Feeling-Talk in Preschool

TEACHER VIEWS OF EMOTIONAL EXPRESSION AND ITS SIGNIFICANCE

ANN JOHNSON

In recent years, interest in cross-cultural definitions of personhood has grown considerably. Anthropologists like Shweder (Shweder & Bourne, 1982), and Geertz (1979) have called our attention to the fact that our cherished but deeply implicit notions of what constitutes a person represent just one cultural possibility. Every culture has a particular set of ideas about what constitutes a self, and these ideas shape how we interact with children. We want children to develop selves with particular qualities and we want them to adopt the culturally appropriate definition of personhood, in order to become properly socialized.

Our everyday concept of the person is highly implicit and usually operates invisibly. Anthropological work helps to highlight and make figural what typically operates as the unseen ground of our personhood assumptions. Clifford Geertz has provided a useful and well-known clarification of the basic requirements of personhood in Western cultures:

> *The Western conception of the person as a bounded, unique, more or less integrated motivational and cognitive universe, a dynamic center of awareness, emotion, judgment, and action organized into a distinctive whole and set contrastively both against other such wholes and against a social and natural background is, however incorrigible it may seem to us, a rather peculiar idea within the context of the world's cultures.* (Geertz, 1979, p. 229).

The self is seen as separate and individuated, singular and integrated, characterized by personal agency, and is considered the internal source of emotional experience and expression. The prescriptive nature of our selfhood assumptions can also be seen here; a healthy sense of self requires certain qualities, and many of our definitions of psychological pathology represent deviations from this ideal (e.g., singularity vs. "multiple personalities" and boundedness vs. "borderline personalities"; see Sampson, 1985; Johnson, 1991). One highly charged area in which cultural norms regarding selfhood intersect with beliefs about mental health is the domain of emotional development and expression.

As Geertz's definition suggests, our local view of the person is a very psychological one. We are supposed to be capable of self-reflection, of self-awareness. We are expected to have a working knowledge of our own mental states, feelings, and thinking processes. We socialize this aspect of the self in our children by calling attention to their internal states, especially feelings. We train our children to recognize, label, and express their

emotions. This can be seen in the following two examples:

EXAMPLE 1:
[The teacher sees Anna standing alone; Anna's mother comes through, says goodbye to Anna; Anna ignores her]
Teacher: What's wrong, Anna? Bye mom, we'll see you later! Could you just wave to her, so she'll feel like it's ok for her to leave? Don't want to? Are you mad? Are you sad? Are you sick? Are you unhappy?
Child: Yeah.
Teacher: Why? Will you tell me why? You don't want to tell me why? Did you go to Breck school yesterday?... Did you talk to anybody? There goes your mom, see her, she's waving. She's right there. [Anna waves] There! That probably made her feel better, you waved at her.

EXAMPLE 2:
[Child falls off chair and starts to cry]
Teacher: Oops. That was pretty scary wasn't it? That was pretty scary. I'm glad you didn't get hurt but that was pretty scary.

In middle-class, mainstream child care contexts, adults routinely speculate about and try to decipher childrens' inner states. These conversations signify for the child the existence of an interiority filled with a variety of desires, thoughts and feelings, and they communicate the importance of knowing and expressing one's own inner states. In other cultures, speculation on what another person may be thinking or feeling is not preferred or practiced (Ochs, 1990). As Ochs (1990) points out, in Samoa and among the Kaluli of New Guinea, social exploration of mental states is not given the status or importance that it is given in our own culture. In Samoa, mental states are considered uncertain by definition, so speculative efforts at clarification are seen as futile and unnecessary; therefore children are not interrogated about their feelings or thoughts. In contrast, middle-class caregivers in America tend to believe in both the possibility and importance of clarifying inner states, especially emotions. A child's feelings and reactions are considered part of that unique core of selfhood that should be known and actively articulated by the child in the service of enlarging self-awareness. In their interactions with children, caregivers in all cultures accentuate certain possibilities for selfhood and constrain others, communicating and reproducing indigenous parameters for cultural personhood. Caregivers in Samoa, like middle-class caregivers in America, socialize children into a particular ontology of the human person, and into their own local epistemological perspective (Ochs, 1990) on self-knowledge.

The way that caregiving practices reflect cultural views of personhood was demonstrated vividly in a study by Tobin, Wu, Davidson (1989) who collected extensive ethnographic data from preschools in three different cultures: Japan, China, and the United States. They demonstrated compelling differences between the Asian schools and the American preschool on the issue of individuality. In Japanese preschools, for example, teachers generally do not focus on individual differences or try to emphasize each child's uniqueness; instead all children are considered equally bright and capable, and the prevalence of group activity downplays individual accomplishment in favor of focusing on group identification and pride. In the Chinese classroom, the authors found a strong commitment to promoting selflessness and collectivism among children. Activities were always conducted in groups, and, in the rural preschool they studied, children even went to the bathroom together as a group at prescribed times of the day.

In contrast, education practices in the American preschool reflected a strong belief in each child's uniqueness, and the importance of recognizing individual differences. In this classroom the researchers saw much more teacher intervention and monitoring of childrens' behaviors, interpersonal conflicts, and communication patterns. Children were encouraged to express their feelings in words, and to resolve disputes through talking about feelings in a manner not seen in the Asian preschools. While American parents who viewed tapes of this preschool were enthusiastic about the feeling-based approach, Japanese teachers were less impressed: One commented, "Talking with children about disagreements like that ... it seems a bit heavy, doesn't it? It reminds me of marriage counseling" (Tobin et. al., 1989, p. 152). A Japanese social worker who viewed the film clarified the way cultural values shape different responses to the American way of resolving conflicts: "The way Americans deal with children's disagreements by agonizing about motivation and guilt and atonement — it's all very Judeo-Christian in a way which is

very foreign to most Japanese. It's based on a very different notion of original sin and conscience and guilt and individuality and especially of the efficacy of words than we have in Japan" (Tobin et. al., 1989, p. 53).

While examining this very intriguing study I was reminded of several incidents I had witnessed during my experiences doing research in preschool settings. One that stands out involved a three-year-old child lying on the floor and clearly struggling to get on a pair of snowpants. The teacher, nearby, noted his struggle and said to him: "You feel frustrated, Paul, you feel frustrated. You need to say 'I feel frustrated and I need some help.'" She repeated this until finally Paul blurted out "I feel frustrated!" The example highlights the importance placed on words and the persistent way American teachers name and label children's inner states. It also illustrates how emotional expression is modeled and constrained by teachers.

Traditional American research on how children develop ideas of the self or person focuses almost exclusively on the individual, private construction of concepts in early childhood, with little attention paid to the social context that shapes children's thinking in this area. Even less attention has been given to how cultural values influence development here. To explore these issues I undertook an ethnographic study of a preschool classroom, focusing on Teacher-Child conversations and exploring some of the cultural issues Tobin identified in his study. I wanted to see in a detailed way how teachers and children construct together a certain reality about the status and meaning of personhood. One important aspect of the meaning of personhood is the way in which emotions are described and the role they play in defining the self. An emphasis on emotions and inner states emerged as a very salient dimension of teacher-child conversations. These "feeling-talk" conversations are examined in detail here; two other major personhood themes (the role of the body and the importance of agency and autonomy) are analyzed in a separate report (Johnson, 1992).

METHOD

The study took place in a local University child care center serving children ranging from infants through preschool age. Children at the center came from several different racial groups and represented a wide range of economic backgrounds. Many of the teachers were trained in early childhood education or child development at the University. Data was collected in the preschool II classroom, enrolling approximately 20 children between the ages of 42 months to Kindergarten age. There were three full-time teachers and several part-time teachers, with a 1:7 staff to child ratio. The head teacher in this classroom agreed to wear a small tape recorder during 2-3 hour observation periods. I also collected field data noting interaction contexts and physical environments and activities. An open-ended approach was used, with no attempts to be selective about conversation topics or activities; I did not want to exclude any contexts or conversations that might turn out to be relevant. I gathered data during both morning and afternoon sessions and attempted to sample many different activities. In all, I collected 41 hours of taped conversations, yielding about 450 pages of transcribed conversations. Field notes were integrated into the transcriptions to clarify interaction contexts. This data set was analyzed qualitatively through the identification of consistent themes (e.g., Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Richer, 1978).

The teacher was also interviewed; she reviewed selections from the transcribed data and commented on her motivations for certain types of interactions and offered interpretations. This step grew out of the desire to include in analysis the perceived intentions of the subject being observed. In addition, eight other preschool teachers chosen randomly from other child care centers were also interviewed. They were shown selections from the transcripts and asked to comment on the typicality of the interactions reflected in the data. This data also helped to clarify the motivational context for consistent patterns of teacher-child interactions.

It should be noted that the study was conducted in a well-funded, University-connected child care center, with educated and relatively well-paid staff. Although the children come from a wide diversity of backgrounds, the Center's philosophy and goals represent a mainstream, middle-class orientation toward child care and child rearing, and the findings should be understood as limited to that context.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Indexing of inner states: Feelings, desires, and intentions

To say that language indexes information is to suggest that certain language forms and practices call attention to implicit sociocultural information (Ochs, 1990). Both Tobin and Ochs have suggested that a unique feature of American adult-child communication is the status and value placed on interpreting mental states. Thoughts, feelings, desires, are considered as really existing and as capable of causing or motivating action. The most pervasive conversation theme in the entire data set was the persistent concern with naming and clarifying inner states, while encouraging children to think about and express their feelings, thoughts, and intentions.

EXAMPLE 1:
Samantha: She doesn't like me (referring to Larissa).
Teacher: I like you. I think she's probably just upset at you right now.
Larissa: She pushed my brother down.
Teacher: But your brother can take care of himself and you're sure you don't like her? I think you do, I think you might be a little bit mad at her right now.
Larissa: No, I don't like her.
Teacher: That's okay, Samantha. I like you. Okay. And I think Larissa's mad at something that you did right now and that's okay.

This example illustrates, first, the way teachers work to make distinctions between feelings (e.g., not liking someone vs. being angry with them). Educating children about emotions requires drawing attention to the subtle differences between similar feelings. Second, a persistent message in teachers' feeling-talk is the belief that all feelings are acceptable and worth expressing — even the unpleasant ones.

EXAMPLE 2:
[Here, Anya is talking about a Sunday School teacher who bosses her around and tells her what to do:]
Teacher: What happens if you don't want to do it? Nothing could happen.
Anya: What happens if we don't do it? The teacher will get real mad at us.
Teacher: And what happens if she gets real mad? Do you know that I get mad at what you do sometimes? I do, and I tell you about it. That's okay if people get mad. You get mad sometimes don't you. It's okay if people get mad.
Anya: They make us do all the work.
Teacher: Do they?
Anya: Yeah, and the other children have fun.
Teacher: Well, I suppose you could talk, you know your Sunday School teacher's name?
Anya: Yeah.
Teacher: Talk to her. Tell her how you feel. She will probably listen. Grownups usually want to know how their children feel. I do. Sometimes I don't change it, sometimes I don't do anything about it, but I always want to know how you feel.
[activities continue]
Anya: And at Sunday School we have to do all the work...
Teacher: You should let them ... next time you go back, you should let the teacher know how you feel about it and she might be able to talk with you about it.

Once again, the importance of accepting negative feelings is communicated here. In addition, this example highlights the frequent emphasis placed on sharing and discussing one's feelings with others. Such discussions are promoted as the best way for resolving interpersonal conflict, as seen in the following examples.

EXAMPLE 3:
Dennis: You're hurting my feelings, Jack.
Teacher: Well that's good talking. If somebody hurts your feelings you really, really, really should let them know.

EXAMPLE 4:
Sonia: She's hitting my back.
Teacher: She did? You should talk to her about it.
Sonia: Stop it.
Teacher: Stop it what? Stop hitting my back.
Sonia: Stop hitting my back.
Teacher: Okay, now you're taking care of it.

EXAMPLE 5:
Claire: Wayne hit me.
Teacher: He did? Did you tell him that you didn't want to be hit?
Claire: Uh,

Teacher: There he is, tell him ... Wayne, stand here, Claire wants to talk with you. Listen to her please.
Claire: I don't want to be hit.
Teacher: She doesn't want to be hit by you.

The last example illustrates the common practice of teaching children to deal with conflict through developing a repertoire of phrases that communicate their desires and dislikes — a practice often referred to by teachers as "using your words." Teachers inculcate a habit of articulating desires and dislikes as a way of prompting children to manage conflict verbally and rationally. These phrases hold the power of defusing and de-tangling interpersonal conflict and are considered to be of prime importance by teachers; this theme will be developed in more detail at the end of this section.

EXAMPLE 6:
Teacher: You want to tell something on Daniel?
Rebecca: I just don't know why Daniel took something from me.
Teacher: OH! Daniel took something from you that you wanted? Oh, well you better talk to Daniel about it and tell Daniel that you want it back.
[Daniel shakes head no while covering his ears with his hands]
Daniel: She already said it!
Teacher: Well did you give it back to her?
Daniel: Yeah, I just put it back where it was.
Teacher: She didn't know it.

In this example, the teacher's concern with promoting verbal conflict resolution diverts her attention from Rebecca's stated concern. She approaches the teacher with a rather philosophical query regarding moral behavior: "I just don't know why Daniel took something from me." The teacher bypasses this difficult issue in favor of reinforcing her pedagogical agenda to train and enforce verbal conflict resolution. A concern with teaching conflict resolution may prompt teachers to reduce the often-complicated and difficult questions children possess about human relationships and morality to simple problem-solving scenarios. By failing to attend to the child's unique question in this situation, the teacher misses an opportunity for exploring with the child the complicated nature of friendship and play. As so often happens in adult-child interactions, the adult imposes a simplified, child-like interpretation of the situation, falling back on routine forms of interaction that reinforce the adult-child hierarchy (the adult as teacher or authority figure) instead of engaging the child as a conversational equal (see, e.g., Matthews, 1987).[1]

The following two examples illustrate how teachers communicate the importance of clarifying **others'** desires, feelings, and intentions:

EXAMPLE 7:
[Putting out carpet squares in preparation for group time; Samantha is trying to put Claire's out for her:]
Samantha, Samantha, does she want your help? Ask her if she wants some help from you. Claire, do you want help from Samantha. I guess not. Can she please put out her own? You can put out your own, Samantha. (2/12)

EXAMPLE 8:
[Andrew is accidentally hit in face with toy shovel]
Teacher: Are you okay?
Andrew: No.
Teacher: That was an accident I could tell.
Andrew: No, I think he did it on purpose.
Teacher: You think he did it on purpose? Let's ask him, ask him if he did it on purpose.
Andrew: Well I think he did.
Jack: I didn't.
Teacher: He didn't do it on purpose, I could tell he was digging trying to get a shovelful. When you're working together like that and when you're so close together, accidents like that can happen. I'm glad you're not hurt Andrew. (1/53-54)

In this last example, the teacher indexes an intention, indicating for the child that other people's actions have motives that may be hidden, and that it's important to clarify the motives or intentions underlying action. The example also illustrates an epistemological stance — the belief that the best way to know another's intention is to ask him or her. From this perspective, second-hand knowledge of someone else's intention (through observation) may be faulty; true knowledge can only be gained through verbal clarification. Once more, the power of words to illuminate the self — its intentions, desires and motives — is illustrated in teachers' promotion of verbal expression.

In sum, teachers index or signal the existence of children's inner states by naming them for the

child, by encouraging children to name them, by making subtle distinctions between inner states (e.g., not liking someone vs. being angry at them, example 1; doing something on purpose or accidentally, example 8); they signify the importance of knowing one's inner states by encouraging and reinforcing discussion of feelings, desires, and intentions, and by making explicit statements about the value of clarifying inner states. These comments by teachers communicate at least three important epistemological assumptions: 1/ that inner states can be made known; they can be clarified, and 2/ I have direct access to knowledge of my own inner states, and 3/ knowledge of others' internal states can only be indirectly known or inferred through observation of behavior; verification requires consulting the person directly about his or her feelings, desires, or intentions.

In addition, these messages are driven by implicit assumptions about the inherent value of knowing and expressing inner states. Connected to this assumption is the message that all emotions are acceptable, even the negative ones, and that one should acknowledge all feelings. In the Parent Handbook (1990) prepared for parents of children in the program, the Center Philosophy clearly states that teachers will engage in "positive reinforcement" through "mak[ing] positive statements of actions and feelings or describ[ing] actions and feelings" — and provides the following kinds of examples: "verbalizing an observation of exactly what the child is doing or has done; verbalizing to the child how we see his/her emotions; verbalizing back to the child just what he/she has said to you about an action or feeling; asking what the child feels or has done" (p. 9).

The philosophy statement does not make it clear why these teacher behaviors are important, but my interview with the observed teacher helped to clarify the values implicit here: There is an assumed therapeutic value to clarifying and expressing one's feelings. As the teacher put it: "That's mainly what we're trying [to do], to stop for a minute and acknowledge that you did hurt somebody and let somebody know how you're feeling about it, mainly talking about feelings though, that you don't have to hold all those feelings all jumbled up inside of you" (Teacher Interview, 1991, p. 4). When there's conflict between two children, "usually all they need is you to be there with them, and then they can say all the things that they need to say, but they feel much better saying it: (Teacher Interview, 1991, p. 6). The operative assumption here is one that is pervasive in our own middle class American culture; that one's mental health requires self-reflection and expression of feelings. If one's feelings are left 'jumbled up' or unexpressed, there will be continued bad feeling and negative mental health consequences, it is believed. Teachers perceive their role as one of assisting in shaping routine forms of feeling-talk that are designed to resolve conflict and illuminate desires and intentions (one's own, and those of others).

Furthermore, if this process of expression and clarification does not occur, it is believed that dangerous mental health consequences will ensue. The belief in the danger of unexpressed feelings is highlighted in the validation interviews with other preschool teachers who were asked to comment on our observed conversations about feelings. When asked "Is it important that children express their feelings?", one teacher responded:

> *Yes, it's very important. One of the things I focus on in my room is accepting and acknowledging and labeling the feelings the kids have, and it's okay to be angry, you can tell people how you feel, all of these things are very important for kids, otherwise they keep it bottled up and they never learn to express it and become the grown-ups that we all know, the emotional cripples.* (Validation Interviews, 1991, p. 2)

Another teacher put it this way:

> *You can't keep your feelings bottled up inside, you need to express what your needs in an appropriate manner are, so other people know how you are feeling. ... If you hold them inside, you don't learn how to correctly express them; I think that's why we have some deviant behaviors in society.* (Validation Interviews, 1991, pp. 36-37).

Bad feelings are viewed as an infecting or contaminating presence which, if left unattended, will create personal and social disaster. Further, teachers express the belief that breaches in human relationship can only be repaired through communication of feelings. When helping to resolve conflict, expressing feelings allows the two children to restore connection. The observed teacher commented, "Involving them both in the

situation [i.e., discussion to resolve conflict], nine times out of ten they'll end up going back and doing the same thing that they were doing together rather than being across the playground, across the room apart and keep watching each other and, you know, not feeling okay with it" (Teacher Interview, 1991, p. 5). Implied is the suggestion that unspoken feelings contaminate a relationship and disallow resolution.

These preschool teachers want to enhance group feeling, create a communal atmosphere, and maximize the potential for positive relationships between students. Teachers in other cultures want the same thing for their children. However, teachers differ in the means by which they try to achieve this goal. In Japan, teachers try to cultivate group feeling by staying back and minimizing conversations with children, encouraging them to resolve conflicts on their own (Tobin, et. al., 1989). American teachers take a much more hands-on, direct intervention approach, believing that certain kinds of communication need to be modeled and practiced for group harmony to be established. Teachers take for granted the natural value of knowing and expressing one's inner states, and engage in direct tuition of appropriate expressive practices.

Teachers seem to believe that their monitoring and modeling of communication patterns is a benign way of directing the child's attention to feelings or desires that really exist and are already present in the child; there is no sense of constructing or shaping the child's emotional reactions, but rather, the monitoring is seen as facilitating expression of already-existing inner states. Young children are perceived as lacking the verbal skills to describe correctly what they're experiencing, and teacher modeling of words and interactions is seen as a way of providing them with the symbols that 'naturally' map onto the child's presumably spontaneous and self-directed experience. As mentioned earlier, this form of tuition is sometimes discussed by teachers as helping children to "learn their words" — to identify the symbols that 'naturally' represent their inner feelings, desires and intentions. Because communication is so important, 'learning one's words' takes on real significance: words have the power to heal, to restore relationship, and assure mental health. When one teacher was asked, "What do you think that children should be learning about their feelings at this preschool age?" she responded: "I guess learning their words are pretty powerful ... putting labels on all those different feelings I think is real important for kids. It gives them a sense of power to be able to ...um... express to themselves ... that I do have these feelings and they're important" (Validation Interviews, 1991, p. 15).

As Tobin (Tobin, et. al., 1989) points out, this emphasis on, and faith in the efficacy of language, is peculiarly American; he found a similar "pedagogy of self-expression" in the American preschool he studied. American caregivers believe that this instruction in labeling and expressing inner states maximizes spontaneity and freedom of expression, but Tobin offers a different interpretation:

> *American children enjoy great freedom to express their opinions and feelings, but conversely, they are much less free than children in China or Japan to remain silent and hide their feelings. Speech in American preschools, then, is constrained differently, not less, than in China and Japan. ... It could be argued that in a culture such as the United States, where children are encouraged and expected to verbalize their feelings, talk about feelings, and perhaps even feelings themselves, will inevitably be more conventional and socially constrained than in a culture such as China, where children are not exposed to public discourse about feelings, or in a culture such as Japan, where teachers stay largely outside the world of children's discourse.* (Tobin, et. al., 1989, p. 153)

CONCLUSION

Preschool teachers, like all caregivers, communicate to children both directly and indirectly standards, values, and assumptions regarding cultural personhood. They create distinct verbal contexts for the joint construction of knowledge about the self and the person. Linguist Edward Sapir has said, "Language is a great force of socialization, probably the greatest that exists" (1974, p. 53). What is spoken to children — and what remains unspoken — creates particular reality for children and adults. In analyzing these conversations, I have tried to treat teacher-child interactions as representing a kind of intermediate space for the elaboration of subjectivities. In this study we see a particular region of self-

experience being elaborated jointly: the valuing of emotional expression and the forming of particular beliefs and expectations about verbal clarification of inner states. What we often call "socialization" is not a matter of adults depositing information into the child, but rather, a continuing and pervasive process of joint meaning construction. What is unique about adult-child interactions is that they are very often motivated by the adult desire to communicate particular realities, to provide the child with the requisite meaning structures for competent participation in the social worlds. For this reason, highly implicit assumptions about the self, about its feeling-experiences and intentions, are created and reconstituted habitually in the repeated patterns of our interactions with children. In this way our participation in language truly becomes, as Merleau-Ponty puts it, "the learning of a structure of conduct" (1964, p. 99)

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am grateful for the cooperation of teachers and students at the University of Minnesota Child Care Center for allowing me to observe their classroom. I would also like to thank Ellen Ames and Amy Naugle for completing the arduous task of transcribing tapes. Finally, an earlier version of this analysis was presented at the Eleventh International Human Science Research Conference held at Oakland University, Rochester, Michigan, in June, 1992. I would like to thank the participants at that conference session for many helpful observations and suggestions.

NOTES

1. I am grateful to David Kennedy for suggesting this interpretation.

REFERENCES

Geertz, C. (1979). From the native's point of view: On the nature of anthropological understanding. In P. Rabinow & W.M. Sullivan (Eds.), *Interpretive social science: A reader* (pp. 225-242). Berkeley: University of California Press.

Glaser, B. & Strauss, A. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory.* Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co.

Johnson, A. (1991). Selfhood and embodiment. *The Humanistic Psychologist*, 19 (3), 301-312.

Johnson, A. (1992, June). *Creating a world of persons: Preschoolers' conversations with teacher.* Paper presented at the Eleventh International Human Sciences Research Conference, Oakland University, Rochester, Michigan.

Matthews, G. (1987). Concept formation and moral development. In J. Russell (Ed.), *Philosophy and mental development* (pp. 175-190). Oxford: Blackwell.

Merleau-Ponty, M. (1964). *The primacy of perception.* (J. Edie, Ed. & Trans.). Evanston: Northwestern University Press.

Ochs, E. (1990). Indexicality and socialization. In J. Stigler, R. Shweder, & G. Herdt (Eds.), *Cultural psychology: Essays on comparative human development* (pp. 287-308). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Parent Handbook (1990). University of Minnesota Child Care Center Parent Handbook. Unpublished document.

Richer, P. (1979). Alterations in the reality character of perception and the concept of sensation. In A. Giorgi, R. Knowles, & D. Smith (Eds.), *Duquesne studies in phenomenological psychology* (Vol. III). Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne University Press.

Sampson, E. (1985). The decentralization of identity: Toward a revised concept of personal and social order. *American Psychologist*, 40 (11), 1203-1211.

Sapir, E. (1974). Culture, genuine and spurious. *American Journal of Sociology*, 29, 401-492.

Shweder, R.A., & Bourne, E.J. (1982). Does the concept of the person vary cross-culturally? In A. J. Marsella & G.M. White (Eds.), *Cultural conceptions of mental health and therapy* (pp. 97-137). Boston: D. Reidel Publishing Company.

Teacher Interview (1991). Unpublished data.

Tobin, J., Wu, D.Y.H., & Davidson, D.H. (1989). *Preschool in three cultures: Japan, China, and the United States.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Validation Interviews with Teachers (1991). Unpublished data.

Address correspondence to:
Ann Johnson, Ph.D.
University of St. Thomas
St. Paul, MN 55101
USA