HOKKAIDO UNIVERSITY

Title	CONTEXTS OF CHILDREARING IN JAPAN AND THE UNITED STATES : DAILY LIFE SETTINGS, RELATIONSHIPS, AND ACTIVITIES
Author(s)	SHWALB, David W.; SHWALB, Barbara J.; KUSANAGI, Emiko et al.
Citation	乳幼児発達臨床センター年報, 28, 115-124
Issue Date	2006-03
Doc URL	https://hdl.handle.net/2115/25379
Type	departmental bulletin paper
File Information	28_P115-124.pdf

Hokkaido University Collection of Scholarly and Academic Papers : HUSCAP

CONTEXTS OF CHILDREARING IN JAPAN AND THE UNITED STATES: DAILY LIFE SETTINGS, RELATIONSHIPS, AND ACTIVITIES

David W. Shwalb
Barbara J. Shwalb
Southeastern Louisiana University
Emiko Kusanagi
Kokugakuin Junior College
Shing-Jen Chen
Hokkaido University
Brett Wilkey
Russell MacKay
Brigham Young University

ABSTRACT

This research compared samples of mothers and fathers of 3-5 year old preschoolers in suburban Provo (Utah, USA: 100 mothers, 78 fathers) and Sapporo (Japan: 172 mothers, 172 fathers). It focused on issues including parenting styles and behavior, co-sleeping, co-bathing, influences of neighbors and grandparents on children, and parental and child time use. Comparative analyses revealed different factor structures of items related to parenting style/behavior, between the Provo and Sapporo samples. The results also suggested both cultural variations and similarities in parents' reports of the contexts (neighborhoods, extended family, parental employment) of child development, and demonstrated the importance of considering religious group membership and historical trends in the study of parent-child relations.

Key words: Parenting, Co-sleeping, Grandparents, Cross-cultural, Time use, Neighborhood, Preschool children.

INTRODUCTION

It is the conventional wisdom of developmental psychologists that parents behave differently toward their children based on the parents' cultural values (Harkness & Super,

We acknowledge the efforts of Yuko Tanaka and Nathaniel Lemon, the Brigham Young University Child and Family Studies Laboratory, and the parents who took part in the research. Portions of this paper were presented at the 2005 conference of the Society for Cross-Cultural Research (Santa Fe). Please direct comments to dshwalb@selu.edu, barbara.shwalb@selu.edu, e_kusanagi@kokugakuin.jp, or schen@edu.hokudai.ac.jp; or to David W. Shwalb, Southeastern Louisiana University, Department of Psychology, SLU 10831, Hammond, LA 70402 U.S.A.

1996). This assumption is based on over a half-century of cross-cultural research (Gardiner & Kosmitzki, 2005), and perhaps the best known two-culture comparisons in the literature on parenting have been between Japanese and American parents (Fogel, Toda, & Kawai, 1988; Miyake, Chen, & Campos, 1985; Shwalb & Shwalb, 1996). It is fair to say that Japan has become part of the West, and that cultural comparisons must be based on a new definition of culture and East/West. As Azuma (2005) wrote recently, our "traditional" definition of culture (as societies, nations, other social groupings) must be distinguished from "functional" culture, which is "the total set of cultures that constitute the milieu for the activities and development of a person or a group of people" (p. xii).

Because Japanese and American cultures and the context in which children develop continue to change historically, it is necessary to continually update the research literature with new studies. Indeed, contrasts made between Japanese and Americans decades ago may not be replicable in the 21st century. It was the goal of the present study to revisit several assumptions about the contexts and patterns of childrearing in the U.S. and Japan. This paper focuses on parental self-reports about the following issues, all of which have been previously compared between Japanese and American samples: (1) co-sleeping and co-bathing, (2) grandparents, and (3) parent-child relationships. Previous research (Lebra, 1984; Schooler, 1996; Shwalb, Nakazawa, Yamamoto, & Hyun, 2003; Sugawara, 2005) led to generalizations that would lead one to predict more co-sleeping and co-bathing, higher involvement of grandparents, more intensely close mother-child relationships, and less involved fathers, in Japanese families. We also asked questions about the involvement of neighbors in the lives of preschool children, because the role of neighbors and neighborhoods has seldom been an issue in previous Japan-U.S. psychological comparisons.

The data presented here are from a four-culture (U.S., Japan, Korea, Indonesia) questionnaire survey data set about cultural, parental, and religious group influences on child development. For the remainder of this paper, we shall refer to our samples as from Provo (Utah, U.S.) and Sapporo (Japan). We do not claim that our samples represent their respective national populations, but the comparisons between the two samples are still illuminating because each sample exemplifies the influence of multiple contexts on child development. But only one of those contexts was that of the national culture; children are viewed in this report as also influenced by their family's religion, their physical environment, the membership of their social networks, and numerous other contextual variables.

METHOD

Participants were parents of children attending middle-class suburban preschools in the Provo (100 mothers, 78 fathers), Sapporo (172 mothers, 172 fathers). The mean ages of parents were as follows: Provo mothers=35.10 (SD=5.87), fathers=36.36 (SD=5.93); Sapporo mothers=32.99 (SD=4.97), fathers=35.11 (SD=5.56). Children in both samples were between ages 3-5 with 4-year olds the modal age group in both cities. The Provo sample consisted of members of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints. The Sapporo sample was from the suburbs of Sapporo and answered the same questions as did the Provo sample. But based on the decision of the researchers religious group affiliation was not considered an appropriate question for the Sapporo sample. Children brought 6-page questionnaires home from their preschools to be filled out by their mothers and

fathers; the overall return rate of 60% was equivalent in the two cities. In addition to demographic questions, the data presented here were taken from the portions of the questionnaire titled "You and Your Family," "Your Preschool Child's Daily Life," "Relationships," and "Your Style and Practices as a Parent." The original questionnaires are available from the authors on request.

RESULTS

Co-Sleeping and Co-Bathing

Given the options of sleeping in one's own bedroom or with others, parents reported that a significantly greater proportion of Sapporo preschoolers shared a bedroom with others than was the case in Provo, $X^2(1)=91.96$, $p<.001$. However, in both groups the majority of children still reportedly slept in the same room with others.

Asked whether the child bathed alone or with others, a significantly greater proportion of Sapporo preschoolers co-bathed than was the case in Provo, $X^2(1)=155.96$, $p<.001$. But as in the case of co-sleeping, the modal response in both samples was to bathe with others.

Presence of Grandparents

Most parents in both cities answered "no" to the question, "Does a grandparent live in your household?" But the percentage of families with grandparents in residence was higher in Sapporo (12.07%) than in Provo (under 2%), $X^2(1)=14.01$, $p<.001$.

Employment and Childrearing

On average, Sapporo fathers (mean=50.20, $SD=15.60$ hours) worked longer hours than did the Provo fathers (mean=41.52 hours, $SD=14.96$ hours), $F(494)=7.36$, $p<.001$. Similarly, Sapporo mothers (mean=18.05, $SD=19.71$ hours) reportedly worked longer hours than Provo mothers (mean=8.51, $SD=14.60$ hours), $F(324)=18.31$, $p<.001$.

Time Use

Table 1 presents the daily number of hours children were reported as sharing time with their fathers, with their mothers, and alone. Provo mothers and fathers spent significantly more time with children on weekdays than Sapporo parents, but Sapporo mothers spent significantly more time with children on weekends than Provo mothers. Over 95% of mothers and fathers in both cities reported that their spouses had "a close relationship" with the child. For both weekdays and weekends, Provo parents reported that their children spent more awake time alone than did Sapporo parents.

Table 1. Comparisons of child's mean time use (hours) with mother, with father, and alone

Hours spent···	Provo	Sapporo	*t*	*p*
sharing activity with mother on weekday	5.63 (4.61)	4.22 (3.69)	3.68	<.001
sharing activity with mother on weekend days	5.63 (4.79)	7.19 (5.82)	2.96	<.01
sharing activity with father on weekday	1.93 (2.36)	1.41 (1.60)	2.79	<.01
sharing activity with father on weekend days	4.27 (3.91)	4.69 (4.45)	1.03	NS
alone (when awake) on weekday	1.23 (1.37)	0.43 (0.80)	7.41	<.001
alone (when awake) on weekend days	1.04 (1.35)	0.52 (1.28)	3.87	<.001

Note. Standard deviations are in parentheses.

Neighbors and Neighborhoods

Asked "How well do some of your neighbors know about your parenting and your child's home life?" significantly greater proportions of Sapporo responded "not well" or "not well at all," while Provo parents were more likely to respond "well" or "very well," $X^2(7)=40.66$, $p<.001$. We next asked parents "How involved are some of your neighbors with your child's daily life?" and while the modal response in both cities was "not involved," a significantly greater proportion of Sapporo parents reportedly were not involved, $X^2(6)=25.31$, $p<.001$. Finally, when asked "How does your neighbors' knowledge of and involvement with your own children compare with that of your neighbors when *you* were a child?" the Provo parents reported that neighbors are more involved now, whereas Sapporo parents reported that neighbors were more involved in the past, $X^2(7)=108.25$, $p<.001$.

Parental Style/Practices

Factor Structures. Exploratory factor analysis was conducted for the overall sample, and then separately for the sample from each city. The factor loadings for the respective samples are presented in Tables 2 and 3. Analysis of data from both groups produced a 7-factor structure, but the items loading on each factor and several of the labels appropriate for factors were different between the two groups. For the Sapporo sample, the Cumulative Variance explained was 55.80%; for Provo it was 58.28%. These results included some factors derived only for one sample (e.g., "Guilt/Shame" in Provo; "Directive" in Sapporo), and also some factors with similar labels but different item combinations between the samples (e.g., "Self-expression").

Mean comparisons. When the data for both cities were combined, the factor analysis derived yet another set of 7 factors, with various labels and item combinations. Therefore, it was not appropriate to create composite variables based on these factors to compare the two samples, and the mean comparisons presented in Table 4 are for each individual item. Two-way ANOVAS for the effects of city (Provo, Sapporo) and participant gender (mother, father) generally revealed differences between the Provo and Sapporo groups, but there were few differences between mothers and fathers in their ratings of parental style/behavior items. Interaction effects presented in Table 4 were significant for about half of these items, suggesting that one or the other gender was responsible for many of the Provo/Sapporo main effects.

DISCUSSION

Generalizations

The analyses reported here suggested both cultural variations and commonalities in parents' reports. However, interpretations of these data are made here with caution because our research team is still grappling with the meaning of the complex data set. We cannot emphasize strongly enough the fact that the data were collected from *samples* of parents from Provo, Utah, and Sapporo, Japan, i.e., the samples do not represent *all parents* in either of the societies. It may be fair to say that the daily life settings, activities, and relationships (i.e., the context of childrearing) in Provo can be identified to a strong degree based on the participants' membership in the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints (Hart, Newell, & Sine, 2000). For the other group, in Sapporo, religion would not be considered an important influence on parenting behavior and thinking. This can be seen

Table 2. Sapporo Factor Analysis

	Factor1	Factor2	Factor3	Factor4	Factor5	Factor6	Factor7	
Factor 1 (EV=3.57, % variance=16.24) Self-expression (自己表現)								
e. Encourage child to express self even when disagrees with parents	0.68							子どもの意見が両親と違う時でも，子どもにそれを言わせるようにする
f. Encourage child to talk about consequences of behavior	0.68							子どもに，こういうことをしたらどうなるかを，言わせるようにする
Factor 2 (EV=2.15, % variance=9.76)−Indirective (間接的)								
l. Let my child know he/she has to be obedient and respectful, in order to be loved		0.73						みんなに好かれるためには，言うことを聞いてお行儀よくしなければならないと子どもに教える
o. Punish by taking away privileges or rewards, rather than giving explanations		0.66						子どもに罰を与える時は，言葉で説明をするよりも，特別扱いやごほうびをあげない
t. Teach my child the value of bringing honor to, and not embarrassing, our family		0.61						家族にとって恥ずかしくない，誇れるようなことをするように子どもにいう
Factor 3 (EV=1.56, % variance=7.11)−Directive (指示的)								
c.Direct child exactly what to do			0.52					子どもにするべきことをきちんと指図する
d. Discourage child from showing off skills or knowledge to get attention			0.49					子どもが人に注目してほしくて，自分の得意なことや知識を見せびらかすようなことは，させないようにする
h. Expect child to be close by me when playing			0.73					遊ぶときは，私の目の届くところで遊んでほしいと思う
q. Set and follow through on clear and firm limits			0.52					しつけをするときは，はっきりときちんとしたきまりをつくって，それに従わせる
Factor 4 (EV=1.50, % variance=6.82)−Confidence/anxiety (自信/不安)								
b. Am anxious about being a good enough parent				0.80				「まあまあ良い親」であるかどうか不安だ
j. Have confidence in my own effectiveness as a parent				−0.83				親としての自分の力量に自信がある
Factor 5 (EV=1.26, % variance=5.70)−Indulgence (甘えさせる)								
g. Encourage feelings of guilt when my child's behavior causes harm					0.47			子どもが人に迷惑をかけたら，子どもに「悪い」という意識を持たせるようにする
i. Give in to child's wishes, because at preschool age kids don't yet have reasoning powers					−0.40			幼児には，まだ十分理解できないので，結局子どものやりたいようにさせる
k. In public situations, would rather give in to the child than risk confrontation or a tantrum					−0.44			人前では，子どもと衝突したりかんしゃくを起こさせるよりも，子どものやりたいようにさせる
m. Let child take care of himself/herself					0.68			子どもに自分のことは自分でさせる
Factor 6 (EV=1.17, % variance=5.33)−Positive in approach (積極的)								
n. Praise child for behaving in a way that brings honor to our family						0.74		家族の自慢となるようなことをしたら，子どもをほめる
p. Remind children that they are greatly indebted to their elders						0.53		子どもに「○○（例えば，お父さんなど年上の人）のおかげである」ということを言う
u. Tell child I appreciate what he/she tries to accomplish						0.46		最後までやりとげようとすることが大切だということを子どもに言う
Factor 7 (EV=1.07, % variance=4.85)−Management/control (コントロール/管理)								
a. Allow child to make a choice, even though I have already expressed a different preference							−0.73	子どもの好みが自分とは違っていても，子どもには好きなものを選ばせる
r. Show strong anger to child							0.49	子どもを強く怒る
s. Spank when child is disobedient							0.49	子どもが言うことをきかない時は，たたく
Mean Correlation Within Factor Items	0.37	0.28	0.18	-0.47	0.21	0.22	0.23	

Note. Minimum Eiqenvalue=1.0, Varimax rotation following Principle Components analysis.

Table 3. Provo Factor Analysis

	Factor1	Factor2	Factor3	Factor4	Factor5	Factor6	Factor7
Factor 1 (EV=3.40, % variance=15.45)—**Discipline**							
i. Give in to child's wishes, because at preschool age kids don't yet have reasoning powers	0.65						
j. Have confidence in my own effectiveness as a parent	−0.61						
k. In public situations, would rather give in to the child than risk confrontation or a tantrum	0.71						
o. Punish by taking away privileges or rewards, rather than giving explanations	0.48						
q. Set and follow through on clear and firm limits	−0.64						
Factor 2 (EV=2.91, % variance=13.23)—**Self-expression**							
a. Allow child to make a choice, even though I have already expressed a different preference		0.70					
e. Encourage child to express self even when disagrees with parents		0.75					
f. Encourage child to talk about consequences of behavior		0.51					
u. Tell child I appreciate what he/she tries to accomplish		0.57					
Factor 3 (EV=1.68, % variance=7.62)—**Family-centered**							
n. Praise child for behaving in a way that brings honor to our family			0.86				
t. Teach my child the value of bringing honor to, and not embarrassing, our family			0.79				
p. Remind children they are greatly indebted to their elders			0.39				
Factor 4 (EV=1.45, % variance=6.39)—**Conflict**							
c. Direct child exactly what to do				0.63			
r. Show strong anger to child				0.60			
s. Spank when child is disobedient				0.81			
Factor 5 (EV=1.25, % variance=5.66)—**Autonomy**							
b. Am anxious about being a good enough parent					0.61		
h. Expect child to be close by me when playing					0.82		
m. Let child take care of himself/herself					−0.65		
Factor 6 (EV=1.17, % variance=5.30)—**Guilt/Shame**							
g. Encourage feelings of guilt when my child's behavior causes harm						0.85	
v. Tell child to be ashamed of misbehavior						0.57	
Factor 7 (EV=1.02, % variance=4.64)—**Conformity**							
d. Discourage child from showing off skills or knowledge to get attention							0.78
l. Let my child know he/she has to be obedient and respectful, in order to be loved							0.44
Mean Correlation Within Factor Items	0.28	0.32	0.39	0.32	0.27	0.41	0.14

Note. Minimum Eigenvalue=1.0, Varimax rotation following Principle Components analysis.

Table 4. Mean Comparisons of Item Ratings: Parental Style/Behavior

	Mean Pro Moth	Mean Pro Fath	Mean Sa Moth	Mean Sa Fath	Culture	Gender	Interaction effect
Factor 1: Controlling Through Emotions (EV=5.07, % variance=23.06)							
c. Direct child exactly what to do	3.21 (1.07)	3.21 (1.09)	4.74 (.90)	4.35 (.99)	Sa>Pro***	M>F*	Sa: M>F, Pro M=F*
g. Encourage feelings of guilt when my child's behavior causes harm	3.30 (1.16)	3.49 (1.03)	5.60 (.61)	5.33 (.71)	Sa>Pro***	/	Sa: M>F, Pro M<F*
p. Remind children that they are greatly indebted to their elders	1.97 (.96)	2.28 (1.14)	3.99 (1.19)	3.91 (1.03)	Sa>Pro***	/	Sa: M=F, Pro M<F*
r. Show strong anger to child	2.32 (.92)	2.49 (1.04)	4.20 (1.09)	3.72 (1.12)	Sa>Pro***	/	Sa: M>F, Pro M=F*
v. Tell child to be ashamed of misbehavior	2.34 (1.18)	2.64 (1.08)	4.66 (.93)	4.38 (.90)	Sa>Pro***	/	Sa: M>F, US M<F*
Factor 2: Firm and Appreciative (EV=2.51, % variance=11.40)							
f. Encourage child to talk about consequences of behavior	4.54 (1.05)	4.63 (1.02)	4.01 (1.12)	3.88 (1.11)	Pro>Sa***	/	/
q. Set and follow through on clear and firm limits	4.14 (.96)	4.22 (1.04)	4.03 (.97)	3.86 (.96)	Pro>Sa**	/	/
u. Tell child I appreciate what he/she tries to accomplish	5.12 (.67)	5.14 (.71)	4.81 (.97)	4.42 (1.10)	Pro>Sa***	M>F*	Sa: M>F, Pro M=F*
Factor 3: Punitive (EV=1.60, % variance=7.25)							
l. Let my child know he/she has to be obedient and respectful, in order to be loved	1.72 (.88)	2.00 (1.10)	3.31 (1.41)	3.27 (1.33)	Sa>Pro***	/	/
o. Punish by taking away privileges or rewards, rather than giving explanations	2.21 (.95)	2.50 (1.02)	2.41 (1.13)	2.52 (1.06)	/	F>M*	/
s. Spank when child is disobedient	1.91 (.92)	2.08 (1.03)	3.03 (1.55)	2.61 (1.49)	Sa>Pro***	/	Sa: M>F, Pro M=F*
Factor 4: Grants Autonomy (EV=1.23, % variance=5.60)							
a. Allow child to make a choice, even though I have already expressed a different preference	3.73 (1.02)	3.53 (1.20)	4.19 (.92)	4.35 (.99)	Sa>Pro***	/	Sa: M<F, Pro M>F*
e. Encourage child to express self even when disagrees with parents	3.56 (1.11)	3.36 (1.24)	3.91 (1.17)	3.76 (1.21)	Sa>Pro***	/	/
m. Let child take care of himself/herself	3.29 (1.18)	3.42 (1.68)	4.45 (.89)	4.39 (.81)	Sa>Pro***	/	/
Factor 5: Yielding and Non-Confrontative to Child (EV=1.19, % variance=5.42)							
d. Discourage child from showing off skills or knowledge to get attention	2.36 (1.11)	2.55 (1.31)	3.09 (1.14)	3.02 (1.12)	Sa>Pro***	/	/
h. Expect child to be close by me when playing	2.87 (1.24)	3.23 (1.33)	4.80 (.99)	4.13 (1.21)	Sa>Pro***	/	Sa: M>F, Pro M<F*
i. Give in to child's wishes, because at preschool age kids don't yet have reasoning powers	1.89 (.73)	2.00 (.88)	3.05 (1.02)	3.45 (1.01)	Sa>Pro***	F>M*	/
k. In public situations, would rather give in to the child than risk confrontation or a tantrum	2.13 (.93)	2.17 (.99)	2.78 (1.06)	2.88 (1.11)	Sa>Pro***	/	/
Factor 6: Anxiety & Low Confidence as Parent (EV=1.06, % variance=4.84)							
b. Am anxious about being a good enough parent	4.32 (1.46)	3.99 (1.47)	3.81 (1.15)	3.20 (1.23)	Pro>Sa***	M>F***	/
j. Have confidence in my own effectiveness as a parent	4.17 (.97)	4.33 (1.05)	2.75 (1.02)	3.35 (1.09)	Pro>Sa***	F>M***	Sa: F>M, Pro F=M*
Factor 7: Shows Value for Family Honor (EV=1.02, % variance=4.63)							
n. Praise child for behaving in a way that brings honor to our family	4.25 (1.26)	4.35 (1.21)	4.49 (1.27)	4.77 (1.04)	Sa>Pro**	/	/
t. Teach my child the value of bringing honor to, and not embarrassing, our family	2.65 (1.20)	3.08 (1.10)	2.37 (1.09)	2.53 (1.04)	Pro>Sa***	F>M**	/

in comparing the two groups' response to the statement "Religion plays an important part in my thinking about children": the modal response on a 6-point scale in Provo was "strongly agree," whereas the modal response in Sapporo was "strongly disagree." The Sapporo sample was more likely to be representative of the broader Japanese middle class population, but in both Sapporo and Provo "functional culture" (Azuma, 2005) incorporates many other contextual influences than simply religion. It is difficult with the present data set, for instance, to distinguish between the effects of religion, geography, social class, politics, and other contextual influences.

Group Comparisons: Similarities and Differences

Some of our results confirmed expectations set by previous research comparing family life in Japan and the United States. For example, co-sleeping, co-bathing, and three-generation families were statistically more common, in absolute numbers, in Sapporo than in Provo. Yet the modal response for these three variables was actually similar between the two cities.

Elsewhere, the number of hours worked by Sapporo fathers confirmed the stereotype of Japanese workers, who make little distinction between overtime and regular work hours. In fact, 58% of Sapporo fathers worked more than 50 hours/week and 12% worked over 70 hours weekly, compared with only 28% over 50 hours and 4% over 70 hours weekly among Provo fathers. The stereotype of the "professional Japanese housewife" has already been dispelled (Sugawara, 2005), and in the present study 60% of the Sapporo mothers and only 32% of the Provo mothers were employed outside the home. Yet 74% of Sapporo mothers reported their occupational classification as "housewife."

With regard to time use, it was notable that Provo mothers reported on average exactly the same number of hours sharing activities with children on weekdays and weekends. Provo fathers, along with Sapporo mothers and fathers, spent more time with their children on the weekend than on weekdays. The finding of "weekend fathers" in Sapporo confirms previous data on Japanese fathers (Shwalb et al., 2003), i.e., fathers work long weekday hours and have restricted contact with their children except for weekends. We may question the meaning of the 95% agreement by mothers in both cities with a global statement that their husbands had close relationships with their children. This item seemed particularly susceptible to a socially desirable response, which is an important issue for the interpretation of any self-report measure. The additional question about time spent alone suggested that neither Provo nor Sapporo preschoolers spend much time alone. It is a possibility that there are different reasons for this finding in each culture, e.g., larger family size and maternal involvement in Provo; smaller family size and involvement in lessons and clubs in Japan. Further research is needed on children's solitary time, given Chen's (1996) observation that Japanese parents often worry about their children being lonely. In the present study, the modal response to the statement "Young children often tend to be lonely" was "disagree" in Provo and "agree" in Sapporo.

Neighbors and neighborhoods seemed to have a different place in the lives of Provo and Sapporo preschoolers. Provo adults were described as more aware of what goes on in their neighbors' families, and were more involved with their neighbors' preschoolers. An interesting historical trend was also observed in that Provo parents believed that people

are more aware of their neighbors' children now than in the past, whereas Sapporo parents believed the opposite. This would suggest another topic for follow-up research, on the effects of social change on the influence of neighbors on child development.

We tend to downplay the significance of mean differences in agreement with statements about parental style/behavior, because the factor analyses indicated that these items had differential significance and meaning in the two cities. Indeed the factor structure for the parenting style/behavior items was quite different between the two samples. In addition, there might have been a response bias among Sapporo participants to rate items more positively than did Provo respondents, which further complicates comparisons of group means.

Perhaps more important than the overall mean differences between the two cities was the finding that Sapporo mothers rated style/behavior items more positively than did Sapporo fathers, whereas the tendency was the opposite in the Provo sample with fathers providing more positive ratings than did mothers. We must consider whether these interaction effects (see Table 4) reflected response biases or different gender-related mentalities in the two cities. Finally, the factor analyses showed that parental thinking about children and childrearing may cluster around different concepts depending on one's cultural, religious or language group membership. Creating measures of parental style that are comparable across languages and cultures remains a very difficult enterprise.

Conclusions

Overall the data reveal several findings of general interest to developmental psychologists. Most notably, the data showed that children in different geographical settings have different types of relationships and activities. One drawback of the present study is that it did not assess children's developmental outcome measures, concentrating as it did on the contexts in which children develop. We were nonetheless able to show that in some regards, past notions of comparisons between "Americans and Japanese" lead to overgeneralizations. Above all, the present study showed the need to focus on intra-cultural variations. One must always consider the nature of our participant populations, and in the current study it was notable that many Provo (American) parents and children had some experiences (e.g., co-sleeping) and relationships (weekend fathers) previously thought to be more typical of Japanese parents and children. The data both confirmed and disconfirmed various previous comparisons made between child development and families in Japan and the U.S., and called attention to some topics (grandparents, neighbors, time alone, etc.) worthy of further cross-cultural exploration.

We cannot take parental or children's behavior or thinking in Provo or Sapporo to be a national standard let alone a universal standard. There was no monolithic view of children in either of our samples, although we may emphasize the influence of religious values in the case of the Provo families. The goal of our ongoing analyses and follow-up research will be to further clarify how culture is influenced by and influences children and adults in a world where functional culture is replacing, or has already replaced, national culture.

REFERENCES

Azuma, H. (2005). Foreword. In D. Shwalb, J. Nakazawa, & B. J. Shwalb (Eds.), Applied developmental psychology: Theory, practice, and research from Japan (pp. xi-xvii). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.

Chen, S-J. (1996). Positive childishness: Images of childhood in Japan. In C. Hwang, M. Lamb, & I. Sigel (Eds.), Images of childhood (pp. 113-127). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Fogel, A., Toda, S., & Kawai, M. (1988). Mother-infant face-to-face interaction in Japan and the United States: A laboratory comparison using 3-month-old infants. Developmental Psychology, 24, 398-406.

Gardiner, H. W., & Kosmitzki, C. (2005). Lives across cultures: Cross-cultural human development (3rd edition). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Harkness, S., & Super, C., Eds. (1996). Parents' cultural belief systems: Their origins, expressions and consequences. New York: Guilford Press.

Hart, C.H., Newell, L.D., & Sine, L.L. (2000). Proclamation-based principles of parenting and supportive scholarship. In D. Dollahite (Ed.), Strenthening our families: An in-depth look at the Proclamation on the Family (100-123). Salt Lake City, UT: Bookcraft.

Lebra, T. S. (1984). Japanese women: Constraint and fulfillment. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Miyake, K., Chen, S. -J., & Campos, J. J. (1985). Infant temperament, mother's mode of interaction, and attachment in Japan: An interim report. In I. Bretherton & E. Waters (Eds.), Growing points of attachment theory and research. Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 50 (Serial No. 209), 276-297.

Schooler, C. (1996). William Caudill and the reproduction of culture: Infant, child, and maternal behavior in Japan and the United States. In D. Shwalb & B. Shwalb (Eds.), Japanese childrearing (pp. 139-176). New York: Guilford Press.

Shwalb, D. W., Nakazawa, J., Yamamoto, T., & Hyun, J. H. (2003). Fathering in Japanese, Chinese, and Korean cultures: A review of the research literature. In M. E. Lamb (Ed.), The role of the father in child development (4th edition) (pp. 146-181). New York: Wiley.

Shwalb, D. W., & Shwalb, B. J. (Eds.) (1996). Japanese childrearing. New York: Guilford.

Sugawara, M. (2005). Maternal employment and child development in Japan: A twelve-year longitudinal study. In D. Shwalb, J. Nakazawa, & B. J. Shwalb (Eds.), Applied developmental psychology: Theory, practice, and research from Japan (pp. 225-240). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.

執筆者紹介（掲載順）

アラン フォーゲル （教授・ユタ大学心理学科）
河合優年 （教授・武庫川女子大学）
星信子 （助教授・北海道浅井学園短期大学部）
陳省仁 （教授・北海道大学教育学研究科）
常田美穂 （博士課程・北海道大学教育学研究科）
佐藤公治 （教授・北海道大学教育学研究科）
鹿嶋桃子 （博士課程・北海道大学教育学研究科）
保坂和貴 （博士課程・北海道大学教育学研究科）
長橋聡 （学部生・北海道大学教育学部）
伊藤崇 （助手・北海道大学教育学研究科）
松本博雄 （講師・名古屋短期大学）
加藤弘通 （講師・常葉学園短期大学保育科）
大久保智生 （客員研究員・早稲田大学　人間総合研究センター）
黒沢香 （教授・東洋大学）
関道子 （教授・北海道大学）
稗田真弓 （講師・北海道大学医療短期大学部）
品川ひろみ （講師・札幌国際大学）
奥平洋子 （教授・札幌学院大学）
ディヴィド シュワールブ （助教授　サウスイスターン　ルイジアナ大学）
ババラーシュワールブ （助教授　サウスイスターン　ルイジアナ大学）
草薙恵美子 （助教授・國學院大學短期大学部）
ブレット　ウィルキー （教授・ブリガムヤング大学）
ラッセル　マッケイー （教授・ブリガムヤング大学）

乳幼児発達臨床センター年報
（2004－2005）**第 28 号**
平成18年３月24日印刷　　３月30日発行
編集者　陳省仁
室橋春光
藤野友紀
印刷所　株式会社アイワード
発行者　北海道大学大学院教育学研究科
附属乳幼児発達臨床センター
〒060-0811 札幌市北区北11条西７丁目
☎(011) 706-3106

RESEARCH AND CLINICAL CENTER
FOR CHILD DEVELOPMENT
ANNUAL REPORT
(2004-2005) **No. 28**
Date of Printing : March 24, 2006
Date of Publication: March 30, 2006
Editors : Shing-Jen Chen
Harumitsu Murohashi
Yuki Fujino
Printer : iword Co., Sapporo
Publisher : Research and Clinical Center for
Child Development, Graduate School
of Education, Hokkaido University
Nishi 7, Kita 11, Kita ku,
Sapporo 060-0811 Japan
Phone: 011-706-3106