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ABSTRACT

Psychological theories and research often assume nations are culturally homogeneous and stable. But global demographic, political, and economic changes and massive immigration have sparked new scholarly and policy interest in cultural diversity and change within nations. This chapter reviews interdisciplinary advances linking culture and psychological development. These challenge and strengthen the external and ecological validity of psychological theories and their applications. Seven theoretical perspectives are reviewed: individualism-collectivism; ecological systems; cultural-ecological; social identity; ecocultural and sociocultural; structure-agency; and multiple worlds. Reviews of each theory summarize key constructs and evidence, recent advances, links between universal and community-specific research and applications, and strengths and limitations. The chapter traces complementarities across theories for the case of personal and social identity. It concludes by discussing implications for science and policy. By viewing theories as distinct yet complementary, researchers and policy makers can forge interdisciplinary, international, and intergenerational collaborations on behalf of the culturally diverse communities of which we are a part.
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INTRODUCTION

The concept of culture has come to the forefront of social science and social policy to address issues of human diversity in psychological processes and performance. Debates about the role of culture in psychological processes have sparked a movement towards research that is directly applicable to social problems. A key challenge lies in how to reconcile community-specific applications with broader theories that guide research.

This is a timely debate for reasons both within and outside the field of psychology. In anthropology, definitions of culture have long been disputed. Although themes of shared values, beliefs, and behaviors that are transmitted through generations are common, some scholars emphasize cognitive orientations to ideas, beliefs, and knowledge; others focus on materialist orientations to technological and environmental features; and others concentrate on behavioral orientations or on moral themes. Anthropologists also increasingly probe the disputed aspects of culture between ethnic groups or nation-states rather than values held in common.

Demographers have since ancient times mapped variation within nation-states by asking adults to identify the country of birth, race, ethnicity, language, income, gender, age, education, and occupation of each member of their household. These responses, analyzed according to political and geographical units such as census tracts, cities, states, or provinces, form the basis for policy decisions regarding the allocation of resources; practical decisions about what is done in daily life in families, schools, and workplaces; and scientific decisions involving the generality or representativeness of studies based, inevitably, on samples rather than entire populations. Historical studies of changing census categories and current debates on a "multiracial" category for the US census illustrate the changing and interacting links among political, practical, and scientific bases of demographic indicators of variation within multicultural societies.

Although psychologists typically conceptualize diversity within nations in terms of demographic variables, they often treat such variables categorically as quasi-independent variables to assess differences between groups. Prob-
lems can then arise when scholars view any one variable as a superordinate “package” of other dimensions and interpret that variable as not only descriptive but also explanatory (Whiting 1976). Interpreting racial or ethnic-group differences as minority-group deficits is an inherent risk of such designs, particularly when only two groups are compared (Cooper et al 1998, García Coll et al 1997, McLoyd 1991).

Views of cultures as static and/or stable have been disrupted by global demographic, economic, and political changes and growing economic disparities between rich and poor. These massive changes have sparked fresh debate about cultural change, diversity, and equity among intellectual and political leaders who once viewed their nations as stable, homogeneous, and just. Policies such as the US Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Japanese Equal Employment Opportunity Law of 1985 are examples of changes that acknowledge diversity by increasing access to educational and occupational mobility.

Recent waves of immigration, however, now pose a fresh challenge to the democratic ideals of tolerating diversity while enhancing equal access to education. In many nations, immigrant families—both relatively impoverished families and families from relatively impoverished countries (Daniels 1990; Hurrelman 1994)—have arrived in great numbers, seeking better lives for their children. For these families, free public schools are the “hills of gold.” Yet despite their dreams, as immigrant youth move through schools, their numbers shrink, making them expensive social dilemmas rather than economic and social assets. Educational disparity, once seen as an issue between Black and “white” populations, is now understood as one of cultural pluralism and inclusion, involving in some communities over 100 different linguistic groups. Their sheer numbers challenge local practices and government policies stating that schools should provide acculturation for immigrants, liberal education, and preparation for work and citizenship in democracies.

Consequently, worldwide social changes are stimulating psychologists, demographers, sociologists, anthropologists, and other social scientists to rethink issues of cultural diversity both within and across national boundaries. Of course, there is precedent for social scientists to consider as valid what appear to be incompatible models of the same phenomena. Globalization has led to increased awareness of differences and similarities both within and across cultures and a search for new models of culture. In the physical sciences, compelling empirical evidence supports the validity of viewing electrons as both particles and waves. Similarly, social scientists in multicultural nations increasingly view culture as both stable and dynamic, shared by groups and disputed within and across borders, and operating at multiple levels of analysis.
Nonetheless, enduring tensions between cultural diversity and national unity fuel ongoing debate among scientists as well as politicians, families, educators, and youth (Cooper et al. 1995, Spindler 1990). To address these issues of linking culture and psychology, this chapter examines development in multicultural nations. For example, identity development involves personal exploration in domains such as ethnicity, occupation, gender role, political ideology, and religious beliefs (Erikson 1968, Grotevant & Cooper 1985, 1998); social negotiations in close relationships with families, peers, and others (Archer 1992, Heath & McLaughlin 1993); and collective processes of categorization and recategorization of group memberships (Brewer 1991, Root 1992). In addition, societal, institutional, and intergenerational changes point to mechanisms affecting individual development. Societal changes, such as new laws regulating eligibility for citizenship or university entrance, can affect how youth develop national or international identities (Denner et al. 1997, Goodman 1990). Institutional changes, such as schools’ offering new bilingual algebra classes, can foster occupational development (Chisholm et al. 1990, Kroger 1993). Intergenerational changes, such as when elders tell old stories while youth learn to ask about them, can foster academic, family, religious, or ethnic identity development (Cooper 1994; Mehan et al. 1994, 1996). Presentation of these theories in one place may help us find new ways of linking universal and community-specific perspectives on culture and psychology.

Two Dilemmas in Linking Cultural-Universal and Community-Specific Perspectives

The resurgence of scholarly and policy debates regarding cultural diversity has also renewed the classic universalism-relativism debate: how to build scientific generalizations while trying to understand diversity, variation, and change in human beliefs and behaviors. Variations across cultural communities are rooted in complex histories and interpretations of intergroup relations and varying access to education, employment, and other opportunities. Yet, attending to the unique histories within each community challenges fundamental goals of science to build theories that describe and predict human development as well as explain and enhance life conditions across a range of communities.

Thus scholars and policy makers seeking to link universal and community-specific perspectives face the classic dilemma of scientific goals conflicting with research application. A traditional scientific goal is to challenge and strengthen existing theoretical models, both their assumptions of universality and their claims of descriptive, predictive, and explanatory adequacy. A sec-
ond goal is to understand and explain existing variation in performance or responses to opportunities among individuals who vary in country of origin, race, ethnicity, gender, and other characteristics. In the application of research findings, the goal is often to be context- or community-specific, incorporating the history and current issues of each social group, thereby regarding generalization beyond that community as less relevant or even inappropriate (Phinney & Landin 1998).

This chapter traces classic dilemmas in linking cultural-universal and community-specific goals across seven models of culture and psychological processes. In doing so, we make two arguments. We argue, first, that bringing concepts of culture into psychological theories is an abstract, disputed, and inherently unresolvable process, yet that doing so is crucial to both social science and policy in multicultural societies, particularly democracies. Second, we argue that explicit interdisciplinary, international, and intergenerational discussions of culture and psychological processes—addressing issues of theories and application—advance global, national, and local goals.

This chapter is written to promote such a discussion of these issues. By showing how bringing concepts of culture into psychology enhances the underlying goals of the field, it seeks to challenge and strengthen the validity of theories and their application. The seven theoretical models of psychological functioning in culturally diverse societies we discuss are: individualism-collectivism theories (Markus & Kitayama 1991; Triandis et al. 1995, Triandis 1996); ecological systems theories (Bronfenbrenner 1979, Sameroff 1995); cultural-ecological theory (Gibson & Bhachu 1991, Ogbu 1991); social identity theories (Berry 1993, Brewer 1995, Tajfel 1978); ecocultural and sociocultural theories (Rogoff 1990, 1991; Shweder 1996; Tharp & Gallimore 1988); theories of structure and agency (Bourdieu & Passeron 1977, Coleman 1988, Mehan 1992); and multiple-worlds theories (Cooper et al. 1995, Cooper 1998, Phelan et al. 1991).

The review of each model addresses its research goals and philosophies of application by summarizing key theoretical constructs and evidence, recent conceptual and empirical advances, emerging links between cultural-universal and community-specific theories and applications, and the strengths and limitations of the theory. For each model, the examples cited are chosen to represent cultural, interdisciplinary, international, and intergenerational breadth and collaboration. The chapter summary considers potential complementarities across models and concludes by discussing implications of these advances for science and policy in culturally diverse nations. We caution readers that the seven theoretical perspectives are actually sets of theories that combine divergent and sometimes disputed viewpoints keenly felt by insiders.
SEVEN THEORIES OF CULTURE AND PSYCHOLOGICAL PROCESSES WITHIN NATIONS

Culture as Core Societal Values: Individualism-Collectivism Theories

THEORY AND EVIDENCE  Harry Triandis, Hazel Markus, and Shinobu Kitayama, all social psychologists, bring culture into psychology by arguing that shared values of social groups play key roles in individuals’ cognitive, emotional, and social functioning. Triandis and his colleagues distinguish groups on the basis of individualist and collectivist values and distinguish individuals on the basis of allocentrism and idiocentrism (1988, 1996). Triandis defined these as multidimensional “cultural syndromes,” seen in “shared attitudes, beliefs, norms, role and self definitions, and values of members of each culture organized around a theme” (1996, p. 407). To assess these syndromes, Triandis (1996) developed questionnaires composed of items “to which 90% of each sample responded on the same side of a neutral point and those to which 90% of triads agreed, with shorter times to reach agreement interpreted as reflecting a greater likelihood that an item reflects a cultural syndrome” (1996, p. 407). This method illustrates the focus of individualism-collectivism theories on locating shared beliefs within groups and differences in beliefs between groups.

In a related effort to build a universal theory to explain community-specific differences, Markus & Kitayama (1991, Kitayama & Markus 1995) proposed a “collective constructionist” model of independence-interdependence. They argue that “core cultural ideas” can be seen in “key ideological and philosophical texts and institutions at the collective level.” These foster “cultural shaping of psychological reality” thereby affecting “customs, norms, practices and institutions” (Kitayama et al 1993, p. 4). Markus & Kitayama argued that American culture emphasizes the core cultural idea of independence by valuing attending to oneself and discovering and expressing individual qualities “while neither assuming nor valuing overt connectedness.” These values are reflected in educational and legal systems, employment and caretaking practices, and individual cognition, emotion, and motivation. In contrast, they argue that Asian cultures emphasize interdependence by valuing the self and individuality as part of social context, connections among persons, and attending to and harmoniously coordinating with others. When Kitayama et al (1993) asked 65 middle-class Caucasian American and 90 Japanese students (whose social class and race/ethnicity were reported) attending the same Oregon university to list situations in which their feelings of self-esteem (jisonshin in Japanese, meaning a feeling of self-respect) would either increase or decrease, the American students focused more on self-enhancement than the Japanese students, who showed more self-deprecation.
RECENT ADVANCES  Recent scholarly work traces both continuity and change within cultural groups in the values of interdependence and independence, particularly in Japan, China, Mexico, and other countries with collectivist traditions. For example, traditional developmental goals in Japan portray the ideal adolescent as *otonashi*—reserved, modest, and reflective—and *omoiyari*—understanding others’ needs without needing to communicate verbally (Gjerde et al. 1995). Research on the socialization of these qualities often focuses on mother-child relationships and portrays ties between fathers and children as more remote, because of fathers’ great involvement in work (Azuma 1994; Gjerde et al. 1995). Recent research, however, documents social change in Japanese norms of independence and interdependence. Fathers in urban families are becoming increasingly involved in child care and joint family decision making, especially when wives are employed, as 60% of Japanese women are (Gjerde et al. 1995). Thus, scientific work based on ideals of culture as core societal values can reflect both continuity and change in community-specific expectations for men, women, and children.

LINKING UNIVERSAL AND COMMUNITY-SPECIFIC RESEARCH AND APPLICATIONS  How do universal theories apply to specific groups? When scholars use universal theories and norms of health, success, and competence, differences across diverse groups can be interpreted as deficits. For example, some scholars hold that individual achievement by children and adults is hampered by collectivist or agrarian values of immigrant or ethnic minority families. However, psychological evidence does not support this view. Valenzuela & Dornbusch (1994) assessed the relation between familistic values and school achievement in a questionnaire study of 2666 Northern California high school students of Anglo origin and 492 students of Mexican origin. Behavioral, attitudinal, and structural dimensions of familism were positively related to grades in the Mexican-origin sample, provided parents had completed at least 12 years of schooling. These findings challenge the view that school achievement is hampered by collectivist values; if anything, they indicate that collectivism may enhance school performance. This research points to the need for more intensive study of the interplay of values, parental education, and family process.

Greenfield & Cocking (1993, 1994) convened an international and interdisciplinary group of scholars to assess the descriptive and explanatory adequacy of individualism-collectivism theories, originally developed to describe ancestral traditions of Africa, Asia, and indigenous America, for their relevance to the experiences of immigrant families (see Harrison et al. 1990). Scholars traced variation and change in collectivist values in “sending” and “receiving” countries. For example, while Ho (1994) analyzed variation in patterns of socialization among “Confucian heritage” cultures, and Uribe et al. (1994) traced
change in a Mexican community, Schneider et al (1994) and Delgado-Gaitan (1994) revealed continuities and changes among Japanese American and Mexican American immigrant families. This work illuminates diversity in cultural values within nations in terms of competence rather than deviance.

Studies of variation in individualism and collectivism within cultural communities have also contributed to moving beyond deficit interpretations of either quality. Recent examples address strengths as well as challenges for families of African descent (Gibbs 1996, McAdoo 1988), Chinese descent (Chao 1997, Lin & Fu 1990), Latino or Hispanic descent (Hurtado et al 1993, Zambrana 1995), and European descent (Eckert 1989). Examining variation within groups can be combined with tracing both similarities and differences across groups, in what Sue & Sue (1987) have called “parallel designs.” These combine the benefits of external and ecological validity (Azmitia et al 1996; Cooper et al 1993, 1998).

Thus, the strengths of individualism-collectivism theories lie in their challenge to psychological theories of individuals and groups that assume universality and their evidence of culture-specific meanings in universal processes involving the self, emotion, and cognition. Their limitations stem from their emphasizing differences between societies, thus portraying cultural communities as holding mutually exclusive, stable, and uniform views. However, recent work with this model examines variation and change among individuals within each group and similarities across groups, particularly in culturally diverse societies experiencing high rates of immigration. Although the United States may be unusual in its focus on individualism and the size of its continuing waves of immigrants from traditionally collectivist societies, social scientists from many nations are rethinking individuality and community.

Culture as Context: Ecological Systems Theories

THEORY AND EVIDENCE The developmental psychologist Urie Bronfenbrenner proposed what he called an “ecological systems model” of psychological development: an evolving systemic process of interaction between the human organism and the environment. Persons are nested within their immediate social and material setting or microsystem, within linkages across settings or mesosystems, and interacting with more distal exosystems and macrosystems, all seen across historical time (chronosystems) (1989, 1993, 1995). In this model, culture is defined as societal customs and values and lies among the distal properties of the exosystem (for other developmental systems perspectives, see Sameroff 1995).

RECENT ADVANCES Although ecological systems researchers do not locate culture as an explicit property of the individual person, some see culture in the meanings people derive or construct from their experiences across con-
texts—how they make sense of their worlds. Social and physical contexts can be seen as settings of safety or violence and of opportunity or risk for children’s development. Garbarino et al (1991), arguing that all children and adults try to make sense of their lives and need love and acceptance, advocate respect for a range of strategies parents may use to raise competent children, but say general standards are part of universal explanations for behavior and coping. Garbarino et al (1991) interviewed children and families in several countries and found that adult support for dealing with stress and offering positive options was key to helping children cope with war trauma.

Transitions across contexts are an expanding area of work in ecological systems theory. As children and youth move beyond their families into the worlds of peers and communities, their life choices and identities may differ as a function of their perceptions of opportunities and risks. For example, in Burton et al’s (1996) ethnographic and intergenerational studies of low-income African American youth living in urban neighborhoods, a sense of high risk of early death was linked to teenage childbearing.

Newman (1996) reported how competent African American youth living in Harlem (New York City), where unemployment is high, commuted between local friendships (with their alienated peers) and jobs in distant neighborhoods. Similarly, Allen et al (1996) examined the links between neighborhoods, families, and schools and adolescents’ ethnic and racial identity; and Eccles et al (1993) probed how transitions between experiences in elementary and middle school often undermine a sense of “fit” in adolescents’ family- and school-based expectations for autonomy and control.

LINKING UNIVERSAL AND COMMUNITY-SPECIFIC RESEARCH AND APPLICATIONS Ecological systems research has contributed to both theory and application based on understanding how children and adults create meaning in their lives. For example, Garbarino & Stott (1989) detail the use of interviews in child abuse cases, custody disputes, and medical settings to help them communicate about stressful experiences and help adults interpret what children say. To conduct such culturally sensitive inquiry, children’s drawings are also used in both research and clinical settings and in communities experiencing violence (Lewis & Osofsky 1997).

Bronfenbrenner developed his model to address the lack of attention to context in psychological theories, and argued against the false dichotomy between basic and applied research. While setting “social address” or demographic categories in the background, Bronfenbrenner differentiated societal, institutional, social, and physical levels of analysis, all viewed across time. The strength of this work lies in its revealing how perceptions and interactions in relationships and in settings such as poverty neighborhoods or child care can
make a difference for children’s well-being (Duncan 1991). Limitations of ecological systems theories were addressed by Goodnow (1994), who observed that metaphors of nested contexts do not foster analyses of children’s interactions with peers, schools, communities, or cultures that do not come through their parents (increasingly likely as adolescence begins) or how families, schools, or cultures themselves change. These remarks are echoed in Taylor & Wang’s (1997) call for bringing ecological theory and culture together.

Culture as Caste: Cultural-Ecological Theories of Adaptation in Stratified Societies

THEORY AND EVIDENCE  The cultural anthropologist John Ogbu (1990, 1993, 1995) developed a theoretical alternative to universal models of child rearing and competence based on studies of European American middle-class children. Such models, Ogbu argued, tend to explain the widespread school failure of minority children in terms either of cultural deficiencies in their early family experiences or of their genetic inferiority. In response to such deficit-oriented accounts, Ogbu proposed his cultural-ecological theory, in which individual competence is defined not in universal terms but within the cultural and historical contexts in which children develop. For example, according to Ogbu, inner-city Black children have had academic difficulties not because of their oral ancestral culture (as opposed to traditions of literacy) but because they typically live in conditions of inequitable access to educational opportunities. This can be seen in urban areas, where schools often lack classes required for university entrance, while schools in upper-income suburbs of the same city offer ample college-preparatory classes. Ogbu argued that under such historical, cultural, and ecological conditions, a sequence of events occurs: Inner-city families initially aspire toward school success for their children, but as they become aware of barriers to educational and occupational opportunities they develop bleak perceptions of their children’s future opportunities. The children themselves can develop oppositional identities, which affirm peer group solidarity while defending against failure in mainstream schools and jobs.

Ogbu drew his original evidence for this model from an ethnographic study combining participant observation; interviews of children, parents, and teachers; and analyses of school records and other documents (1990). Ogbu traced the history of racial stratification in the school system of Stockton, California. The original public school system (1863–1869) had barred Black and American Indian children from attending school with “white” children. Later patterns of residential segregation reinforced the prior patterns of school segregation. Ogbu documented that among a sample of 17 Black and Mexican American children who received the average grade of C (where A is the top grade and
F is failing) at the end of first grade in 1964–1965, all but one continued receiving Cs through grade six. Ogbu interpreted this pattern as not differentiating children’s performance over time, thereby denying them opportunities to experience rewards for their educational accomplishments. In an extension of this model, Fordham (1988, Fordham & Ogbu 1986) conducted an ethnographic study of African American high school youth in Washington, DC. To cope with the stresses of being successful amid a peer group facing limited opportunities, some Black high school students reported downplaying their racial identity or hiding their academic success by acting as “class clown.”

RECENT ADVANCES Key advances in cultural-ecological theory involve tracing variation within ethnic minority groups, and similarity across groups, in stress and in coping with barriers to educational mobility, and probing under what conditions youth develop school identities or oppositional identities. Ford & Harris (1996) compared the views of 148 fifth and sixth grade Black youths in programs for gifted, above-average, and average students in Virginia, measuring their support for achievement ideology, the importance they placed on school, and their level of effort in school. Students in the gifted program were most supportive of the achievement ideology and students in the average program were least supportive.

In related ethnographic work, Gibson investigated “accommodation without assimilation” in northern California among academically successful Punjabi Sikh (1988) and Mexican immigrant youth (1995). Many students who were optimistic about their own prospects were found to be aware of their peers’ limited opportunities. Similarly, Matute-Bianchi (1991) studied how students’ peer affiliations, including their involvement in school student organizations, revealed patterns of “situational ethnicity” and links to school performance among immigrant and nonimmigrant students of Mexican descent in central California.

LINKING UNIVERSAL AND COMMUNITY-SPECIFIC RESEARCH AND APPLICATIONS Gibson & Ogbu (1991) edited a volume of comparative case studies of immigrant and indigenous minority youth and schooling. Examples include a paper by Inglis & Manderson on Turkish immigrants in Australia; Shishimaru’s analysis of the Burakumin, a stigmatized ethnic minority group in Japan; Barrington’s account of the experiences of the indigenous Maori community in New Zealand; and Kramer’s work on the Ute Indian tribe in the United States. In addition, Gibson & Ogbu’s volume allows for the comparison of the experiences of immigrants from the same sending country in different receiving countries, as illustrated by Gibson’s comparison of Sikh communities in the United States and Great Britain. These comparative case studies link “emic” or community-specific meanings, based on ethnographic interviews.
and observations, with “etic” or universal perspectives, including survey, achievement, and demographic data. This classic anthropological approach holds promise for psychological research.

In sum, the cultural anthropologists Ogbu, Gibson, and their colleagues have examined the psychological consequences of differences in social position and in children’s and families’ adaptations to inequalities in access to education and employment in and across a range of nations. The strength of their work stems from its explicitly addressing inequalities in access or performance and speaking to the experiences of specific communities. Cultural-ecological theorists view as universal the psychological processes of setting educational aspirations and goals, assessing future prospects for attaining these goals, and seeking group identity. However, they view minority families’ development of pessimism and hopelessness and their children’s development of oppositional identity in reaction to racial and class stratification as community specific. The limitation of this approach appears in its placing less emphasis on variation and change within communities, particularly the experiences of upwardly mobile ethnic minority families and children.

Culture as Intergroup Relations: Social Identity Theories

THEORY AND EVIDENCE  According to social identity theorists John Berry (1993), Marilynn Brewer (1995), and Henri Tajfel (1978), members of all societies engage in social categorization and recategorization. Tajfel stated that social identity is constructed in the context of attitudes toward one’s group, and is related to prejudice, intergroup conflict, culture, and acculturation. Brewer (1991) demonstrated that individuals’ motivation to claim and express their social identities “depends on the competing needs for inclusiveness and uniqueness, whereby people seek an optimal level of distinctiveness” (Ethier & Deaux 1994, p. 243) in choosing a group. Situational cues can shift the salience of an identity, but individuals also see themselves and others in consistent terms and create situations that support these views. Although studies of social identity have typically used artificial social groups such as college students brought together in short-term laboratory situations, normal transitions through the life that affect social identities and self definition can, in turn, affect how individuals adapt to changing environmental opportunities and threats (Ruble 1994).

RECENT ADVANCES  Ethnic identity is one domain of personal and group identity that changes across context through the life span (Rumbaut 1994, Waters 1994). To test the social identity perspective regarding how individuals maintain their social identities across transitions and in response to threat, Ethier & Deaux (1994) conducted a longitudinal study of ethnic identity among Hispanic college students, who were interviewed three times during their first
year at universities with predominantly European American student bodies. Combining qualitative and quantitative methods, Ethier & Deaux asked students to name their important identities, providing examples such as age, gender, relationships, and race or ethnicity, as well as to complete standardized survey measures of collective self-esteem. Two developmental pathways emerged that supported social identity theory: Students who began college with a strong Hispanic identity, as indicated by their language, generation of immigration, and ties to family and peers, were more likely to affiliate with ethnic student organizations and to report a positive personal and group identity. In contrast, students who came to college with a weak sense of ethnic identity were less likely to affiliate with ethnic student organizations and more likely to respond to threat with negative emotions and negative self-esteem. In a related vein, Hurtado & Garcia (1994) and Banks (1988, 1989) have conducted work linking social identity to achievement and feelings of efficacy.

LINKING UNIVERSAL AND COMMUNITY-SPECIFIC RESEARCH AND APPLICATIONS Research designs that compare members of majority or mainstream groups can create norms based on mainstream middle-class experience (McLoyd 1991). These can lead to interpreting differences between groups in terms of deficits from the referent group or mainstream and to viewing minority youth and families in terms of negative stereotypes. In the United States, for example, Spindler (1990) has argued that the referent group consists of upper-middle-class Protestant males of Northern European origins—as reflected in the membership of legislative, executive, and judicial systems. He also argues that members of a referent group may not view themselves as having ethnicity; only other groups are marked by ethnicity. The focus of government funding on research and policies involving ethnic minority youth and problems of crime, drug use, and pregnancy reinforce the links from ethnicity or cultural diversity to high-risk status rather than to competence (Spencer & Dornbusch 1990).

Phinney (1996) criticized using demographic categories pertaining to ethnicity as causal explanations of psychological functioning and argued for using psychological dimensions such as cultural norms and values; the strength, salience, and meaning of ethnic identity; and the experiences and attitudes associated with minority status within and between groups. In such a study of the meanings of ethnic identity, Berry (1993) built on Tajfel’s (1978) distinction between criterial attributes, which are based on discrete categories or define boundaries for inclusion or exclusion, and correlated (dimensional) attributes, which are continuous and indicate how much of a certain quality is present. Berry asked 661 English Canadian and 398 French Canadian respondents to sort cards bearing names of ethnocultural groups. Multidimensional scaling
analysis revealed that identity based on criterial attributes was unstable while identity based on dimensional attributes was stable.

In sum, social-identity theorists have linked group- and individual-level definitions of self and context and have made important contributions with laboratory and field studies. Their more recent work points to an important new direction: toward tracing the mechanisms of change and stability over time and place. The work of Ruble (1994) and Tropp (1996) is also building promising bridges between social and developmental psychology.

Culture as Universally Adaptive Tools: Ecocultural and Sociocultural Theories

THEORY AND EVIDENCE Ecocultural theory, an integration of ecological and cultural perspectives, is based on the universalist assumption that all families seek to make meaningful accommodations to their ecological niches through sustainable routines of daily living (Gallimore et al. 1993, Tharp & Gallimore 1988, Weisner et al. 1988). These routines, known as activity settings, have been examined in terms of interdependent dimensions, including who participates in daily activities, known as personnel; the salient goals, values, and beliefs that underlie and organize these activities; and the recurring patterns of social interaction, or scripts. Beatrice Whiting (1976) first challenged scholars to “unpackage” static categories related to culture in order to understand their multiple dimensions and to separate child-rearing practices and behaviors from material aspects of culture. She saw “ecology, economics, and social and political organizations as setting the parameters for the behavior of the agents of child rearing [and] child behavior as an index of child personality and adult behavior and beliefs and values as indices of adult personality” (Whiting 1963, p. 5).

From this perspective, Harkness et al. (1992) developed the concept of the developmental niche to examine cultural structuring of child development through the everyday physical and social settings in which children live, community customs of child care and child rearing, and the psychology of caretakers. Harkness et al drew their evidence from ethnographic work in a range of communities, including a farming community in Kenya and a suburban community near Boston, Massachusetts. They examined questions of universality and cultural variation in mothers’ and children’s expression of emotion and began to delineate the interrelationships among culture, parental behavior, and children’s developmental outcomes.

RECENT ADVANCES Rogoff et al. (1993) investigated young children’s experiences in guided participation in four cultural communities: San Pedro, a Ma-
yan Indian town in Guatemala; Salt Lake City, Utah, a middle-class urban community in the United States; Dhol-Ki-Patti, a tribal village in India; and Keçiören, a middle-class urban neighborhood in Turkey. Studying 14 toddlers and their families in each community, Rogoff et al combined ethnographic description of everyday activities and more conventional procedures taken into everyday contexts—e.g. presenting a novel toy and videotaping in the homes and later coding and comparing across groups. Commonalities across the four communities emerged in that adults structured teaching, but in Salt Lake City and Keçiören, toddlers were more segregated from adult activities, and in Dhol-ki-Patti and San Pedro, how toddlers learned by watching and participating in adult activities with caregivers’ support.

**LINKING UNIVERSAL AND COMMUNITY-SPECIFIC RESEARCH AND APPLICATIONS** Ecocultural researchers move beyond demographic categories in defining cultural groups as communities. For example, Shweder (1996) has argued for the use of ethnographic methods to identify moral communities, whose members share values; such moral communities are embedded in all complex societies. Shweder et al drew from their study of moral, emotional, and personality functioning and development in the Hindu temple town of Orissa, India (1995). In their work on what they term cultural psychology, Shweder et al have sought to build a universal psychological theory consistent with evidence from diverse cultural communities by reconceptualizing fundamental problems in psychology so cultural variability is central. To allow for “universalism without the uniformity,” in which basic constructs encompass both universality and cultural variability, Shweder et al contend that each person holds a similarly heterogeneous collection of concept and psychological processes, which are activated differentially across history and culture, thereby enabling humans to understand one another.

Jessor et al (1996) convened an interdisciplinary group, including sociocultural researchers, to consider the relationships between ethnography and human development. Participating scholars reported investigations of individual meaning systems over time, including contradictions and differences as well as convergences in meanings. Ethnographic approaches, including observing behavior and interactions in their immediate and historical contexts, are relevant to particular communities and allow investigators “to make sure ideas and concepts exhibited when informants talk to researchers also occur spontaneously with one another” (Shweder 1996, p. 40). Analysis of field notes based on observations allows integrating personal, relational, and institutional aspects of what are typically thought of as constructs found in the individual.

Thus, the strength of ecocultural and sociocultural theories lies in their having linked universal and community-specific research goals; they focus on in-
dividual, interpersonal, and institutional processes considered universal (Cole 1996, Goodnow et al 1995, Penuel & Wertsch 1995). Culture-specific content, including values, practices, roles, and modes of communication as well as the material circumstances of living, presume potential relativism in defining valued qualities of group members as well as community-specific adaptations to particular ecological niches. A potential limitation of this approach was articulated by Damon (1996), who challenged the moral relativism of ethnographic and community-specific theorists to define not only communities but also moral outcomes.

**Culture as Capital: Theories of Structure, Agency, and Social Capital**

**THEORY AND EVIDENCE** Social capital refers to the relationships and networks from which individuals are able to derive institutional support. According to sociologist Pierre Bourdieu (Bourdieu & Passeron 1977), social capital is cumulative, leads to benefits in the social world, can be converted into other forms of capital, and can be reproduced in the same or expanded form (Stanton-Salazar et al 1996). Both Bourdieu and John Coleman, also a sociologist, saw social capital as rooted in the family, with networks among elite families benefiting their children through links to college and occupational status (Coleman 1988).

What role does schooling play in creating social capital? Mehan (1992) critiqued the “cultural reproduction” theory outlined above as overly deterministic, asserting that it emphasizes structural constraints while ignoring the potential roles played by the social organization of school practices and by individual actions. According to Mehan, ethnographic studies in the interpretive tradition help account for social inequality: Cultural elements, human agency, and schooling have revealed “reflexive relations between institutional practices and students’ careers. Schools are composed of processes and practices that respond to competing demands and often unwittingly contribute to inequality, while social actors become active sense-makers choosing among alternatives in often contradictory circumstances” (Mehan 1992, p. 1).

**RECENT ADVANCES** The structure-agency theories of Bourdieu and of Coleman have sparked research on creating cultural and social capital. Work has been done toward developing interventions among culturally diverse youth that enhance their access to educational opportunities (Heath & McLaughlin 1993) and that trace change within nations in youth’s experiences of agency, communion, and academic mobility (Gándara 1995, Gándara & Osugi 1994).

Can low-income families be sources of cultural capital? Moll & Gonzalez (1994) described how children from low-income Mexican immigrant families
bring to school the cultural knowledge and information from their households and neighborhoods used by community members to succeed in everyday life, as well as community-based knowledge that can be used by teachers and other agents. This validates the importance of such knowledge and builds respect for diversity. It also enhances institutionally based skills such as how to operate in bureaucracies and engage the help of adults. Immigrant, working-class, and minority children may come to school with cultural resources and as competent decoders in cultural domains that do not necessarily include the school (Moll et al. 1991).

LINKING UNIVERSAL AND COMMUNITY-SPECIFIC RESEARCH AND APPLICATIONS Like upper-class families, low-income youth and families negotiate access to schooling by using family members’ experiences and social networks; in addition, when they are unfamiliar with US institutions, they make use of brokers and advocates in schools or community-based organizations. Through these relationships, youth learn how and when to shift dialects or languages and how to access the help of mentoring, advocacy, and institutional bridging. Stanton-Salazar et al. (1996) described interventions in how institutional agents and community mentors enhanced the development and schooling of youth from economically marginalized communities. Their access to institutional resources depended on their embeddedness in social networks that provide attachments to institutional agents who were able and willing to broker opportunities. These brokers’ positions in schools, government agencies, programs, colleges, and community-based organizations allowed them to provide knowledge and place youth in resource-rich social networks.

The structure-agency theories bring concepts of power and access to the analysis of cultural change while highlighting an active role for individuals. The concepts of social capital are useful for understanding the role of culture in the academic performance of diverse youth within nations. Recent work has illuminated the role of attitudes and behavior of youth and low-income families in accessing educational resources (Denner et al. 1997). The limitations of this area stem from the relatively small amount of empirical work that has been conducted so far.

Culture as Navigating and Negotiating Borders: Multiple Worlds Theories

THEORY AND EVIDENCE The educational anthropologists Patricia Phelan, Ann Locke Davidson, and Hanh Cao Yu (Phelan et al. 1991) proposed that all youth in diverse societies are challenged as they attempt to move across their multiple worlds, which are defined in terms of the “cultural knowledge and be-
behavior found within the boundaries of students’ particular families, peer groups, and schools.... [E]ach world contains values and beliefs, expectations, actions, and emotional responses familiar to insiders” (1991, p. 53). Phelan et al conducted a two-year longitudinal ethnographic study of 54 African American, Filipino, Vietnamese American, Mexican American, and European American adolescents attending large urban desegregated high schools in Northern California. On the basis of case studies of how these adolescents migrated across borders between their worlds of family, peers, and school, Phelan et al (1991) described four prototypic patterns. Some crossed borders smoothly, with a sense that their parents, friends, and teachers held compatible goals and expectations for them. However, even though they seemed on track for their future occupational plans, they were often isolated from students who were not part of their smoothly connected worlds. A second group occupied different worlds from their school peers in terms of culture, social class, ethnicity, or religion but still found crossing between school and home worlds manageable. They could adapt to mainstream patterns yet return to community patterns when with friends in their neighborhoods, even though they risked criticism from people in each world who expected unwavering adherence to their expectations. A third group occupied different worlds but found border crossing difficult. They were able to do well in classrooms where teachers showed personal interest in them, but they “teetered between engagement and withdrawal, whether with family, school, or friends” (1991, p. 84). Finally, students in the fourth group found the borders impenetrable. They found moving between worlds so difficult that they had become alienated—from school, family, or peers. Even so, many still hoped to move successfully into the world of school. Phelan et al concluded that students’ abilities to move between worlds affect their chances of using educational institutions as steppingstones to further their education, work experiences, and meaningful adult lives but that success in managing these transitions varies widely (p. 85). Key assets were people who also moved across these boundaries, such as parents who were involved in school or teachers who knew parents and friends; but many students were left to navigate across their worlds without help.

**Recent Advances** In industrialized countries, the student’s pathway through school to work has been described as a smooth *academic pipeline*, with access by choice and advancement through merit; families support the school while fostering their children’s autonomous achievement. Cooper et al (1995) have argued that this idealized view is particularly inappropriate for youth who encounter ethnic, gender, linguistic, or economic barriers in schooling and employment (Chisholm et al 1990, Hurrelman 1994). As each wave of students
moves through elementary and secondary school toward college in the United States, the numbers of ethnic minority youth shrink (O’Brien 1993). Simultaneously, youth who leave school can become alienated and are overrepresented in unemployed and prison populations (Vigil & Yun 1996).

Cultural mismatch models consider ethnic minority youth at risk for dropping out of school and engaging in criminal activity that leads to prison. Scholars in several countries have mapped how youth navigate their multiple worlds, persist in school, and attain occupational success (Azmitia et al 1996, Grotevant & Cooper 1998, Hurtado & García 1994). For example, Cooper et al (1995) built on the multiple worlds model (Phelan et al 1991), the ecocultural model (Gallimore et al 1993), and the individuality-connectedness model (Grotevant & Cooper 1985, 1986) to examine how 60 African American and 60 Latino adolescents in Northern California bridged their multiple worlds of family, peers, neighborhoods, and schools while participating in university academic outreach programs. Students reported that their worlds included families, countries of origin, friends’ homes, churches, mosques, academic outreach programs, shopping malls, video arcades, school clubs, and sports. Most worlds—including schools—were sources of positive expectations, but neighborhoods were the greatest source of expectations that students would fail, become pregnant and leave school, or engage in delinquent activities. Both African American and Latino students reported benefit from “brokering”: Their families, program staff, teachers, siblings, and friends had provided support or had spoken up for them at school, at home, or in the neighborhood. Students also reported “gatekeeping”: School counselors, for example, had discouraged them from taking classes required for university admission (Erickson & Shultz 1982). Students named parents and teachers most frequently as resources but saw peers and themselves as both resources and difficulties. Students making higher math grades were more likely to name mothers, fathers, teachers, and sisters as resources, while those making lower grades were more likely to report providing their own resources and having difficulties with peers.

LINKING UNIVERSAL AND COMMUNITY-SPECIFIC RESEARCH AND APPLICATIONS Combining ethnographic and survey methods, Cooper et al (1995) conducted interviews with program founders and staff about the histories of their programs, reported participant observations, and initiated focus groups with male and female students at junior high, high school, and college levels. They developed a survey with both open- and closed-ended questions to assess adolescents’ challenges and resources in navigating across their multiple worlds. Similarly, Davidson (1996) linked ethnographic studies in the interpretive tradition, by using focus groups as collaborative participation in re-
search with students and in-service training for teachers. Davidson addresses a key need of multiple world theories: explaining variation in school performance in societies among youth who share similar worlds.

SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS

The seven theoretical perspectives reviewed in this chapter provide complementary views of culture and psychological processes. By defining culture as core societal values, *individualism-collectivism theories* trace variation in behavior across cultures explained by core values that exist outside the individual. The model is relevant across countries (universal) and is used to look at community-specific values. By defining culture as contexts, *ecological system theories* hold the potential to address diversity in psychological processes by looking at the interrelationships of individuals and contexts. The theory is applicable to differences in school performance by addressing how children make sense of their environments. By defining culture as caste, *cultural-ecological theories* move beyond deficit models of cultural differences to explain cultural variations in behavior as a function of psychological processes, particularly perceptions of opportunity and efficacy. By defining culture as capital, *structure-agency theories* interface the concept of culture as core values with those of context and caste. By defining culture as a set of universally adaptive tools, *ecocultural and sociocultural theories* posit universal concepts to understand similarities and differences across cultures and variations within cultures as a function of dynamic interactions. By defining culture as intergroup relations, *social identity theories* see culture in psychological terms and link individual with social-group processes. By defining culture as a dynamic psychological construct, *multiple-worlds theories* link individuals with contexts and conceptualize people as agentic in negotiating cultural boundaries.

Of course, some critics assert that psychologists should omit cultural processes from consideration in their theoretical or empirical work. Psychology, they argue, is primarily about understanding the behavior of individuals, not of groups; the most important psychological processes and mechanisms are universal, while environmental variation helps little to explain individual functioning. Some take an alternative position, arguing that historical and societal processes are so powerful in creating distinctive communities, institutional systems, and situations that individual meanings become trivial and that meaningful comparisons across cultural communities become impossible. It may seem easier to take either of these positions—cultural-universal or community-specific—than to try to understand what makes humans similar
and what makes them different, particularly when we do not know beforehand for which domain the first or second position might be more true.

Another approach to understanding individual and cultural systems is based on tracing individuals moving from one system to another or within a system (RG Cooper, personal communication). If change occurs in a social structure, such as when public schools in a low-income neighborhood add college preparatory classes, then one should see change in individuals within the structure, such as more students planning to attend college. If relatively stable qualities of individuals, such as their future orientation (Nurmi et al 1995), influence the effects of structural qualities, then individual theoretical constructs are necessary. Thus we need psychological constructs, not only demographic categories, to integrate cultural processes in both psychological and structural terms (García Coll et al 1997). Meanwhile psychologists continue to generalize beyond their samples; while studying only their own countries, for example, they assume that psychological phenomena are universal enough to make such studies representative.

Finally, scholars are also moving beyond “giving science away.” Consideration of the role of cultural diversity in psychological theory and methods has begun to cause a shift in how research is done. This has resulted in more integration of scholarly and policy debates on issues of application and ethics, as seen in the US Human Capital Initiative emerging from a coalition of government agencies and professional organizations. Policy regarding children and youth in many nations focuses on the relative authority and fiscal responsibility of central governments, states, and localities. Similarly, debates on the universal applicability of the United Nations Convention for the Rights of the Child have compared individualistic—often industrialized—versus collectivist societies, noting that the influence of policy depends on these culture-specific values (Limber & Flekkøy 1995). Issues of equity and access to resources bring issues of universality beyond scholarship to those of policy and practice in which scholarship is entwined (Werner 1997).

Social scientists will continue to debate models of cultural-universal and community-specific research and application within and across nations (Segriner et al 1993). But the international scholarly community is finding new ways to understand the role of culture in human development without overemphasizing or ignoring either psychological (“micro”) or structural (“macro”) processes. Psychologists are coming to understand cultures as developing systems of individuals, relationships, material and social contexts, and institutions. By viewing theories linking culture and psychological processes as distinct yet complementary, researchers and policy makers can forge interdisciplinary, international, and intergenerational collaborations on behalf of the culturally diverse communities of which we are a part.
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors thank Renee Ferigo Marshall for preparing references for this chapter. We also thank the following reviewers for their helpful comments on drafts of this chapter: Margarita Azmitia, Cynthia Garcia Coll, Robert G Cooper, Barbara Rogoff, Linda Tropp, Tom Weisner, and Chaim Richman. Partial support in preparing this review was provided to Catherine Cooper by the John D and Catherine T MacArthur Foundation Research Network on Successful Transitions through Middle Childhood, to Margarita Azmitia and Catherine Cooper from the US Department of Education Office of Educational Research Institute (National Center for Research on Education, Diversity, and Excellence), and to Catherine Cooper, Francisco Hernandez, and Jill Denner from the University of California Regents’ Diversity Initiative. Support for Jill Denner was provided by a grant to Barrie Thorne and Catherine Cooper from the John D and Catherine T MacArthur Foundation Research Network on Successful Transitions through Middle Childhood.


Literature Cited


Berry JW. 1993. Ethnic identity in plural societies. See Bernal & Knight 1993, pp. 65–77


Bronfenbrenner U. 1995. The bioecological model from a life course perspective: re-


Ford DY, Harris JJ. 1996. Perceptions and attitudes of Black students toward school, achievement and other educational variables. Child Dev. 67:1141–52


Kroger J. 1993. The role of historical context in the identity formation process of late adolescence. Youth Soc. 24:363–76


Phinney JS. 1996. When we talk about American ethnic groups, what do we mean? Am. Psychol. 51:918–27


## CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sibling Relationship Quality: Its Causes and Consequences, <em>Gene H. Brody</em></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memory-Based Language Processing: Psycholinguistic Research in the 1990s, <em>Gail McKoon, Roger Ratcliff</em></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brain Plasticity and Behavior, <em>Bryan Kolb, Ian Q. Whishaw</em></td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergroup Contact Theory, <em>Thomas F. Pettigrew</em></td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Neuroscience of Human Memory, <em>J. D. E. Gabrieli</em></td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology and the Study of Marital Processes, <em>John Mordechai Gottman</em></td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Models of the Emergence of Language, <em>Brian MacWhinney</em></td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reconciling Processing Dynamics and Personality Dispositions, <em>Walter Mischel, Yuichi Shoda</em></td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biases in the Interpretation and Use of Research Results, <em>Robert J. MacCoun</em></td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Cognitive Neuroscience of Constructive Memory, <em>Daniel L. Schacter, Kenneth A. Norman, Wilma Koutstaal</em></td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSUMER BEHAVIOR: A Quadrennium, <em>J. Jacoby, G. V. Johar, M. Morrin</em></td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Constructivist Perspectives on Teaching and Learning, <em>A. Sullivan Palincsar</em></td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMORBIDITY OF ANXIETY AND UNIPOLAR MOOD DISORDERS, <em>Susan Mineka, David Watson, Lee Anna Clark</em></td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADOLESCENT DEVELOPMENT: Challenges and Opportunities for Research, Programs, and Policies, <em>Richard M. Lerner, Nancy L. Galambos</em></td>
<td>413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judgment and Decision Making, <em>B. A. Mellers, A. Schwartz, A. D. J. Cooke</em></td>
<td>447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Abilities, <em>Robert J. Sternberg, James C. Kaufman</em></td>
<td>479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower-Level Visual Processing and Models of Light Adaptation, <em>D. C. Hood</em></td>
<td>503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categorical Data Analysis, <em>Thomas D. Wickens</em></td>
<td>537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theories Linking Culture and Psychology: Universal and Community-Specific Processes, <em>Catherine R. Cooper, Jill Denner</em></td>
<td>559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptual Learning, <em>Robert L. Goldstone</em></td>
<td>585</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>