Enculturation

When the study of culture and psychology uncovers cultural differences, some natural questions are: How did these differences arise in the first place? What happens during development that makes people of different cultures different? What are the relative influences of parents, families, extended families, schools, and other social institutions? Are people born with inherent, biological predispositions to behavioral and cultural differences, or are such differences due entirely to environment and upbringing? What psychological differences are there in childhood and development when people are raised in different cultures? This chapter examines how the process of enculturation works. That is, how do people come to acquire their cultures? Research in this area has focused on parenting, peer groups, and institutions such as day care, the educational system, and religion, each of which will be discussed here. First, we'll define and compare two important terms in this area of study: enculturation and socialization.

Enculturation and Socialization

Childhood in any society is a period of considerable change and flux, subject to more cultural and environmental influences than any other in the life span. One aspect of childhood that is probably constant across cultures is that people emerge from this period with a wish to become happy, productive adults. Cultures differ, however, in exactly what they mean by "happy" and "productive."

Despite similarities in the overall goals of development, cultures exhibit a tremendous degree of variability in its content.

Each culture has some understanding of the adult competencies needed for adequate functioning (Ogbu, 1981; Kagitcibasi, 1996b), but these competencies differ by culture and environment. Children are socialized in ecologies that promote their specific competencies (Harrison, Wilson, Pine, Chan, & Buriel, 1990). For example, children who need a formal education to succeed in their culture are likely to be exposed to these values early in childhood; thus, they may receive books and instruction at a young age. Children in another culture may have to do spinning and weaving as part of their adult livelihood. These children are likely to receive early exposure to those crafts.

We are all truly integrated in our own societies and cultures. By the time we are adults, we have learned many cultural rules of behavior and have practiced those rules so much that they are second nature to us. Much of our behavior as adults is influenced by these learned patterns and rules, and we are so well practiced at them that we engage in these behaviors automatically and unconsciously without giving them much thought.

Still, at some time in our lives, we must have learned those rules and patterns of behavior. Culture, in its truest and broadest sense, involves so many different aspects of life that it is impossible to simply sit somewhere and read a book and learn about, let alone thoroughly master, a culture. Culture must be learned through a prolonged process, over a considerable period of time, with much practice. This learning involves all aspects of the learning processes that psychologists have identified over the years, including classical conditioning, operant conditioning, and social learning. In learning about culture, we make mistakes along the way, but people or groups or institutions are always around to help us, and in some cases force us, to correct those mistakes.

Socialization is the process by which we learn and internalize the rules and patterns of behavior that are affected by culture. This process, which occurs over a long period of time, involves learning and mastering societal and cultural norms, attitudes, values, and belief systems. The process of socialization starts early, probably from the very first day of life. Some people believe that the biological temperaments and predispositions we bring with us into the world at birth are actually part of the socialization process. Although this is an interesting and intriguing idea, most of what we know about the socialization process and the effects of socialization concern life after birth.

Closely related to the process of socialization is the process called **enculturation**. This is the process by which youngsters learn and adopt the ways and manners of their culture. There is very little difference, in fact, between the two terms. *Socialization* generally refers more to the actual process and mechanisms by which people learn the rules of society and culture—what is said to whom and in which contexts. *Enculturation* generally refers to the products of the socialization process—the subjective, underlying, psychological aspects of culture that become internalized through development. The similarities and differences between the terms *enculturation* and *socialization* are thus related to the similarities and differences between the terms *culture* and *society.*

Socialization (and enculturation) **agents** are the people, institutions, and organizations that exist to help ensure that socialization (or enculturation) occurs. The first and most important of these agents is parents. They help instill cultural mores and values in their children, reinforcing those mores and values when they are learned and practiced well and correcting mistakes in that learning.

Parents, however, are not the only socialization agents. Siblings, extended families, friends, and peers are important socialization and enculturation agents for many people. Organizations such as school, church, and social groups such as Boy or Girl Scouts also become important agents of these processes. In fact, as you learn more about the socialization process, you will find that culture is enforced and reinforced by so many people and institutions that it is no wonder we all emerge from the process as masters of our own culture.

In recent years, researchers have tried to examine the process of enculturation itself, looking at how people's interactions with the various socialization agents help to produce cultures, and how we develop cultural and ethnic identities. People are not passive recipients of cultural knowledge. Bronfenbrenner (1979) posits that human development is a dynamic, interactive process between individuals and their environments on several levels. These include the *microsystem* (the immediate surrounding such as the family, school, peer group, that children directly interact with), the *mesosystem* (the linkages between microsystems, such as between school and family), the *exosystem* (the context that indirectly affects children, such as parent's workplace), and the *macrosystem* (culture, religion, society). We are not simply socialized by our families, peer groups, and educational and religious institutions; we also contribute to our own development by affecting the people and contexts around us. In other words, we are also active producers of our own development. In the following sections, we will review research that includes several important contexts of enculturation: the family, peer groups, day care, and educational and religious institutions.

Culture, Child Rearing, Parenting, and Families

Parenting Goals and Beliefs

Clearly, our parents play an important, if not the most important, role in our development. Parenting has many dimensions: the goals and beliefs that parents hold for their children, the general style of parenting they exhibit, and the specific behaviors they use to realize their goals. The goals that parents have for their child's development are based on the caregiving context and the behaviors that each specific culture values (LeVine, 1977, 1997).

An example of how parenting goals may lead to variation in parenting behaviors across cultures is seen in the work of LeVine and his colleagues. These researchers (1996) have contrasted the parenting goals of Gusii mothers in Kenya with those of American mothers living in a Boston suburb. The Gusii

are an agricultural people. Children are expected to help their mothers in the household and fields at a young age. In this environment, one goal Gusii mothers emphasize is protection of their infants. During infancy, soothing behaviors are emphasized to attain this goal. In Boston, however, one goal that mothers emphasize for their infants' development is active engagement and social exchange. Thus, these mothers emphasize stimulation and conversation with their infants.

Parents' beliefs concerning their role as caregivers also influence their behaviors. Parents in Western countries (especially in the United States) believe that they play a very active, goal-directed role in the development of their children (Coll, 1990; Goodnow, 1988). In India, however, parents do not believe they "direct" their children's development, but rather focus on enjoying the parent–child relationship (Kakar, 1978). Similarly, Kagitcibasi (1996b) describes traditional Turkish mothers as believing that their children "grow up" rather than are "brought up." This range of parenting beliefs will be reflected in the type and extent of involvement in children's upbringing, such as whether or not the mother will transmit cultural knowledge by verbalization or will expect her child to learn primarily by observation and imitation.

Parenting Styles

In addition to parental goals and beliefs, parenting styles are another important dimension of caregiving. Baumrind (1971) has identified three major patterns of parenting. **Authoritarian parents** expect unquestioned obedience and view the child as needing to be controlled. They have also been described as being low on warmth and responsiveness toward their children. **Permissive parents** are warm and nurturing to their children; however, they allow their children to regulate their own lives and provide few firm guidelines. **Authoritative parents** are sensitive to the child's maturity and are firm, fair, and reasonable. They also express a high degree of warmth and affection to their children. This is the most common type of parenting.

Other researchers (Maccoby & Martin, 1983) have identified a fourth type of parenting style, called uninvolved. **Uninvolved parents** are often too absorbed in their own lives to respond appropriately to their children and may seem indifferent to them. They do not seem committed to caregiving, beyond the minimum effort required to meet the physical needs of their child. An extreme form of this type of parenting is neglect.

Which of these parenting styles is optimal for a child's development? In general, research on American children indicates that children seem to do well with the authoritative parenting style. Compared to children of other parenting styles, children of authoritative parents demonstrate more positive mood, self-reliance, self-confidence, and higher emotional and social skills (Baumrind, 1967, 1971; Denham, Renwick, & Holt, 1997). This style is seen as promoting psychologically healthy, competent, independent children who are cooperative and at ease in social situations. Children of authoritarian parents are found to be more anxious and withdrawn, lacking spontaneity and intellectual curiosity.

Children of permissive parents tend to be immature; they have difficulty controlling their impulses and acting independently. Children of uninvolved parents fare the worst, being noncompliant and demanding. The benefits of authoritative parenting also extend to the later years. Teenagers with authoritative parents tend to have higher self-esteem, show higher achievement in school, and be more socially and morally mature (Lamborn, Mounts, Steinberg, & Dornbusch, 1991; Luster & McAdoo, 1996; Steinberg, Lamborn, Darling, Mounts, & Dornbusch, 1994; Steinberg, Lamborn, Dornbusch, & Darling, 1992; Steinberg, Mounts, Lamborn, & Dornbusch, 1991).

Because Baumrind's parenting styles were based on observations from a European American sample, Steinberg and his colleagues (1992) argued that the benefits of authoritative parenting may differ depending on the particular ethnic group. For example, when they compared several thousand U.S. adolescents from four ethnic groups (European American, African American, Asian American, and Hispanic American), they found that authoritative parenting significantly predicted higher school achievement for European American, African American, and Hispanic American adolescents, but not for Asian Americans. They also found that European American adolescents were the most likely, and Asian American adolescents the least likely, to report that their parents were authoritative.

Some researchers have conducted cross-cultural studies using the classifications of parenting derived from Baumrind's original research. For instance, a study with second-graders in China examined how children's school and social adjustment compared in authoritative versus authoritarian families (Chen, Dong, & Zhou, 1997). These researchers found that authoritarian parenting was related negatively, and authoritative parenting positively, to children's school and social adjustment. The researchers state that their findings are inconsistent with Steinberg et al.'s (1992) argument that the effects of authoritative parenting are less pronounced for Asian children. Still, further cross-cultural studies examining these parenting styles are needed before concluding that the authoritative style is optimal.

Some researchers argue that the conceptualization of these parenting styles itself may not be appropriate for parents of other cultures. For instance, Chinese parents have been thought to be more authoritarian. However, the significance and meaning attached to this parenting style may originate from a set of cultural beliefs that may differ greatly from the European American cultural belief system (Chao, 1994; Gorman, 1998). Chao advocates that researchers identify parenting styles that are specific to the culture by first understanding the values of the culture. For example, based on Confucian philosophy, Chinese parenting may be distinguished by the concept of *chiao shun*, or "training," in child rearing. She argues that this training aspect, which is not considered in Baumrind's styles of parenting, may be more useful in predicting Chinese children's outcomes. Research in Pakistan has also found this notion of training to be an important component of parenting (Stewart et al., 1999).

The specific dimensions of parenting styles, such as warmth and control, may have different meanings in different cultures. For example, in certain

cultures such as the United States, control has a negative connotation, involving dominance and mistrust. In other cultures, however, "control" may connote something positive. Rohner and Pettengill (1985) report that Korean children's perception of parental control is positively associated with parental warmth and low neglect. Interestingly, Korean youth who undergo **acculturation** in a country that emphasizes different values (for example, independence versus interdependence) no longer view parental control positively. Kim (1992) reports that parental control is associated with less parental warmth and higher neglect in Korean Canadian and Korean American adolescents. These findings highlight the fact that perceptions of parenting are not static, but can be altered in a different social context.

Cross-Cultural Studies on Parenting Behaviors and Strategies

Over the past two or three decades, a considerable amount of cross-cultural research has examined differences in parenting behaviors across cultures and investigated the degree to which these parenting differences contribute to cultural differences on a variety of psychological constructs. Much of this research has centered on differences between American and Japanese parenting behaviors and strategies, mainly because Japanese culture seems to be very different from that of the United States yet is relatively accessible to American researchers. Studies of European cultures and Indian culture have been conducted as well, and also provide valuable information on this topic.

One interesting study investigated the strategies that Japanese and American mothers use to gain compliance from young children. In this study (Conroy, Hess, Azuma, & Kashiwagi, 1980), American and Japanese mothers and their firstborn children were interviewed about six hypothetical situations, each representing an action on the part of the child that the mother was likely to encounter in their daily interactions and that was likely to evoke an adult intervention. On the basis of the responses, the mothers' control strategies were then coded into categories such as appeals to authority, rules, feelings, consequences, or modeling. The Japanese mothers were more likely to engage in feeling-oriented appeals and demonstrated greater flexibility than the American mothers, who relied more extensively on their authority as mothers. The authors concluded that the findings reflected broad cultural differences in patterns of enculturation and socialization, with the focus in Japan on personal and interpersonal ties, in contrast to the American focus on direct instrumental processes with greater reliance on rewards and punishments.

Differences in child-rearing practices have also been found for other cultural groups. Kelley and Tseng (1992), for instance, compared European American and Chinese American mothers. They found that European American mothers scored higher on sensitivity, consistency, nonrestrictiveness, nurturance, and rule setting, whereas the Chinese American mothers scored higher on physical punishment and yelling. The authors related these results to the need for Chinese Americans to maintain their ties to their culture of origin. Also, Devereux,

Bronfenbrenner, and Suci (1962) reported that Germans engaged in more parenting behaviors related to affection, companionship, and direct punishment and control than did American parents.

Of the many different child-rearing behaviors people of different cultures engage in, one of the most representative of cultural differences concerns sleeping arrangements. One of the single greatest concerns of urban-dwelling Western parents, especially Americans, is getting their baby to sleep through the night, and to do so in a room separate from the parents'. Americans shun cosleeping arrangements, with the underlying assumption that sleeping alone will help develop independence. Some assistance is offered to the child by way of "security objects" such as a special blanket or toy.

Many other cultures do not share this value. In rural areas of Europe, for example, infants sleep with their mothers for most, if not all, of their first year. This is true for many other cultures in the world, and comfort objects or bedtime rituals are not common in other cultures. Mayan mothers allow their children to sleep with them for several years because of a commitment to forming a very close bond with their children. When a new baby comes along, older children move to a bed in the same room or share a bed with another member of the family (Morelli, Oppenheim, Rogoff, & Goldsmith, 1992). The Mayan mothers in this study expressed shock and concern that American mothers would leave their babies alone at night. In traditional Japanese families, the child sleeps with the mother, either with the father on the other side or in a separate room. Again, these practices foster behaviors and values that are consonant with the developmental goals of the culture.

Cross-cultural research has also shown considerable differences in gender role differentiation between parents. Best, House, Barnard, and Spicker (1994), for instance, examined gender differences in parent–child interactions in France, Germany, and Italy. They found that French and Italian fathers engaged in more play than mothers, but the opposite was true in Germany. Devereux, Bronfenbrenner, and Suci (1962) found that the relative prominence of the mother is much more marked in American families than in German ones; that is, their American sample showed greater gender role differentiation than did their German sample. Bronstein (1984) studied parent–child dyads in Mexican families and found that fathers were more playful and companionable than mothers, whereas mothers were more nurturant in providing for immediate physical needs.

As stated earlier, many of these cultural differences in parenting behaviors may be related to expectations that parents have about child rearing and culture. Joshi and MacLean (1997), for example, investigated maternal expectations of child development in India, Japan, and England. In this study, mothers were asked to indicate the age at which they expected a child to achieve each of 45 developmental tasks. Japanese mothers had higher expectations than British mothers in the domains of education, self-care, and environmental independence. Indian mothers had lower expectations than the Japanese and British in all domains except environmental independence. Another study (Luthar & Quinlan, 1993) found that images about parental style in India and

the United States were related to perceptions of care, ego resilience, and depressive tendencies.

Cross-cultural research has not only demonstrated cultural differences in parenting behaviors; it has documented numerous cultural similarities as well. Kelley and Tseng (1992), for example, found that both European American and Chinese American mothers place more emphasis on manners, school-related skills, and emotional adjustment when their children are 6–8 years of age than when they are 3–5. Solis-Camara and Fox (1995), using a 100-item rating scale called the Parent Behavior Checklist, found that Mexican and American mothers did not differ in their developmental expectations or in their parenting practices. Papps, Walker, Trimboli, and Trimboli (1995) found that mothers from Anglo-American, Greek, Lebanese, and Vietnamese ethnic groups all indicated that power assertion was their most frequently used disciplinary technique. And Keller, Chasiotis, and Runde (1992) reported cultural similarities among American, German, and Greek parents in the latencies of verbal and vocal behaviors toward children.

Thus, the available research evidence suggests both differences and similarities across cultures in parenting styles and child rearing. All of the studies have shown that parenting styles tend to be congruent with developmental goals dictated by culture; that is, cultural differences in specific values, beliefs, attitudes, and behaviors necessary for survival are associated with different developmental goals so that developing members of a society can carry on culture-relevant work related to survival. It seems that all people are similar in that their developmental processes are designed to meet cultural goals; people differ, however, in the specific nature of those goals.

Cultural differences in parenting reflect other social factors as well, such as the economic situation of the family, to which we now turn.

Diversity in Parenting as a Function of Economics

Parenting and child rearing often occur in very different economic conditions in different countries and cultures, and even within the United States. These diverse conditions produce socialization processes that vary widely from culture to culture. Child-rearing practices may differ not only because of difference in beliefs but also because of marked differences in standards of living. Applying U.S. standards to evaluate parenting in other countries and cultures can lead to harsh conclusions.

Consider the case of a slum-dwelling Brazilian mother who leaves her three children under the age of 5 locked in a bare, dark room for the day while she is out trying to meet their basic needs for food and clothing. We cannot judge the practices of others by the standards of the affluent and well-fed.

One recent study highlighted these issues. In this study, the reasons why mothers work and the number of hours they work were examined for mothers of firstborn children in the United States and Argentina (Pascual, Haynes,

Galperin, & Bornstein, 1995). In both countries, both length of marriage and whether a woman worked during pregnancy predicted whether she worked after giving birth. In the United States, however, better-educated women with higher-status occupations worked longer hours, whereas in Argentina, better-educated women with higher-status occupations worked shorter hours. Thus, different cultural and economic conditions mediated the women's decisions to work in these two countries.

It is common folklore that picking up a baby and bringing it to the shoulder reduces bouts of crying and that babies who are ignored and allowed to cry for fear of spoiling them actually cry more. However, in remote rural river regions of China, few-week-old infants are left for long periods of time while their mothers work in the fields. These babies are placed in large sacks of sand that support them upright and act as an absorbent diaper. These babies quickly cease crying because they learn early that it will not bring about any response at all.

If a society has a high rate of infant mortality, parenting efforts may concentrate on meeting basic physical needs. Parents may have little choice but to disregard other developmental demands. Sometimes the response to harsh and stressful conditions is parenting behavior that we might consider positive. In the Sudan, for example, the mother traditionally spends the first 40 days after delivery entirely with her baby. She rests while her relatives tend to her, and she focuses all her energy on her baby (Cederblad, 1988).

LeVine (1977) has theorized that the caregiving environment reflects a set of goals that are ordered in importance. First is physical health and survival. Next is the promotion of behaviors that will lead to self-sufficiency. Last are behaviors that promote other cultural values, such as morality and prestige.

Many families in the United States are fortunate in that they can turn their attention to meeting the second two goals. In many countries, the primary goal of survival is all-important and often overrides the other goals in the amount of parental effort exerted. Indeed, this is true in many areas of the United States as well.

Siblings

Siblings play an important role in the socialization of children (Dunn, 1988). Zukow-Goldring (1995) states that many of the behaviors and beliefs of the social group are transferred through siblings. For example, among the Kwara'ae infants in the Solomon Islands, siblings are highly involved as caregivers. In this culture, the responsibilities involved in caregiving are viewed as a training ground for siblings to become mutually dependent on one another in adulthood. For example, one sibling may be designated to go to school while the others combine their resources to support that sibling. In turn, this sibling will support the family financially once he has finishing his schooling and found a job (Watson-Gegeo, 1992). In agricultural societies especially, where there are usually a greater number of children in each family, siblings are often responsible for child care and thus influence one another in significant ways.

Extended Families

In many non–European American cultures, extended families are prevalent. In the United States in 1996, for example, 23% of African American, 24% of Asian and Pacific Islander, 24% of American Indian and Alaskan Native, and 22% of Hispanic children lived in extended families, compared with only 12% of European American children (Fields, 2001).

Extended families are a vital and important feature of child rearing, even when resources are not limited. Many cultures view extended-family child rearing as an integral and important part of their cultures. The extended family can provide a buffer to stresses of everyday living. It is also an important means of transmitting cultural heritage from generation to generation.

Extended families can support and facilitate child rearing in ways that are completely different from the European American nuclear family. Research on parenting style (authoritarian, permissive, authoritative, or neglectful) tends to assume a nuclear family structure. In the United States, ethnic minority families have been characterized as extended and generally more conservative than European American families. For example, Japanese American families have strict age and sex roles, and emphasize children's obedience to authority figures (Trankina, 1983; Yamamoto & Kubota, 1983). Arab American families are also characterized by an extended family system, where loyalty, emotional support, and financial assistance are emphasized (Nydell, 1998). Of course, not all ethnic minority families are extended, and caregiving between nuclear and extended families may differ. For instance, African American extended families tend to emphasize cooperation and moral and religious values more than African American nuclear families do (Tolson & Wilson, 1990).

In an extended family situation, even though mothers are still seen as the primary caregiver, children experience frequent interaction with fathers, grandparents, godparents, siblings, and cousins. Hispanic and Filipino families see godparents as important models for children, and as sources of support for the parents. Sharing households with relatives, characteristic of extended families, is seen as a good way of maximizing the family's resources for successful child rearing.

One need not look outside the United States to recognize the importance of extended families. One major difference, however, is that participation in child rearing via extended families in the United States is often seen as a consequence of poor economics rather than a desirable state of affairs. Limited resources are a reality, with 16.3% of children in the United States living in poverty in 2001 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2002). Many are born to single mothers, and here the extended family plays an important role in the child-rearing process. Grandmothers are more actively involved with their grandchildren when they live with their single adult daughters. These children experience a greater variety of principal caregivers and have different social interactions than their middle-class European American counterparts. Compounding this picture is the reality that ethnicity also confounds social class.

Teenage parenting also forces us to think differently about traditional notions of parenting. The presence of the maternal grandmother in these families

has been found to cancel out some of the negative results associated with teen mothering (Garcia Coll, 1990). The grandmother often serves as a valuable source of information about child development. She also tends to be more responsive and less punitive with the child than the teen mother is. The grandmother in these three-generation households plays a very important role as teacher and role model to her daughter and can provide favorable, positive social interaction for her grandchild.

Extended families differ in their composition from one culture to another but have in common a sharing of resources, emotional support, and caregiving. The experiences of a child growing up in these situations can be quite different from those of a child in a European American nuclear family. In addition, we need to be aware that the traditional two-parent household is changing for many European Americans as well. Future studies will undoubtedly change the way we view parenting in this culture as well.

Culture and Peers

One's peer group is another critical context for enculturation. How much do your peers influence your development? It may depend on how rapidly your culture is changing. Margaret Mead (1928/1978) described three types of cultures with differing levels of peer influence on the socialization of its young people. In **postfigurative cultures,** where cultural change is slow, socialization occurs primarily by elders transferring their knowledge to their children. In this case, elders hold the knowledge necessary for becoming a successful and competent adult. In **cofigurative cultures,** where cultural change occurs more rapidly, adults continue to socialize their children, but peers play a greater role in socializing each other. Young people may have to turn to one another for advice and information. In **prefigurative cultures,** the culture is changing so rapidly that young people may be the ones to teach adults. The knowledge that adults hold may not be sufficient for the next generation, and adults may need to look to younger people to negotiate society.

Exposure to Peer Groups

Researchers have studied how cultures vary in the exposure that children have to their peer groups. In industrialized countries, children spend a significant amount of time with same-aged peers. Fuligni and Stevenson's (1995) comparison of the number of hours that teenagers spend with one another outside of school reveals that American teenagers spend more hours (18 hours) with their peers compared to Japanese (12) and Taiwanese (8). The nature and strength of peers as socializing agents in these highly industrialized cultures will differ from other cultures. For instance, children growing up in solitary farm settlements will have limited options to interact with a wide range of potential playmates. Or, children growing up in a hunting/gathering society may be socialized by their peers within the context of multi-age groups instead of the same-age

groups that are characteristic of countries such as the United States, where age-stratified schooling is the norm (Krappmann, 1996). Thus, depending on the specific culture, the extent to which children interact with their peers may or may not be significant in terms of enculturation.

Friendships

The unique relationship called friendship is found in virtually all cultures (Krappmann, 1996), and these friendships are important vehicles for enculturation. Within the context of friendships, children learn cultural ways of negotiation, reciprocity, cooperation, and interpersonal sensitivity (Youniss & Smollar, 1989). Davis and Davis (1989) studied adolescent friendships in Zawiya, Morocco, and found that one of the main purposes of friendships in this culture is to learn about establishing one's "trustworthiness" in society—for instance, by building a good reputation. Toward this end, Moroccan teenagers emphasized that sharing, refraining from gossip, taking care of their reputation, and not being a bad influence on their friends were important concerns in their friendships. Davis and Davis write that "the core goal of Zawiya socialization is to produce a person worthy of trust and able to command respect, one who respects propriety, displays mature judgment, and stands by one's word. Interactions with friends help develop and hone this sense of how one comes across to people" (p. 89). This is a good illustration of how friendships are instrumental in helping children achieve culturally appropriate behaviors and values.

Culture and Day Care

Variations in Day Care

The differences we see across cultures in day care are a window into different cultural attitudes about children, parenting roles, and social organization. Variations in cultural attitudes concerning how children should be socialized affect the quality and availability of day care around the world. For instance, in the United States, there is a controversy regarding whether child care should be a public responsibility or a private, individual concern (Lamb & Sternberg, 1992). Perhaps because of this tension, there is no national day-care policy, and day-care facilities and practices vary greatly. Unfortunately, the quality of many day-care facilities in the United States appears inadequate. Many caregivers do not receive specialized training for teaching young children, and a majority of private day-care homes are unlicensed and therefore not subject to close monitoring to ensure that children are receiving high-quality care (Howes, Whitebrook, & Phillips, 1992; Kontos, Howes, Shinn, & Galinsky, 1995). In contrast, parents in other countries, such as Israel, take for granted that all citizens should share the responsibility of rearing and educating young children. Rosenthal (1992) points out that most Israeli parents believe it is appropriate and important for

young children to interact in a group setting with their peers and not be kept at home. Cultural attitudes such as this contribute to the quality and availability of day care.

Day Care and Child Development

Whether day care is beneficial or detrimental to a child's development has been a hotly debated topic. The answer seems to lie in the quality of the day care. Studies in the United States demonstrate that low-quality day care can be detrimental to a child's social and intellectual development (Haskins, 1989; Howes, 1990). Conversely, high-quality day care can enhance children's development, especially for those from underprivileged, low-SES families (Phillips, Voran, Kisker, Howes, & Whitebrook, 1994). Studies of young children in Sweden, where day care is of uniformly high quality, show that those in day care seem to have slightly more advanced cognitive and social development compared to those cared for at home (Hwang & Broberg, 1992). Day care in all cultures can be an effective context in which children's development can be enriched, better preparing them to fill their societies' expected roles (Lamb & Sternberg, 1992).

Culture and Education

The single most important formalized mechanism of instruction in many societies and cultures today is the educational system. Most of us think of a country's educational system solely as an institution that teaches thinking skills and knowledge. But a society's educational system is probably the most important institution socializing its children and teaching and reinforcing its cultural values. Much of the cross-national and cross-cultural research in this area has focused on cross-national differences in math achievement.

Cross-National Differences in Math Achievement

Mathematics learning occupies a special place in our understanding of culture, socialization, and the educational system. Of course, learning math skills is crucial to the ultimate development of science in any society, which is probably why it has received so much research attention, as well as funding from government and private sources.

Still, math and culture have a very special relationship because, as Stigler and Baranes (1988) put it, math skills "are not logically constructed on the basis of abstract cognitive structures, but rather are forged out of a combination of previously acquired (or inherited) knowledge and skills, and new cultural input" (p. 258). Culture is not only a stimulator of math but is itself represented in math, and how a society teaches and learns it.

Cross-national research on math learning in schools has traditionally compared the math abilities of students around the world. An early study conducted by the International Association for the Evaluation of Education Achievement (IEA) (Husen, 1967), for example, measured math achievement scores in 12 different countries at the eighth and twelfth grades. The overall performance of the American eighth-graders was ranked 11th, and their mean scores were below the international mean in every area of math assessed. The performance of the American twelfth-graders was even worse. A later IEA study comparing 17 countries found that the performance of American students relative to the rest of the world had declined even further. According to Geary (1996), the top 5% of American elite math students (those enrolled in college-prep math courses) had average scores in relation to the international standard in algebra and calculus, and only slightly above average scores in geometry. American students who score at the 95th percentile in the United States would score at the 30th percentile in Japan and the 50th percentile in England.

These findings have been corroborated by other research involving primary school children (for example, Stevenson, Chen, & Lee, 1993). Even in first grade, the superiority of the Japanese and Chinese in math performance is already striking, reaching "dynamic" proportions by fifth grade (Stevenson, Lee, & Stigler, 1986; Stigler & Baranes, 1988, p. 291). The relatively poor performance of American children has also been documented in comparisons with Korean children (Song & Ginsburg, 1987). Moreover, the differences were observed not only in computational tests but in all math tests produced and administered by the researchers.

Of course, such findings have been alarming to educators at all levels in the United States for many years. The relatively poor performance of American youth in these skills is not only an important social concern; it is also of major concern for the future health of the U.S. economy, as more and more potentially unskilled or underskilled employees enter the workforce (Geary, 1996). Math abilities—and, more important, the logical reasoning skills underlying math and the mental discipline associated with math—are essential in many walks of life.

In searching for the possible causes of these differences, Geary (1996) has suggested a distinction between primary and secondary math abilities. Primary math abilities refer to natural abilities that are shaped by evolutionary processes that all people presumably share (for example, language, counting). Secondary abilities refer to unnatural abilities that are based in large part on primary systems. Whereas the motivation to acquire primary abilities is likely to be inherent, the motivation to acquire secondary abilities may be more strongly influenced by culture.

Are differences in math abilities biologically caused? If biological factors were responsible for cross-national differences in math ability, then cross-national differences in primary math abilities should exist. But, although the research is not definitive, indirect evidence indicates no cross-national differences in primary math abilities. Those cross-national differences that have been found appear to be related to secondary, not primary, math achievements

(Geary, 1996). Some people may suggest that research presented in the previous chapter on possible racial differences in IQ or head (brain) size may also be related to differences in math achievement and thus imply biological causes for those differences. Those IQ differences, however, tend to be small, and not robust enough to account for the rather large differences in math abilities. Moreover, comparisons of mean IQ scores of American, Japanese, and Chinese children (for example, Stevenson et al., 1985) have found no differences; thus, IQ cannot possibly account for cross-national differences among these children. As noted throughout this book, moreover, interpretation of biological differences based on classifications of race are always problematic.

Social and Cultural Factors That Influence Math Achievement

That cross-national differences in math achievement are related to secondary rather than primary math abilities implies that social and cultural factors play a major role in producing those differences. A number of possible contributing factors have been examined in the literature, including differences in language, school systems, parental and familial values, teaching styles and teacher–student relationships, and attitudes and appraisals of students. Work in each of these areas supports the contribution of each factor to cross-national differences in math achievement, and collectively constitutes a wealth of evidence concerning the relationship between culture and education.

Language.   Research by Stigler, Lee, and Stevenson (1986) has shown that cross-national differences among Chinese, Japanese, and American children in counting and memory exercises may be largely a function of differences in the Chinese, Japanese, and English languages related to counting and numbers. The Japanese language, for example, has unique verbal labels only for the numbers 1 through 10. Number 11 is then "ten-one," 12 is "ten-two," 20 is "two-ten," 21 is "two-ten-one," and so forth. English, however, has unique labels for numbers 1 through 19 as well as all the decade numbers (20, 30, 40, and so forth). Research has shown that East Asian students make fewer errors than Americans in counting, and understand some basic math concepts related to counting and numbers better (Miura, Okamoto, Kim, Steere, & Fayol, 1993). These differences may account for some, but not all, of the cross-national differences in math abilities.

School systems.   Research has shown that the educational system in which children take part plays an important role in producing cross-national differences in math abilities, while at the same time imparting cultural values. First of all, the content of what is taught in the schools reflects a priori choices by that culture or society regarding what it believes is important to learn. Different cultures believe different topics to be important for later success in that society. By teaching a certain type of content, the educational system reinforces a particular view of cognition and intelligence.

Another important factor to consider is the environmental setting in which education occurs. Many industrialized societies have a formal educational system, with identifiable areas and structures (schools) and identifiable education agents (teachers) to "do" education. In other cultures, formalized education may take place in small groups led by elders of the community. In yet other cultures, formalized education may be a family task (for example, the mother tutoring her own children in cognitive and other skills necessary for members of their community). Regardless of the environmental setting, the vehicle by which education occurs reinforces certain types of cultural values in its recipients.

The organization, planning, and implementation of lesson plans are other important cultural socializers. Some cultures encourage a didactic model of teaching, in which an expert teacher simply gives information to students, who are expected to listen and learn. Other cultures view teachers as leaders through a lesson plan, providing the overall structure and framework by which students discover principles and concepts. Some cultures view imparting of praise as an important process. Other cultures focus on mistakes made by students in the learning process. Some cultures have special classes and mechanisms to deal with many different types of students—for example, students with learning disabilities, physical handicaps, and special gifts or talents. Other cultures tend to downplay such differences among their students, treating them all as equals.

Once in school, children spend the majority of their waking hours away from their parents. The socialization process that began in the primary relationship with the parents continues with peers in play situations and in school. School institutionalizes cultural values and attitudes and is a significant contributor not only to the intellectual development of the child but, just as important, to the child's social and emotional development.

To highlight the role of the educational system as an enculturation agent, one need only recognize that not all cultures of the world rely solely on an institutionalized school setting to teach math. For example, important math skills are taught to Micronesian islanders in the Puluwat culture through navigation, to coastal Ghanaians by marketing fish, and even to bookies in Brazil (Acioly & Schliemann, 1986; Gladwin, 1970; Gladwin & Gladwin, 1971). Important math skills are imparted through nonschool activities not only in more "exotic" cultures, but also through activities such as dieting and athletic training in the United States (Stigler & Baranes, 1988).

Regardless of the way education occurs, the choices a society and culture make concerning its structure, organization, planning, and implementation all encourage and reinforce a certain view of culture. We are not always cognizant of our own cultural view because we are in the middle of it. To see our own biases and choices, we need to observe education in other cultures and compare what is done elsewhere to what we do. Through such comparisons, the differences and the similarities often become quite clear.

Parental and familial values.   Research has shown that a number of important differences in cultural values and belief systems among Americans, Japanese, and Chinese have an impact on education. For example, Japanese and

Chinese parents and teachers are more likely to consider all children as equal, with no differences between them. American parents and teachers are more likely to recognize differences and find reasons to treat their children as special. This difference is probably rooted in a cultural tension between individualism and collectivism among the three cultures.

American parents and teachers are more likely to consider innate ability more important than effort; for the Japanese and Chinese, however, effort is far more important than ability. This difference is also rooted in cultural differences among the three countries and has enormous implications for education.

American parents tend to be more easily satisfied at lower levels of competence than either the Japanese or the Chinese. Also, when problems arise, Americans are more likely to attribute the cause of the problem to something they cannot do anything about (such as ability). These cultural differences in attribution of causality are directly related to cultural differences in self-construals, discussed in Chapter 11.

Believing that ability is more important than effort has yet another side to it—a belief that each child is limited in his or her abilities. Once this belief becomes a cultural institution, it dictates how the educational system should respond. The resulting emphasis in the case of the American system is to seek unique, innate differences among the students, to generate separate special classes for these unique groups of students, and generally to individualize the process of education. As a result, more time is spent on individualized instruction and less on whole-group instruction.

Research has documented other interesting effects of parental and familial values related to achievement and academic success. Chao (1996), for example, found that Chinese mothers of preschoolers conveyed a high value on education, the high investment and sacrifice they themselves need to make in order for their children to succeed, their desire for direct intervention approaches to their children's schooling, and a belief that they play a major role in their children's success. American mothers of preschoolers in her study, however, conveyed a negation of the importance of academic skills, a desire for a less directive approach in instruction, and concern for building their children's self-esteem. Kush (1996) found that although European Americans and Mexican Americans differed in level of academic achievement, these differences disappeared when parental education was statistically controlled in the analysis.

Finally, Yao (1985) compared family characteristics of European American and Asian American high achievers. This study found that the family life of the European Americans was less structured and provided fewer formal educational experiences for children on weekends and after school. Asian families, in contrast, structured their children's lives more and actively sought more after-school and extracurricular programs to complement school learning. These findings suggest the importance of parental education in predicting and contributing toward cultural differences in academic achievement.

Attitudes and appraisals of students.   A number of studies have examined cultural differences between Asian or Asian American children and European

Americans. Pang (1991), for example, studied the relationships among test anxiety, self-concept, and student perceptions of parental support in Asian American and European American middle school students. This study found that Asian American students exhibited a stronger desire to please parents, greater parental pressure, but also higher levels of parental support, than did the European American students. Yan and Gaier (1994) looked at causal attributions for college success and failure in Asian and American college undergraduate and graduate students; they found that American students attributed academic achievement more often to ability than did Asian subjects. American students also believed that effort was more important for success than lack of effort was for failure, whereas Asian students considered effort equally important for success or failure. These results are consonant with similar tendencies in parental attitudes described earlier, and with attributional biases discussed elsewhere in this book. Similar findings were obtained with fourth-graders in Japan, China, and the United States (Tuss, Zimmer, & Ho, 1995).

Cross-national differences have been found in other samples as well. Little, Oettingen, Stetsenko, and Baltes (1995), for example, compared American, German, and Russian beliefs about school performance. They found that American children had the highest levels of personal agency and control expectancy, but the lowest belief–performance correlations. That is, Americans believed they had the most control over their academic outcomes, but this degree of perceived control was unrelated to their actual performance. Birenbaum and Kraemer (1995) also demonstrated differences in causal attributions in relation to academic success and failure in Arab and Jewish high school students.

Together, these findings suggest that students around the world approach their academic work with quite different worldviews, attitudes, and attributional styles; that these differences are related to parental differences found in other research; that they may account for cross-national differences in academic achievement; and that they are intimately related to culture.

Teaching styles and teacher–student relationships.   Stigler and his colleagues have examined classrooms to find possible roots of the cross-national differences in math achievement reported earlier (for example, Stigler & Perry, 1988). Several major differences in the use of classroom time appear to underlie math performance differences. The Japanese and Chinese spend more days per year in school, more hours per day in school, a greater proportion of time in school devoted to purely academic subjects, and a greater proportion of time devoted to math. In addition, Japanese and Chinese teachers spend a greater proportion of time working with the whole class than do American teachers. This difference is even more dramatic because average class size is smaller in the United States than in Japan or China. As a result, American students spend less time working under the supervision and guidance of a teacher.

During class, it was observed, American teachers tend to use praise to reward correct responses. Teachers in Japan, however, tend to focus on incorrect

answers, using them as examples to lead into discussion of the computational process and math concepts. Teachers in Taiwan tend to use a process more congruent with the Japanese approach. These teaching differences speak to the cultural emphasis in the United States on rewarding uniqueness and individualism and the emphasis in Japan and China on finding ways to engage in group process and sharing responsibility for mistakes with members of the group. Praise, while nice, often precludes such discussion.

Differences exist in other cultures as well. McCargar (1993), for example, documented differences among 10 cultural groups of students on 8 scales of student role expectations and 11 scales of teacher role expectations. Taken together, these studies highlight important differences that are present every day in the classroom in terms of teaching style, expectations, and actual behaviors that may account for cross-national differences in academic achievement.

Summary.   We know that cross-national differences in academic achievement are not necessarily accounted for by biological differences between people of different cultures. And although differences in languages, especially related to counting systems, may be a factor, they cannot account for the size of the differences. Instead, research indicates that cross-national differences in academic achievement are the result of many social and cultural factors, some of which are institutionalized in educational systems, others found in parents and parental values, others in children's cognitive and attributional styles, and yet others in specific classroom practices. No research suggests that any single factor can fully account for cross-national differences in achievement; instead, it is a combination of these and other factors that leads to differences.

Nor are cross-national differences in academic performance, and the other cross-cultural differences that underlie them, solely products of culture. The performance of students of any culture, in any subject area, is the result of a complex interplay of economics, geography, resources, cultural values and beliefs, abilities, experiences, language, and family dynamics.

Research on differences in academic performance also highlights the role of the educational system as an important enculturation agent in any society. That is, not only do all of the differences discussed here contribute to cross-national differences in academic achievement; they also contribute to differences in culture itself. Parents' and children's attitudes, educational practices and curricula, teacher behaviors, and all other associated factors are important transmitters of culture. They impart important cultural knowledge to the students as members of a culture or society, and thus play a major role in the socialization and enculturation of the child members of many societies of the world. Differences in these institutions not only reflect but reinforce cultural differences in values, beliefs, attitudes, norms, and behaviors and help transmit this important cultural information from one generation to the next. The school-age period of life is indeed a critical time in any culture, when culture is strongly reinforced in children by society as a whole. This process is pervasive.

Religion

Religious institutions are another important vehicle of enculturation. In the United States, for most of the 20th century, psychologists neglected the role of religion in the development of individuals (Pargament & Maton, 2000). Religion, however, is an "ever present and extremely important aspect of the historical, cultural, social and psychological realities that humans confront in their daily lives" (Hood, Spilka, Hunsberger, & Gorsuch, 1996, p. 2). Religious institutions socialize children by setting rules for behavior, by preparing children for the roles they will play as men and women, and by helping individuals to create an identity (Arnett, 2001; Pargament & Maton, 2000). Furthermore, the religious community offers support to the developing child, a sense of belonging, and an affirmation of worthiness (Garcia Coll, Meyer, & Brillon, 1995). Whether it is Islam, Christianity, Judaism, Buddhism, or another religious system, religion is a part of the human experience that can provide individuals with guidance, structure, and appropriate ways of behaving and thinking in many aspects of life.

The importance and pervasiveness of religion, however, vary across cultures. Goossens (1994) reports that only 30% of Belgian adolescents believe in God, and only 10% regularly attend religious services. In contrast, 95% of American adolescents believe in God, and 32% attend weekly religious services (Gallup & Bezilla, 1992; Wallace & Williams, 1997). In Poland, 92% of youth are members of the Catholic church, and about 71% attend church regularly (Wlodarek, 1994). And in Korea, more than half of the adolescents report participating in some religion, ranging from Christianity to Buddhism to Catholicism (Choe, 1994).

Developmentally, religious ceremonies are an important part of child care and rites of passage in many cultures around the world. For instance, infants in India undergo a hair-shaving ceremony when they are born, and undergo a prayer and holy water ritual when they are named (Dosanjh & Ghuman, 1996). Some religious ceremonies mark the passage from childhood to adulthood, such as in Jewish culture, with the Bar (Bas) Mitzvah. In Islam, the beginning of adolescence is marked by participation in fasting during the holy month of Ramadan.

Dosanjh and Ghuman's (1997) study of Punjabi families living in England illustrates how parents use religion and religious practices in their daily lives to transmit the values and language of their culture to their children. A majority of the sample (87.5%) reported that religious education was "important" or "very important." They also reported discussing religion with their children, and actively encouraged them to attend religious services and engage in prayers at home. The authors note that for a majority of Punjabi families, religion plays a critical role in the development and maintenance of their personal identities.

Religious beliefs have been linked to the study of cognitive development in Jewish, Catholic, and Protestant children (Elkind, 1978); moral development in Africa (Okonkwo, 1997); attitudes toward sexuality in older adolescents in the United States (Fehring, Cheever, German, & Philpot, 1998); and attitudes to-

ward suicide for Hindus and Muslims living in England (Kamal & Lowenthal, 2002). However, much still needs to be done to identify exactly what aspects of religion relate to what aspects of human development.

A major challenge for future cross-cultural researchers is to better understand the complex interplay between culture and religion and how they influence family beliefs and values, child-rearing goals and practices, and ultimately, the developing individual. In a world where religion is increasingly becoming a visible target of cross-cultural conflicts and misunderstandings, it is of utmost importance for us to continue exploring how religion defines and shapes an individual's personal experiences, belief systems, and identity.

Summary

The information presented so far speaks to just a few of the many ways in which enculturation occurs around the world. Differences in parenting styles and child rearing provide learning platforms for children that allow them to achieve developmental goals fostered by their particular cultures. Each culture's way of raising children—through parenting, sleeping arrangements, and other concrete mechanisms—represents that culture's way of ensuring that its values and norms are transmitted to those children. In all cultures, these practices are ritualized so that this transmission of information can occur generation after generation. Learning cultural values is as much a part of the process of socialization as it is an outcome of socialization.

What does contemporary cross-cultural research say about how all this occurs? According to Bornstein (1989), some early cross-cultural work in development (for example, Caudill & Frost, 1974; Caudill & Weinstein, 1969) focused primarily on the role of culture in "driving" parenting behaviors that resulted in changes in the infant and young child. This model suggests that culture unidirectionally provides the structure and environment for parents, particularly mothers, to affect their children in culturally appropriate ways: culture → mother → infant.

Others (for example, Shand & Kosawa, 1985) have focused on biology, proposing a developmental model that starts with the effects of genes, biology, and heredity on infant temperament, which then affects the mother's behaviors, which in turn produce cultural differences: genes → infant → mother → culture.

The available cross-cultural research provides support for both models of understanding. The work on parenting styles, for instance, supports the first model, while the work on temperament and attachment supports the second. Most recent work in this area (for example, Holloway & Minami, 1996) suggests a rapprochement between the two, conceptualizing both parents and children as interactive partners in the joint creation of cultural meanings. This view suggests that children's active processing of information results in the reproduction of culture, and the production of new elements of culture. The interaction of

language between parent and child provides the platform on which divergent points of view construct new realities. These recent theories also attempt to discover cultural meanings held in common between parents and children, rather than assuming a common understanding "imposed" by an outside culture.

Additionally, the assumption in most of the literature on child rearing that the effect of caregiving flows from the caregiver to the child has been challenged (for example, Bell, 1968, Scarr, 1993). Is it really the case that authoritative parents produce more competent children, or is it that children who are easygoing, cooperative, and obedient elicit authoritative parenting? Characteristics of the child, such as temperament (discussed in detail in the next chapter), play an important role in the parenting the child receives. For instance, Ge et al. (1996) examined how an adolescent characterized by a difficult temperamental style might elicit negative parenting behaviors, leading to parent–adolescent conflict and subsequently to adolescent problem behavior. Ge et al. argue that the characteristics of both the adolescent and the parent must be considered in order to more fully understand how children and adolescents contribute to their own development in relation to their parents. Current theories on parenting emphasize this dynamic interaction between the child and his or her parent (Collins, Maccoby, Steinberg, Hetherington, & Bornstein, 2000). Whoever the caregiver may be—whether mother, father, sibling, or grandparent—there is a mutual exchange between the child and the caretaker(s) that drives a child's development (Tronick, 1989).

Future research in this area will hopefully bridge the gaps among all of these various components, assessing the interplay of temperament, attachment, parenting styles, and psychological culture in the milieu. Ideally, longitudinal studies will enable researchers to examine the interactions among these various components of the enculturation process in the same individuals across time.

Conclusion

This chapter has examined a multitude of factors that may influence how people become enculturated—parenting styles, child-rearing practices, peer groups, day care, the educational system, and religious institutions. Just how is it that all these processes are assembled in people's minds as enculturation occurs? Research that directly addresses this question is sorely lacking. Much of what we do know comes from theoretical and conceptual research in anthropology and cross-cultural psychology that attempts to aggregate the various pieces of evidence into a coherent whole.

Tomasello (1993), for example, has suggested that cultural learning manifests itself in three different ways in human development: imitation, instruction, and collaboration. These processes, in turn, are supposedly related to the development of social and cognitive concepts and processes that are necessary for enculturation to occur. Imitation relies on a concept of intentional agent and requires perspective taking. Instructional learning requires mental agents and

involves interactive and coordinated perspective taking. Collaborative learning relies on the ability to reflect and involves integrated perspective taking.

Correlations between these aspects of social cognition and cultural learning in normal and autistic children, and in wild and enculturated chimpanzees, offer further support for these mechanisms. (The importance of imitation in cultural learning has drawn some criticism, however; see Heyes, 1993.) Some authors have suggested that culture can best be characterized as the conglomeration of situated context-related learning. Jacobsen (1996), for instance, suggests that contexts are inseparable from cognitive processes. As culture-appropriate learning occurs in multiple and different contexts, such culture-specific learning is joined together across contexts into a cohesive whole, on the level of either understanding, appreciation, or behavior. Likewise, Shore (1991) defines cultural cognition as the product of an organization of cultural texts and models, and the subjective processes of meaning construction through which we become aware of cultural symbols through subjective experience. Different cognitive processes and sensory experiences help to link schemas across contexts and provide cultural meaning that is constructed through that experience.

Super and Harkness (1986, 1994) suggest that enculturation occurs within what they term a developmental niche. This niche forms the structural and subjective framework within which children come to learn the cultural values and mores important to their society. According to these authors, this niche includes three major components: the physical and social setting, the customs of child care and child rearing, and the psychology of the caregivers. The developing child is influenced by all three components, or more precisely by their interaction, all of which occurs within a larger environmental and human ecology. In their niche, developing children are able to receive the influences of the various socialization agents and institutions around them, ensuring their enculturation, while at the same time the child also brings his or her temperamental disposition to the interaction.

The issue of enculturation is related to that of ethnic identity development, a topic that has received considerable attention in recent years. The concept of identity differs from that of enculturation in that identity typically refers to an awareness of one's culture or ethnicity. Certainly, people can become enculturated without having conscious awareness of that cultural learning. In fact, research has tended to show that the development of ethnic identity occurs in stages. In studying ethnic identity development in Mexican Americans, for example, Bernal (1993) has found that very young children (around 4 years of age) tend to have very limited knowledge of their ethnic identity. As they get older, however, their understanding of their heritage grows broader and more complex. Phinney's program of research has shown that ethnic identity continues to develop through adolescence and young adulthood, and is positively related to self-esteem (Phinney & Chavira, 1992; Phinney & Rosenthal, 1992; Phinney, Horenczyk, & Liebkind, 2001).

Thus, available studies suggest that culture may be learned through situated cognitive schemas and structures related to specific contexts, and that cultural