Psychology*, *35*, 145–152.

Triandis, H. C., McCusker, C., & Hui, C. H. (1990). Multimethod probes of individualism and collectivism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *59*, 1006–1020.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Walder, A. (1986). *Community neo-traditionalism: Work and authority in Chinese industry*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Wang, S., & Tamis-LeMonda, C. S. (2003). Do child-rearing values in Taiwan and the United States reflect cultural values of collectivism and individualism? *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *34*, 629–642.

Way, N., Becker, B., & Greene, M. (2005). Friendships among African American, Latino, and Asian American adolescents in an urban context. In C. Tamis-Lemonda, & L. Balter (Eds.), *Child Psychology: A Handbook of Contemporary Issues* (2nd ed., pp. 415–443). New York: Psychology Press.

Way, N., Greene, M., & Pandey, P. (in press). Parental peer-related attitudes and practices and their link to friendship quality among ethnic minority adolescents. In B. Brown, & N. Mounts (Eds). *Parents and peers among adolescents. Monographs for Child and Adolescent Development*.

Weber, M. (1958). *The Protestant ethic and the spirit of capitalism* (Talcott Parsons, Trans.). New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. (Originally published as two separate essays 1904–1905).

Weisner, T. (2002). The American dependency conflict: Continuities and discontinuities in behaviours and values of countercultural parents and their children. *Ethos*, *29*, 271–295.

Whiting, B. B. (1974). Folk wisdom and child rearing. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, *20*, 9–19.

Whiting, B. B. (1978). The dependency hang-up and experiments in alternative life styles. In M. J. Yinger, & S. J. Cutler (Eds.), *Major social issues: A multidisciplinary view* (pp. 217–226). New York: The Free Press.

Wilson, R. W., & Pusey, A. W. (1982). Achievement motivation and small-business relationship patterns in Chinese society. In S. L. Greenblatt, R. W. Wilson, & A. A. Wilson (Eds.), *Social interaction in Chinese society* (pp. 195–208). New York: Praeger.

Witken, H. A., & Berry, J. W. (1975). Psychological differentiation in cross-cultural perspective. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *6*, 4–87.

Yu, A., & Yang, K. (1994). The nature of achievement motivation in collectivist societies. In U. Kim, H. C. Triandis, C. Kagitcibasi, S. Choi, & G. Yoon (Eds.), *Individualism and collectivism: Theory, method, and applications* (Vol. 18, pp. 239–250). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Acknowledgments

Note

1. The majority of research referred to in this article stems from ongoing studies being conducted at the Center for Research on Culture, Development and Education (National Science Foundation # BCS0218159; Principal Investigators: Catherine S. Tamis-LeMonda, Niobe Way, Hirokazu Yoshikawa, & Diane Hughes; Coinvestigator Ronit Kahana Kalman).