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Abstract

Intercultural transitions are alterations that occur in individuals and in their environments as a consequence of contact between cultures. This paper focuses on the life events that children (and the adults in their lives) may face in bridging cultures, the options they are given, the choices they make--or that adults make for them--the circumstances and experiences that accompany these choices, and their consequences. The paper identifies and discusses issues in need of research concerning ways to foster scholastic success and socioemotional well-being in populations that contemporary policies and practices may be putting at risk for school failure and for other forms of marginality. A better understanding of these issues can contribute to the improvement of intergroup relations, and it can be used to enhance the educational development and life chances of individuals from all ethnocultural and linguistic backgrounds.
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The term intercultural transition, or intercultural change, as used in this paper refers to alterations that occur in individuals and in their environments as a consequence of culture-contact situations. These alterations can occur on many levels, ranging from the most superficial and temporary (e.g., mode of dress or choice of diet) to the deepest and most lasting (e.g., a personality change or the creation of a societal institution).

All societies require their members to undergo some major life changes, or transitions, that are predictable and that profoundly alter the individual and the individual’s role in and relationship to the group. These life changes, or normative transitions, are often—but not always—accompanied by a biological change of life (e.g., school entry, graduation, puberty, matrimony, parenthood, retirement). They are almost always accompanied by a prescribed set of supporting rituals that mark, symbolize, and memorialize the change (Laosa, 1997). Scientists and scholars have devoted considerable attention to the study of normative life transitions. For example, anthropologists and folklorists have long been fascinated by the study of passage rites in the world’s past and contemporary cultures (e.g., Norbeck, 1992). Similarly, a considerable body of scientific research by developmental biologists and psychologists focuses on the transitions that surround normative biological life changes (e.g., Bornstein & Lerner, 1992; Tanner, 1992).

In addition to those normative transitions, there exist other major life changes, which are less predictable, less prevalent, and less visible; they usually lack prescribed guidelines and supports. These alterations include intercultural changes. Compared with the vast research literature on normative transitions, little scientific attention has focused on intercultural transitions generally, and particularly on their bearing on child development and education. There is, however, a growing public recognition of the far-reaching significance of
culture-contact situations for the future of American society. Yet, the causes, processes, and consequences of intercultural change remain poorly understood.

An intercultural transition is essentially a process of change by means of which an individual or a social system may bridge two different cultures. It can be subtractive, additive, or transcending. A transition is subtractive if an element of one culture is lost when an element of the other culture is acquired. A transition is additive if no loss occurs when an element of the other culture is acquired. A transcending transition occurs when a culture-contact situation becomes a catalyst for the development of some characteristic that is not typical of either culture.

A transition of any of these types can be unilateral or multilateral. If change occurs in only one of the parties in the culture-contact situation, the transition is said to be unilateral; if change occurs in both, bilateral. Moreover, a transition may be adjustable or maladjustive. It is adjustable if it makes it possible to meet the individual's needs and expectations and most of the demands placed upon the individual by the environment.

The difference between an intercultural change and an intercultural transition is a theoretical issue that awaits formulation, as discussed later in this paper. For present purposes, the two terms may be used interchangeably.

In the United States, intercultural transitions are usually subtractive or transcending-maladjustive; similarly, they are usually unilateral--although with effort they could be additive- or transcending-adjustive, and multilateral. The ambivalence and anxiety that often surrounds intercultural transitions in this country may stem from false perceptions that they cannot possibly be additive and multilateral.

A principal focus of this paper is on the life events that children (and the adults in their lives) may face in culture-contact situations, the options they are given in these situations, the choices they make--or that adults make for them--the circumstances and experiences that accompany these choices, and their consequences. The ultimate aim is to gain a better understanding of the continuities and changes that may occur in individuals' behavior--and in their environments--as a consequence of contact with cultures different from their primary
culture. In particular, the purpose of this paper is to generate discussion for input into OERI's deliberations regarding its evolving research agenda on the subject of "students at risk of educational failure." To these ends, the paper identifies and discusses issues and questions that need and merit research attention regarding the educational success and well-being of children from populations that contemporary policies and practices may be putting at risk for educational failure.

A better understanding of intercultural change can contribute significantly to the improvement of intergroup relations. This deeper understanding can in turn be used to improve education, to formulate preventive approaches to problems regarding "at-risk" student populations, and to equalize opportunities for children from all ethnocultural and linguistic backgrounds.

**Intercultural Change as Individual Experience**

The following autobiographical narrative by Chicana social psychologist and university professor Aida Hurtado (1997) provides a personal glimpse into how she, as a school-age child, experienced culture contact. It also illustrates some of the stresses and other roots of psychosocial distress that a child may experience when the demands for cultural change occur in contexts that lack sensitivity to these experiences.

I started first grade in Toledo, Ohio... my parents were part of the migrant stream that headed to the Northern United States from South Texas to pick crops during the summer months. Like many labor migrants, we eventually settled in the Midwest, and I attended an elementary school experiencing "White flight" as African Americans moved into the neighborhood. There was only one other Mexican family living in the area. At the time, the predominant ideology in research about ethnicity was that we should all be the same; that like the European immigrants before us, we too should strive to be Americans, forget our language and culture, and become part of the great American melting pot. This was not a malevolent position in the schools I attended; rather, it was offered as the solution to becoming part of the middle class and bettering our lives.

This was especially the case for students like me who learned English quickly without the aid of bilingual education and who did very well in school. The cost to me, however, was very high. Like most kids, I hated being different in any way. I pretended I didn't speak Spanish, and I wanted my mom to wear pearls like June Cleaver. There was always an uneasiness I felt in school despite my success, and certainly it was not a place where my
parents, or their history and culture were welcomed. My emerging multiplicity
due to my many significant group memberships was not recognized in school.
(p. 300)

"How these dislocations would be experienced by a dark skinned, working-class,
Mexican, Spanish-speaking, daughter of immigrant parents," Hurtado (p. 300) lamented, was
not explored.

For individuals in culture-contact situations who face conscious or subconscious
demands or decisions about adopting some aspect of the outgroup culture, the
psychological burden can be heavy. For example, there may be issues of loyalty to the
group, intergenerational conflict, threats to one's identity, the sheer difficulty of the task, the
time and effort required, fear of failure, fear of rejection by one's own group, feelings of
ambivalence, and doubts about the worth of the outcome (e.g., the probability that even a
transition will never lead to one's full acceptance by the outgroup).

Many of these issues, especially the tension and inner conflict between the press to
become acculturated, or "Americanized," and preserving one's ethnic identity can be seen in
the works of many U.S. Hispanic/Latino literary writers. The writings that emerged in the
1960s, for example, clearly express a bold affirmation of roots and an articulation of values
posed in direct contrast and opposition to "Anglo" culture. These young writers sought to
counterbalance the mainstream images of youth and the development of personal identity.
In asserting a personal identity that was not always condoned by the larger society, they
sought to create new standards and perspectives. As Augenbraum and Fernández Olmos
(1997) and other literary critics have further noted, some of these writers even chose no
longer to be confined to the traditional forms of publication or concerned with critical
recognition; they delivered their works directly to an eager public at political rallies, union
meetings, street performances, and storefront coffeehouses. Some of these authors saw
their proper duties as writers to be those of claiming lost cultural identities, advancing
sociopolitical struggles, and providing a stimulus for action against the social injustices they
saw perpetrated on their ethnocultural group. These social, psychological, and cultural
tensions are expressed, for example, in I Am Joaquín by Chicano poet Rodolfo "Corky"
González. Often published in a bilingual format, this long poem became a rallying point of the effort to create a Chicano consciousness; a few stanzas from it follow:

I am Joaquín,
lost in a world of confusion,
caught up in the whirl of a gringo society,
confused by the rules,
scorned by attitudes,
suppressed by manipulation,
and destroyed by modern society.

My fathers have lost the economic battle and won the struggle of cultural survival.

And now!
I must choose between
the paradox of victory of the spirit,
despite physical hunger, or
to exist in the grasp of American social neurosis, sterilization of the soul and a full stomach.

Yes,
I have come a long way to nowhere, unwillingly dragged by that monstrous, technical, industrial giant called Progress and Anglo success. . . .
I look at myself.
I watch my brothers.
I shed tears of sorrow.
I sow seeds of hate.
I withdraw to the safety within the circle of life--

MY OWN PEOPLE. . . .

Research and practice have often focused on cognitive variables and have tended to neglect the psychological burden that can accompany intercultural transitions. Needed are
studies to examine (a) how children experience the intercultural transitions they face in
culture-contact situations and (b) the availability of institutional and informal sources of
support that may help them through this process. Needed for this purpose are theoretical
advances and empirical research designed to examine both noncognitive and cognitive
factors as they influence, mediate, and are influenced by these experiences.

Goals, Trajectories, and Options for Intercultural Change

When different cultures initially come in contact, individuals and groups face many
choices regarding how to relate to one another. In the beginning phases of this process,
much short-term variability may be observed in the choices made by each cultural group;
later, a fairly stable relational pattern can emerge, becoming difficult—but not impossible—to
alter.

The goals of intercultural change may differ widely among the members of any given
group. Thus, two individuals from the same ethnocultural group may differ from each other
with respect to which characteristics of the outgroup, or mainstream, they wish to acquire. At
the same time, an individual’s goal and ability to fulfill it will inevitably be conditioned by the
outgroup’s openness and willingness to accept members from the individual’s group.

Acculturation Attitudes and Coping Strategies

The term acculturation attitudes refers to how individuals from a cultural group may
wish to relate to another group (Berry, 1990, 1997). A typology offered by Berry (1990) helps
to classify these attitudes and their attendant coping strategies: One category consists of
individuals who do not wish to maintain their primary cultural identity (and other elements of
their primary culture) and seek to function fully in the other culture. The goal for these
individuals is assimilation. If this trajectory is freely chosen, the model is a "melting pot;" if
forced by a dominant group, the trajectory has been called a "pressure cooker" (Berry, 1990,
p. 244).

A second category consists of persons who place a high value on maintaining their
primary culture and wish to avoid interaction with outgroups. The goal for them is separation.
If, however, this cultural distinctiveness is required by the dominant society or the person’s group is otherwise kept at a distance, the resulting model is segregation.

A third category consists of persons who wish both to maintain their primary culture and to function fully in the other culture. Their goal is integration. This course is possible only when the outgroup is open to and accepting of the group seeking integration. Berry (1990, 1997) distinguished integration from assimilation, although many writers use these two terms synonymously: cultural maintenance is sought in integration, whereas little or no interest in such continuity is sought in assimilation. A person’s goals for intercultural change may vary across domains; for example, a person may seek economic assimilation (in work) and linguistic integration (bilingualism) but ingroup marriage (Berry, 1990, p. 245).

Finally, a fourth category consists of persons with little interest either in maintaining their primary culture or in having relations with the other cultural group. This situation leads to marginalization. The classic concept of marginalization (Stonequist, 1935) may be used generically to refer to the situation of being on the margin of two cultures, being accepted or supported by neither one. When the situation of being out of touch with both cultures is the outcome of actions by a dominant society (e.g., through forced cultural loss, along with forced exclusion), the concepts of deculturation or ethnocide have been used (Berry, 1990). When a group faces both forced cultural loss and forced exclusion in the extreme, the model may become ethnic cleansing, or genocide, as recent events in the Balkans and in Africa illustrate.

The shift since the mid 1960s from European and Canadian sources of U.S. immigration to Latin American, Caribbean, Asian, and African has created a new and different multiethnic pattern in the United States (Portes & Rumbaut, 1990; Zhou, 1997a). This pattern differs sharply from the four patterns of preceding generations: the Northern pattern, with its social base of European immigrants, who expected to and were expected to assimilate; and the Southern, the Southwestern, and the Western, with their stark Black-White, Mexican-Anglo, and American Indian- and Asian-White divides based on histories of slavery, casteism, and military conquest (Erie, 1985; Glazer, 1983; Laosa, 1984b; Portes & Rumbaut,
1990; Rumbaut, 1997; Takagi, 1979; Woodward, 1966). These profound alterations in the ethnic/racial composition of the population raise two broad questions, one addressing macro-level issues, and the other, individuals’ opportunities and choices: How will the United States build a country out of diverse peoples from all over the world? What models of intercultural adaptation, human development, and education will emerge in the present and future generations of Americans? In a dynamic nation whose place in the world, sources of migration, and self-image constantly change, these questions must again and again be raised, as Glazer (1983) noted, and their answers must be pondered.

Needed is research to obtain a deeper knowledge and understanding of the goals for intercultural change that educators and parents have for students, and that students have for themselves. At the same time, also needed is a better understanding of the underlying conflicts that may exist among the goals that varied parties may have for a student’s intercultural change; and a better understanding of the effects that such unresolved conflicts—and their resolutions—may have on students’ scholastic performance, psychosocial development, and well-being. How do conflicting demands for intercultural change put students at risk for educational failure? What realistic options and opportunities for making intercultural transitions do individuals have? What constraints? What dilemmas or double binds do students, families, and educators face with respect to demands for intercultural change?

Assimilation vs. Acculturation

As a concept, assimilation bears two distinct facets: One is descriptive; the other, prescriptive (Fernández-Kelly & Schauffler, 1994). From a descriptive standpoint, the concept refers empirically to a range of self-adjustments by individuals as they blend into a cultural group different from their own. From a prescriptive stance, the concept evokes the normative expectation that, as the individuals thus blend, they will shed, or at least contain, their native culture.

An important theoretical distinction—articulated early by Gordon (1964), as Hurtado (1997) reminded us—is that between acculturation and assimilation. In Gordon’s formulation,
each of these concepts is a distinct multidimensional construct. "Cultural assimilation, or acculturation, . . . may take place even when none of the other types of assimilation [structural, marital, identificational, attitude receptional, behavior receptional, and civic] occurs, . . . and this condition of 'acculturation only' may continue indefinitely" (Gordon, 1964, p. 77). His approach thus recognized that there may be variations in level of assimilation as well as in level of acculturation of individuals and groups. In Gordon's view, the aim of empirical research is to identify the characteristics that a group (i.e., "minority group") may share in common with another group (i.e., the "dominant White" group). In his view, a group is considered to be more or less assimilated/acculturated depending on its similarity to the "dominant" group. Notwithstanding its shortcomings and the ideological objections to it, Gordon's framework made a significant contribution to the field by recognizing that an individual may become highly acculturated (i.e., culturally assimilated) and yet remain unassimilated on other dimensions. Assessing Gordon's theoretical formulation in its historical context, Hurtado (1997, p. 301) further noted that it was "revolutionary at the time" because it recognized nuances of cultural adaptations and possible levels and combinations of acculturation and assimilation, and it provided for empirically measuring these different dimensions. Studies stimulated by Gordon's work led to the recognition that structurally assimilated individuals (e.g., as measured by income and education) can "remain ethnic and loyal to their communities of origin rather than joining the ranks of marginal [individuals]" (Hurtado, 1997, p. 301).

Because cultural assimilation was for Gordon (1964) a necessary first step toward full assimilation, acculturation came to occupy the top priority on the agenda for immigrant adjustment (Zhou, 1997a). In his view, ethnic groups would remain distinguished from one another depending largely on the degree to which the groups gained the acceptance of the dominant population. Gordon anticipated, nevertheless, that ethnic minorities would eventually lose all their distinctive characteristics and cease to exist as ethnic groups as they would pass through the stages of assimilation, eventually intermarrying with the majority...
population and entering its institutions on a primary-group basis (Gordon, 1964; Zhou, 1997a).

**Classical Theories of Assimilation**

The traditional theories of assimilation (e.g., Gordon, 1964; Park, 1950; Warner & Srole, 1945; Wirth, 1928/1956) and related concepts such as the melting pot are based on the turn-of-the-century American immigrant experience—an era, and thus an experience, profoundly different from the present (Portes, 1994, 1997). Nevertheless, concepts from that era constitute the intellectual legacy and the interpretive guides for much of the contemporary academic research, public debate, and policy formulation. Those concepts reflect a view of assimilation as a "single straight-line" process, predicting that immigrants will, over time, lose their cultural and socioeconomic distinctiveness and thus blend into the melting pot, or mainstream, of U.S. society (e.g., Gordon, 1964; Park, 1950). Longer residence in the United States would lead to "Americanization," namely, to socioeconomic advancement beyond the parental generation and to the narrowing of differences from the native population. Although typically framed as intergenerational social mobility, the hypothesis logically applies also to intragenerational change (Hirschman, 1994; Landale, 1997).

In short, the standard perspectives on assimilation generally assume that there exists a natural process by which diverse ethnic groups come to share a common culture and to gain equal access to the society's opportunity structure—a process consisting of individuals' gradually discarding their native culture in favor of the society's mainstream culture; once begun, this process proceeds inevitably and irreversibly toward full assimilation (Park, 1950; Warner & Srole, 1945; Wirth, 1928/1956).

**Challenges to the Conventional Model of Assimilation**

Although the standard model of assimilation continues to inform much of the current thinking on intercultural change, recent research casts doubt on its generalizability across populations and historical periods (e.g., Caplan, Whitmore, & Choy, 1989; Gibson, 1988; Waters, 1994, 1997; Zhou & Bankston, 1994). Recent changes in this nation, in the composition of its immigrant and native populations, and in the world have prompted some
scholars to question whether the assimilation concepts from an earlier era can help us understand contemporary events (e.g., Portes, 1994, 1997; Vernez & Abrahamse, 1996; Zhou, 1997a). As Portes (1994) and others have noted, a fortuitous combination of circumstances—including a rapidly expanding economy, a scarcity of labor stemming from a global military conflict, and other factors—allowed offspring of the turn-of-the-century European immigrants to advance steadily up the economic and social ladders. African American and Puerto Rican migrants who arrived in the northern United States later in the century were less fortunate (see, e.g., Weinberg, 1977). Different circumstances, including widespread racial discrimination and a changing economy, limited their socioeconomic mobility and that of their children. Similarly, other non-European ancestry groups elsewhere in the country, including persons of Mexican heritage, continued to face barriers to their educational and socioeconomic advancement (Laosa, 1984b). The perpetuation of these conditions led to the urban problems that prompted new academic theories (Portes, 1994), including the concepts of the "culture of poverty" (Valentine, 1968), the "urban underclass" (Wilson, 1987), and the "new urban poverty" (Wilson, 1995).

Doubts about the current validity of the standard assimilation model are based largely on observations of structural changes in social and economic conditions, which many researchers have argued may be contributing to the creation of environments that offer few incentives and opportunities for educational achievement and economic advancement (e.g., Hirschman, 1994; Portes, 1994, 1997; Portes & Rumbaut, 1990). For example, some researchers have noted a growing "oppositional culture" among many young Americans, especially among those feeling oppressed by and excluded from a mainstream culture that highly values freedom and materialism (e.g., Ogbu, 1986, 1990, 1994, 1995; Wilson, 1995). The social isolation of such youngsters and their perceived future of constrained opportunities can naturally lead to resentment toward the U.S. middle-class mainstream culture and to rejection of its mores and authority and of the goals of educational achievement. For children who have a normal need to maintain self-esteem but who face environmental conditions that cause serious frustration and pessimism, these adversarial stances may
"become important strategies for psychological survival" (Zhou, 1997a, p. 70). If spread through the peer group, such attitudes and expectations will likely affect educational outcomes negatively for many children (Ogbu, 1986, 1990, 1994, 1995). Although discussed less frequently, ethnic/racial prejudice is doubtless a key contributor to the classic assimilation model’s failure for certain groups.

Some scholars have turned their attention to the study of resilient children, namely, children who succeed scholastically and socioemotionally under environmental conditions in which the vast majority of their peers fail. These researchers seek to identify and understand the factors that contribute to resilience, namely, these children’s ability to succeed in spite of the enormous odds against them (e.g., Garmezy & Rutter, 1983; Harrington & Boardman, 1997; Laosa, 1990b; O’Connor, 1997; Rutter, 1979, 1990; Wang & Gordon, 1994; Werner, 1986).

The discussion above brings forward a need for research on within-group individual differences in the context of ecological approaches to the study of intercultural change, a point discussed further later in this paper. Among the emerging alternatives to the conventional assimilation model is the segmented assimilation hypothesis, discussed below.

**Segmented Assimilation.**

Although the early theorists recognized certain intricacies of the assimilation process (e.g., Gordon, 1964), recent research suggests a greater complexity, including the emergence of multiple pathways of assimilation. For example, studies suggest that assimilation is not necessarily a single linear process: Under certain conditions it becomes a segmented process (Portes & Zhou, 1993; Waters, 1994, 1997; Zhou, 1997a, b; Zhou & Bankston, 1994). These findings point to a need to reframe the issues by asking: Assimilation to what? Assimilation by whom?

As the term segmented assimilation implies, the reference point for intercultural change in the United States is not a single mainstream group. According to this hypothesis, articulated by Portes and Zhou (1993), immigrants settle in, and are thus absorbed by, varied segments of American society—ranging from affluent suburbs to impoverished urban
neighborhoods. Such contextual differences may partly explain, for example, why some immigrant children assimilate to the underclass whereas others advance rapidly educationally (and hence economically) while preserving their ancestral culture.

Thus, in certain contexts, becoming "American" may not be an advantage for a child's prospects for scholastic success. Consider, for instance, a family who settles in a neighborhood characterized by a deteriorating social environment, including the presence of youth gangs with oppositional attitudes toward formal schooling, frequent violence, or illicit drug dealing. Children's "Americanization" to these conditions may be disadvantageous relative to retaining the traditional values and behavior patterns of the family's ancestral culture and cultivating their ethnic ties in their ethnic communities in order to preserve or develop behavior patterns "likely to break the cycle of disadvantage and to lead to upward mobility" (Zhou, 1997a, p. 91). Indeed, when the forces of assimilation come mainly from a segment of the society characterized by conditions such as these, assimilation will likely result in distinct disadvantages, viewed as maladjustment by both the mainstream society and the ethnic community (Hirschman, 1994; Portes & Zhou, 1993; Zhou, 1997a, b).

Portes and Zhou (1993) identified three modes of immigrant incorporation in this country: the traditional assimilation pattern; "downward" assimilation (i.e., confinement to a permanent, multiethnic underclass); and an adaptation pattern characterized by the child's rapidly attaining a high level of formal education (and eventual economic success) within the context of a tightly knit, supportive family and community of co-ethnics who deliberately preserve and reinforce the ancestral culture.

The last pattern implies that ethnic families and communities possess ethnocultural resources that can "confer advantages on their young as they seek avenues for successful adaptation" (Portes, 1994, p. 636). Recent studies demonstrate that a child's trajectory of adaptation and development in culture-contact situations may depend at least partly on the ethnocultural resources that their families and communities of co-ethnics can bring to bear on this process (e.g., Caplan et al., 1989; Gibson, 1988; Waters, 1994, 1997; Zhou & Bankston, 1994). These resources consist of informal social networks and other associations of
co-ethnics who purposely preserve their ancestral cultural orientations (e.g., values, behavior patterns) and, through ethnic solidarity, create a socially integrated community, or social structure, that enables families to provide ongoing mutual support and direction and to promote value conformity, thus influencing children to behave consistently with the expectations (e.g., academic achievement, hard work) of the community (see, e.g., Coleman, 1987, 1990; Sullivan, 1997; Zhou & Bankston, 1994). Indeed, these resources, or social capital, may be at least as pivotal as human capital (e.g., formal education, skills acquired through organized instruction) and financial capital in determining the outcome of the adaptation process in culture-contact situations. According to this hypothesis, which needs further study, the varied forms of capital will interact with ecological and other factors to shape the course and outcome of the adaptation process.

**Biculturism**

One of the central questions regarding intercultural transitions is, How do individuals respond to the demands for personal change and adaptation placed upon them by culture-contact situations? The developmental tasks and processes that this response entails cannot be understood merely as those of acquiring a new language, forging a new role as a student, and learning a set of academic skills. Entering a new and different cultural environment disrupts the sense of security and of self-continuity of the individual. The prospects and the experience of entering this new environment produce emotional stress. The causes of this stress may lie partly, as Marris (1980) argued, in the disruption of structures of meaning--defined as the conceptual organization of understandings of one's physical and social surroundings and of one's self.

In this view, an individual's structure of meaning emerges gradually during the course of socialization, as a product of this socialization. It consists, as articulated by Marris, of the unique understandings that individuals form out of their own experiences, as well as the shared knowledge that individuals learn about a culture that provides them with ways of solving the problems of crises of change. Structures of meaning may be highly specific, as "they are embodied in unique emotional attachments and commitments to persons, places,
and political entities" (p. 97). The prospects of acquiring a new way of life and of possibly losing one's own (or some aspect of it) are interruptions of the continuity of the structure of meaning. Change may mean loss and bereavement of intimate bonds (e.g., to persons, beliefs, customs, competencies), which can lead to grief and mourning syndromes. Coping strategies, therefore, are to be viewed not only as instrumental means for dealing with the immediate psychological loss and for acquiring new roles and skills but also as efforts to recover meanings that may be irretrievably lost, or threatened, when one is exposed to or enters a new and different cultural environment.

Thus, the developmental task for an individual who faces demands for intercultural change is difficult, complex, and uncharted. This task may require that the individual construct not only a meaning structure that is appropriate for the purposes of functioning in the new cultural setting at a desired level, but also a superordinate, or bicultural, structure of meaning that integrates both cultures' structures of meaning and that is appropriate for the individual's functioning as a bicultural person.

Needed is a better understanding of the tasks and processes of bicultural development. Also needed is research to shed light on the informal and formal social support systems, educational programs, and other factors that may facilitate this development.

**Consequences of Language Loss**

In recent years, a growing concern in the United States among many members of the public, educators, and policy makers is that the "new immigrants" and other ethnocultural groups in this country may not be assimilating quickly enough. A widespread, largely unsubstantiated (Kim, Collins, & McArthur, 1997) belief is that immigrants are refusing to learn English, and that this resistance accounts for many of their children's academic progress falling below standard. Partly as a consequence of this belief, bilingual education has lost support in recent years. For example, the state of California no longer has a legal mandate for bilingual education; the legislation requiring it expired in 1987 and has not been renewed (Fix & Zimmermann, 1997; Wong Fillmore, 1991b). This situation is a serious concern
among many education experts who regard bilingual education as the most appropriate and pedagogically sound approach to educating language-minority children in the nation’s public schools. Bilingual education remains available to only a fraction of the language-minority student population; moreover, of the available programs, most emphasize the learning of English and neglect the use and retention of the students’ primary languages. Consequently, many young children are losing their ability to speak and understand their primary language (Wong Fillmore, 1991a, b).

The societal attitudes and beliefs that contribute to this replacement of Spanish by English, to the view that the Spanish language is of lower status than English and that Hispanic/Latino cultures are inferior to "mainstream" culture (i.e., that they should not be maintained or that schools should not contribute to their maintenance), have been called legitimizing myths. Sidanius, Pratto, and Rabinowitz (1994) defined legitimizing myths as group-relevant "sociopolitical attitudes, ideologies, opinions, beliefs, values, causal attributions, and public policy initiatives that either express support for, or opposition to, the redistribution of social value among social groups (e.g., social classes, ethnic/racial groups, genders, nations). . . . These legitimizing myths are . . . used to give moral and intellectual legitimacy to the uneven distribution of social value within the social system and the resultant hierarchical structure within this social system" (p. 196).

Essayist Richard Rodriguez, born in the United States to a Spanish-speaking family of Mexican descent, recounted that, shortly after he entered first grade, three teachers from his school visited his house and, with the best of intentions, asked his parents to encourage their children to practice English actively at home. "Of course, my parents complied. What would they not do for their children’s well-being? . . . The moment after the visitors left, the change was observed. Ahora, speak to us en inglés, my father and mother united to tell us" (1982, p. 21). His and his siblings’ relationships with their parents altered radically and irrevocably as a consequence of learning English and losing the ability to speak their native language:

At last, seven years old, I came to believe what had been technically true since my birth; I was an American citizen.
But the special feeling of closeness at home was diminished by then. Gone was the desperate, urgent, intense feeling of being at home; rare was the experience of feeling myself individualized by family intimates. We remained a loving family, but one greatly changed. No longer so close; no longer bound tight by the pleasing and troubling knowledge of our public separateness. . . .

The family's quiet was partly due to the fact that, as we children learned more and more English, we shared fewer and fewer words with our parents. Sentences needed to be spoken slowly when a child addressed his mother or father. (Often the parent wouldn't understand.) The child would need to repeat himself. (Still the parent misunderstood.) The young voice, frustrated, would end up saying, "Never mind"--the subject was closed. Dinners would be noisy with the clinking of knives and forks against dishes. My mother would smile softly between her remarks; my father at the other end of the table would chew and chew at his food, while he stared over the heads of his children.

My mother! My father! After English became my primary language, I no longer knew what words to use in addressing my parents. The old Spanish words (those tender accents of sound) I had used earlier--mamá and papá--I couldn't use anymore. They would have been too painful reminders of how much had changed in my life. On the other hand, the words I heard neighborhood kids call their parents seemed equally unsatisfactory. Mother and Father; Ma, Papa, Pa, Dad, Pop (how I hated the all-American sound of that last word especially)--all these terms I felt were unsuitable, not really terms of address for my parents. As a result, I never used them at home. Whenever I'd speak to my parents, I would try to get their attention with eye contact alone. In public conversations, I'd refer to "my parents" or "my mother and father."

My mother and father, for their part, responded differently, as their children spoke to them less. She grew restless, seemed troubled and anxious at the scarcity of words exchanged in the house. It was she who would question me about my day when I came home from school. She smiled at small talk. She pried at the edges of my sentences to get me to say something more. (What?) She'd join conversations she overheard, but her intrusions often stopped her children's talking. By contrast, my father seemed reconciled to the new quiet. Though his English improved somewhat, he retired into silence. At dinner he spoke very little. One night his children and even his wife helplessly giggled at his garbled English pronunciation of the Catholic Grace before Meals. Thereafter he made his wife recite the prayer at the start of each meal, even on formal occasions, when there were guests in the house. . . . His children grew so accustomed to his silence that, years later, they would speak routinely of his shyness. . . . But my father was not shy, I realized, when I'd watch him speaking Spanish with relatives. Using Spanish, he was quickly effusive. . . . His voice would spark, flicker, flare alive with sounds. . . . He expressed ideas and feelings he rarely revealed in
English. With firm Spanish sounds, he conveyed confidence and authority English would never allow him. (Rodriguez, 1982, pp. 22-25)

Only recently have the potentially negative consequences of language loss begun to be explored by research scientists (Wong Fillmore, 1991b; notable exceptions include Merino, 1983, and Pan & Berko-Gleason, 1986, as cited in Wong Fillmore, 1991b). Needed is research on the dynamics and consequences of language loss, including the effects of this loss on both socioemotional and intellectual development. Also needed is research on the relationship between second language acquisition and first language maintenance/loss. There is also a need to gain a better understanding of the variables that may moderate language loss; these variables include characteristics of the instructional services that schools provide to children whose native language is other than English.

In addition, there is a need to gain a better understanding of population-specific needs with respect to first language maintenance/loss. Consider, for example, children who migrate back and forth between the United States and Puerto Rico. If children from this specific subpopulation do not continue their native language literacy development while residing in the United States, they will then lag behind their peers on the island when they return thereto; this situation may lead to marginalization, which can cause severe maladjustment and may put them at risk for educational failure.

**Research on Acculturation**

Acculturation has been a topic of considerable discussion among many U.S. Hispanic/Latino scholars in recent years. There is little disagreement that with increased exposure to a particular culture, individuals generally tend to acquire the characteristics of members of that culture—that is, they "acculturate." There is less consensus, however, about the dynamics, course, depth, and measurement of this process or about the psychological mechanisms that mediate its course.

In social and behavioral science research, biculturism has typically been thought of in terms of individual differences along a continuum of acculturation to a particular culture. This continuum is composed of various dimensions or variables. Instruments designed to
measure the level of acculturation to Mexican culture in persons living in the United States, for example, have typically included such items or variables as the frequency of exposure to or use of the Spanish language with family, peers, and through the mass media (e.g., Spanish language TV); food and music preferences; cognitive knowledge of particular aspects of the culture; the amount of contact with persons of Mexican origin; the number of past generations in this country; the country of birth; and, if born outside the United States, the number of years living in this country.

Language preference and language use variables predominate in the conceptions of acculturation that guide many of the existing studies on acculturation. For instance, Martinez, Norman, and Delaney (1984) developed a 30-item Children's Hispanic Background Scale; each item is rated on a four-point scale (1 = almost always, 4 = almost never). Twenty-eight items focus on Spanish language use (e.g., "I speak Spanish," "My mother speaks to me in Spanish," "My father speaks to my brothers in Spanish"), and two items on food preferences (e.g., "My family eats Mexican food"). According to Martinez et al. (1984), low scores on this scale represent "high Hispanic cultural exposure and probably low Anglo acculturation, and high scores the reverse" (p. 107).

Padilla (1980) proposed a theoretical model of acculturation that consists of two major dimensions, "cultural awareness" and "ethnic loyalty," and developed a 136-item scale to measure them. Cuéllar, Arnold, and Maldonado (1995) have recently revised a frequently used acculturation scale.

**Culture Change and Psychological Well-Being**

Psychologists have often postulated a relationship between acculturation and psychological well-being. One hypothesis predicts that ethnic minority persons who are relatively unacculturated (to the mainstream society or to the dominant group) will--because of language barriers, insufficient knowledge of how to interact successfully in the mainstream or dominant culture, and the resulting isolation or discrimination--tend to experience higher stress levels than their more highly acculturated counterparts (e.g., Ortiz & Arce, 1984). The opposite prediction has also been proposed. According to this hypothesis, the process of
acculturation may draw the person away from the social and familial structure of the primary culture—thus causing the loss of a significant source of nurturance and support that could provide protection from stress (Ortiz & Arce, 1984). The argument has been extended by hypothesizing a curvilinear relationship between acculturation and psychological well-being. That is, persons "caught" between two cultures may consequently experience more conflict and therefore more stress and distress than those highly integrated into either the new culture or the primary one. In short, diverse hypotheses have been advanced regarding the effects of acculturation on psychosocial functioning and well-being: Some researchers have hypothesized a positive relationship between acculturation and psychological distress; others, a negative relationship; and still others, a curvilinear relationship, predicting that biculturality will exert an optimal influence on the individual's socioemotional functioning and well-being.

The results of empirical studies appear inconclusive regarding these alternative hypotheses. In a recent review of the literature on acculturation and mental health status among U.S. Hispanics/Latinos, Rogler, Cortes, and Malgady (1991) found 12 studies that supported a positive relationship, 13 a negative relationship, and 3 a curvilinear relationship. Rogler et al. concluded, "What appears at first glance to be an essentially simple hypothesis designating a relationship between acculturation and mental health status is in fact a complex set of propositions designating multiple linkages between cultural and psychological processes," and pointed out the need for "new [research] directions, proceeding from but not constricted by the assumptions and procedures in the work already done" (p. 591).

**Berry's Conception of Acculturation**

The extensive and complex literature on acculturation contains numerous conceptual frameworks, which attempt to systematize the process of acculturation and the main factors that affect an individual's adaptation (e.g., Berry, 1990, 1997; Berry, Trimble, & Olmedo, 1986; Olmedo, 1979; Rogler, 1994; Ward, 1996). An example is Berry's (1997) framework, which postulates that the nature of a person's psychological acculturation and eventual adaptation to a culture other than his or her primary culture depend on three types of group-level factors and on the moderating influences of individual-level factors. He labeled the types of
group-level factors, society-of-origin, group-acculturation, and society-of-settlement factors. Factors of the first type include the political context, economic situation, and demographic characteristics of the person's primary society or society of origin. The second type comprises physical, biological, economic, social, and cultural factors. Factors of the third type include the attitudes and social support present in each society.

The individual-level factors, or moderators, he divided into those that occur prior to and during acculturation. Those prior to acculturation include age, gender, education, motivation, expectations, cultural distance, and personality factors; those during acculturation include phase (length of time), acculturation strategies (attitudes and behaviors), coping (strategies and resources), social support, and societal attitudes (prejudice and discrimination). Resulting from the effects of the group- and individual-level factors are the "psychological acculturation phenomena" (p. 14); that is, the cultural groups-in-contact's bringing about changes in their respective collective features (e.g., political, economic, and social structures), which affect the individual experiencing acculturation, results in a number of possible psychological experiences and changes (acculturation experiences/life events, appraisal of experience/stressors, strategies/coping) that influence a person's adaptation.

New Directions for Research on Acculturation

Despite the extensive literature on the topic, questions remain about the process of acculturation, what the proper unit of analysis (individual vs. group) should be, and whether an adequate model can be formulated to describe and explain the nature, rate, and extent of acculturative change and its impact on the psychological functioning of the individual.

The processes involved in intercultural transitions appear vastly more complex and dynamic than the operational definitions typically given to the notion of "acculturation" in empirical research thus far. Some of these intricacies have been brought forward, for example, in discussions by Keefe and Padilla (1987) regarding research on Chicano ethnicity. Evidence is now clear that the processes of individual change accompanying intergroup contact are immensely more complex and multidimensional than has typically been assumed.
in empirical research on acculturation. What these processes are or how they operate are questions, however, that have yet to be satisfactorily answered.

Because the general notion of acculturation is exceedingly global and ambiguous, there is a need for research that can help to "unpackage" it. That is, there is a need to examine much more than just the variables that have been used to operationalize conceptions of acculturation. It is important to examine specific processes of change in the context of human development and education in specific populations. In order to advance the present state of knowledge of intercultural change, future research should avoid reliance on such global constructs as acculturation.

**Developmental Perspectives**

A few investigators (e.g., Laosa, 1997b; Schönpflug, 1997) have recently argued that there is a need to formulate theoretical approaches to the study of culture change that incorporate a developmental perspective. Models of acculturation such as Berry’s (1997) framework represent significant conceptual advances, but they lack a developmental perspective and therefore cannot adequately address questions regarding enduring outcomes (of the acculturation process) at the level of cognitive and personality changes. To illustrate this point, Schönpflug (1997) reminded us that many approaches to the study of acculturation, including Berry’s (1997), are based on a stress-coping paradigm such as that proposed by Lazarus and Folkman (1984), a paradigm that is intended to explain changes made in response to situational demands rather than to model "developmentally induced long-lasting changes" (p. 53). Also, the changes induced by the stress-coping process are not necessarily changes toward acculturation; they may be an outcome of the increasing self-organization of the individual during the course of normal development.

Scientists who study the development of human behavior aim chiefly to illuminate the history and growth of individuals' behavior and the functions and causes of behavior—i.e., short, what develops and when, how, and why (e.g., Bornstein & Lamb, 1992; Bornstein & Lerner, 1992; Hartup & van Lieshout, 1995; Parke, Ornstein, Rieser, & Zahn-Waxler, 1994). The study of culture change in individuals has seldom been approached from a developmental
perspective because comprehensive conceptions of human development are typically so complex that the attempts to superimpose them on the similarly intricate issues of culture-contact situations become dauntingly difficult (Laosa, 1997b).

As is generally true of scientific constructs, development is not a straightforward empirical concept but rather a postulate; as such, there is no consensus on a single conception of development. Whether development has occurred in any given instance is ascertained by whether the data fit a concept (e.g., metatheory, paradigm) of development. Among the many and varied conceptions of human development (see, e.g., Baltes & Nesselroade, 1979; Bornstein & Lamb, 1992; Bornstein & Lerner, 1992; Brim & Kagan, 1980; Emmerich, 1968, 1977; Laosa, 1979/1989; Loevinger, 1976, 1987; Parke et al., 1994; Piaget, 1983; Wainryb, 1993; White, 1983; Wohlwill, 1973), one emerging view recognizes that human beings generally undergo periods of relative stability and periods of marked change, or transition, that important changes can occur throughout the entire life span, and that many individuals retain a great capacity for change (Brim & Kagan, 1980). Typically, however, the concept of transition is ambiguous; the term is used and interpreted in a variety of ways. Thus, as some writers have observed, transitions can be defined by time periods in the life span, by role changes, by internal transformations in the individual, or by external events (e.g., Bronfenbrenner & Crouter, 1983; Connell & Furman, 1984; Emmerich, 1968; Reese & Smyer, 1983).

The difference between an intercultural transition and simple intercultural change is a theoretical issue that awaits formulation. For example, a strategy for the study of development is to conceptualize change as temporal events divisible into successive states and subsequently to find patterns in the succession of these "snapshots" (Siegel, Bisanz, & Bisanz, 1983). Change may thus be studied developmentally by first positing successive states of organization and then drawing inferences about the nature of the change. Beyond description of sequence and generalization about the direction of change, a goal is to specify the principles, properties, or mechanisms that result in the observed change (e.g., Siegel et al., 1983). In short, mechanisms of transition must form part of a theory of transitions. The
alterations may occur in overt behavior, in an underlying attribute, or in the structural or organizational properties of the person (or of the group or the environment).

Such a theory should also distinguish the transitional event, that is, the instigation of the transition, from the transitional period, the duration of the transition (cf. Connell & Furman, 1984). It should also consider the effects of the event's timing, the point in the course of the individual's psychological or biological development at which the event occurs (Brim & Ryff, 1980; Elder, 1995; Laosa, 1979/1989). Connell and Furman (1984) suggested that extended periods of transition will most likely occur when a transitional event precipitates multiple effects or when these effects in turn initiate further changes. Because the transitional period does not always occur immediately after the event, as in cases of delayed and inhibited grief reactions (Carr, 1985; DiMatteo, 1991; Gonda, 1989), and because it may even begin prior to the event, as in cases of anticipatory socialization (Brim & Ryff, 1980; Kolker & Ahmed, 1980; Laosa, 1997b; Pruchno, Blow, & Smyer 1989), caution is warranted when attempting to pinpoint the causes of transitions (Connell & Furman, 1984; Pruchno et al., 1989; Laosa, 1997b; Reese & Smyer, 1983).

These approaches to the study of transitions are compatible with the goals of instructional psychology (Siegel et al., 1983). It has been argued that instructional theory must be directed toward characterizing both the initial and the subsequent states of the learner's knowledge and the conditions or mechanisms that influence transition from state to state (e.g., Garcia & Colón, 1995; Glaser, 1976). As Siegel et al. (1983) noted, a developmental approach to the study of transitions is primarily a descriptive and explanatory enterprise, whereas instructional psychology is prescriptive in that it chiefly aims to optimize the acquisition of knowledge and skills. Needed for the field of education and allied professions is a theory of intercultural transitions that not only will describe, explain, and predict but also can be used to guide applied practice. To these ends, a need exists to undertake work intended to make theoretical advances to guide research that can integrate multiple sources of variance, including individual and group differences, contextual and
situational effects, developmental processes, and socialization and learning (see, e.g., Emmerich, 1988; Laosa, 1979/1989, 1997b; Moen, Elder, & Lüscher, 1995).

**Ecological Approaches**

Because participation in society means participation in a complex social order, it is important to consider the child’s development as embedded in the larger society. A helpful conception of the ecology of human development is Bronfenbrenner’s framework (Bronfenbrenner, 1977, 1979, 1988, 1995). It emphasizes “the progressive accommodation, throughout the life span, between the growing human organism and the changing environment in which it lives and grows” (1977, p. 513). This emphasis is found also in Laosa’s (1979/1989) socioculturally relativistic paradigm and in Sameroff’s (1983) general systems approach.

Bronfenbrenner’s framework, offering as it does a useful vocabulary, considers the environment as a set of four nested structures, each inside the next (Bronfenbrenner, 1979, 1988, 1995). At the innermost level is the **microsystem**, the immediate setting containing the person (e.g., home, classroom). Next is the **mesosystem**, which refers to the relations among the individual’s microsystem settings at any given point in his or her development. For example, a child’s ability to learn in school may depend as much on the linkages between home and school as on a particular curriculum. The third level, the **exosystem**, refers to the hypothesis that individuals’ environments are affected by events occurring in settings in which they are not even present. For instance, parents’ experiences at the work site may indirectly influence their child’s context in the home. Finally, there is the overarching **macrosystem**, the "blueprint" that every society, culture, or subculture has for the organization of every type of setting. As a consequence of alterations in this blueprint (e.g., a change in policy, an economic crisis), the settings at the other levels of the ecology can become markedly altered and produce corresponding changes in human behavior and development.

Schools are social institutions ecologically niched in individual communities that are in turn embedded in larger, layered systems. What each school is like will be determined in part by this ecology. In the United States, vast ecological differences exist among schools.
This subject raises a broad range of research issues in need of attention, as discussed further in later sections of this paper. These considerations bear especially on children from ethnocultural and linguistic minority groups. For many of these children, the school is the first--and perhaps the only--influential point of direct experience with a mainstream socializing institution.

In recent years, the public debate over education reform has focused primarily on academic standards, accountability, and student assessment. Although these are critically important issues, others equally critical exist; in particular, insufficient attention has been given to the ecology of schools. Thus, needed is ecologically oriented research addressing characteristics of schools, classrooms, families, and communities, and focusing on within-group individual differences in the context of issues of intercultural change discussed in this paper. This research would generate sound scientific information that can and, it is hoped, will be used for the formulation of policies and practices to ensure a fair opportunity for success for all children, including particularly children from populations that contemporary policies and practices may be putting at risk for scholastic failure and other forms of marginality. Unless prevented, such failures will continue to take an increasingly heavy toll on the nation.

Granted, it is difficult and often impossible to include more than one or two ecological levels in a single study and yet avoid superficiality. But regardless of the number of levels directly included in a particular study, the interpretation of the study's results should as much as possible take cognizance of the other layers of the ecological system.

An illustration of research focusing on both microsystem and exosystem variables is a series of studies of maternal teaching strategies, conducted by the present author. These studies sought to "unpackage" what is commonly called social class; that is, to analyze separately the components of socioeconomic status (SES), an exosystem factor, and then to examine the influence of these exosystem components upon particular features of parents' teaching strategies in the home, a microsystem factor. One of the studies, which focused on a sample of Chicano families of widely varied parental schooling levels (Laosa, 1978; see
also Laosa, 1980a, b, 1981, 1982), showed that the level of formal schooling attained by individuals is a significant predictor of the teaching strategies that they, upon becoming adults, will use in teaching their own children. These teaching strategies may in turn determine the learning styles their children develop. Because some learning styles may be more compatible with certain classroom teaching strategies, this chain of ecological effects may put certain children at risk for educational failure if they are placed with teachers whose teaching strategies do not match those of the child's parents. Needed is continued research on these issues, as discussed further below.

Cultural Discontinuities and Continuities

In recent years, researchers and educators have become increasingly interested in the discontinuities that children from certain ethnic groups may experience between the culture of the home and that of the school. This interest has been stimulated by the hypothesis that these discontinuities may explain, at least partly, the observed mean differences in educational achievement among U.S. ethnic groups. Underlying this hypothesis is the difficult challenge expressed in the question, How can children, families, and schools successfully navigate a largely uncharted, often bewildering gulf between the culture of the home and the cultures of the school and of the larger society?

The research literature offers various conceptual approaches to explain the differences in mean scholastic achievement among U.S. ethnocultural groups. The most influential approaches attribute these achievement differences to discontinuities (i.e., differences, incompatibilities, mismatches) between the school and the culture of the home. Important differences among three types of cultural discontinuity approaches hinge on interpreting these discontinuities:

Some approaches evaluate the cultural discontinuities as deficiencies in the child or in the home. For example, one perspective attributes the scholastic failure of children from certain non-Euro-American ethnic groups to culturally determined socialization practices in the home (e.g., Heller, 1966). These approaches typically view such socialization practices as inferior to those that generally occur in Euro-American middle-class families.
Other approaches interpret the discontinuities within a framework of cultural differences rather than deficiencies (e.g., Boykin, 1986; Cárdenas, 1995; Cárdenas & Cárdenas, 1973, 1977; Cohen & Pompa, 1994; Delgado-Gaitan, 1994; Durán & Szymanski, 1995; Farr, 1993; Foster, 1995; Gutierrez, 1995; Heath, 1983; Jordan, Au, & Joesting, 1983; Laosa, 1977c, 1982, 1983; Laosa & Henderson, 1991; McNeil & Laosa, 1975; Mohatt & Erickson, 1981; Phillips, 1974; Rogoff, 1990; Rogoff, Mistry, Gönçü, & Mosier, 1993; Villegas, 1991). The problem, according to these approaches, is that socialization patterns in families from certain ethnocultural groups are inconsistent with—not inferior to—certain pedagogical practices in schools.

Still other approaches point to attitudes and values that emerge as coping strategies in groups that have historically been victimized by discrimination, strategies that are dysfunctional for scholastic success. For example, Ogbu (1978, 1986, 1990, 1994, 1995) hypothesized that because of job ceilings and other forms of economic discrimination, many members of these groups see little connection between school success and jobs earnings, and therefore see little point in expending great efforts in school. Many members of some immigrant groups as well, Ogbu further argued, eventually discern that a disadvantageous opportunity structure exists for their group in the United States. These perceptions give rise to achievement-related beliefs, which in turn cause what Ogbu called low academic effort syndrome: "Even young children will begin to form their image of the connection or lack of connection between school success and future employment or self-advancement. As the children get older and encounter personal failures and frustrations as they try to get part-time and summer jobs, these perceptions and frustrations discourage them from maximizing their academic efforts" (Ogbu & Matute-Bianchi, 1986, pp. 123-128; see also Goldenberg & Gallimore, 1995; Phelan, Davidson, & Cao, 1991; Phelan, Yu, & Davidson, 1994; Wilson, 1995).

In short, these three perspectives, as different as they are, share in common a major emphasis—that is, they attribute the scholastic difficulties of many children from certain ethnic
groups to cultural discontinuities between the home and the school—but they lead to very different interpretations of these discontinuities and hence to divergent policy implications.

Some researchers (e.g., Goldenberg & Gallimore, 1995) have offered a variation on these perspectives by noting that, in addition to home-school discontinuities that clearly occur for some cultural groups, subtle home-school commonalities may also exist for each group. From this perspective, a search for both discontinuity and commonality may uncover more possibilities for practical application than a focus on only one.

In addition to between the home and the school, discontinuities can emerge between the generations (e.g., child, parent, grandparent). Intergenerational discontinuity can occur not only from intercultural transition but also from historical change not attributable to intercultural contact; intergenerational discontinuity may further result from a complex dynamic involving both processes (Goldenberg & Gallimore, 1995; Greenfield & Cocking, 1994; Laosa, 1982; Tapia Uribe, LeVine, & LeVine, 1994; Vinovskis, 1996). Home-school and intergenerational discontinuities and commonalities may interact to influence student outcomes.

Once research has identified cultural discontinuities, the challenge for educators is to apply this scientific knowledge so that academic learning can occur in the most effective way possible. Educational interventions based on cultural discontinuity approaches seek to reduce this discontinuity by modifying the home or the school or both. For example, some interventions educate parents about the normative expectations of the school and train or exhort them to adopt beliefs, behaviors, and values that match those of classroom teachers (e.g., Azmitia et al., 1994; Funkhouser, Gonzales, & Moles, 1997; Goldenberg, Reese, & Gallimore, 1992; Henderson & Garcia, 1973; Henderson & Swanson, 1974). Other interventions educate teachers about cultural influences on student behavior and encourage them to adopt teaching strategies that are indigenous to the student’s culture (e.g., Au & Jordan, 1981; Villegas, 1991).

Culturally sensitive instruction refers to pedagogical systems or techniques designed to be congruent with cultural characteristics of students. (Other terms used in reference to
these methods include culturally responsive pedagogy, culturally compatible instruction, culturally congruent teaching, and culturally matched instruction.) Although there is general agreement that instruction can be made more culturally sensitive, there is considerable debate concerning how best to do so, especially concerning how to accommodate both individual and group differences (Banks & McGee Banks, 1995; Laosa, 1990a, 1991; Protheroe & Barsdate, 1991).

The most frequently cited example of culturally sensitive instruction is the Kamehameha Early Education Project (KEEP), designed to increase the school success of Hawaiian children of Polynesian ancestry. As a group these children, especially those of low SES, fare poorly in school, having major problems with their acquisition of English literacy (Au & Jordan, 1981). Through years of sustained research and experimentation, KEEP staff developed a successful program for elementary school classrooms (Au & Jordan, 1981; Tharp & Gallimore, 1988/1991). The origins of the program lie in earlier studies conducted by social scientists in Polynesian-ancestry communities in Hawaii--studies that described this population's culture and styles of interaction, thus stimulating hypotheses about the effects of home-school discontinuities in learning styles on scholastic performance and leading to the question: If schools are made culturally compatible with the learning contexts that the children are accustomed to, will academic achievement improve (Au & Jordan, 1981; Cazden, 1981; Jordan et al., 1983)? KEEP's effectiveness is generally credited to a type of reading lesson designed to resemble talk-story, a unique speech activity characteristic of Polynesian-Hawaiian culture. Talk-story consists of overlapping speech and cooperative production of narrative by several speakers (Au & Jordan, 1981). In the reading lesson, the teacher allows the children to discuss text ideas using rules for speaking and turn-taking similar (though not identical) to those in talk-story. "In responding to these similarities, the children are able to apply their abilities to the task of learning to read to a greater degree than they can in conventional reading lessons" (Au & Jordan, 1981, p. 151; see also Tharp & Gallimore, 1988/1991).
Significantly, efforts to apply the Kamehameha program to another culture did not succeed. In order to test the program's cross-cultural generalizability, the KEEP team operated a research-and-development site on the Navajo reservation of northern Arizona, selected because of the sharp differences between the Hawaiian and Navajo cultures. With Navajo children, key features of the program did not function well, apparently due to cultural differences in participation structures (e.g., the implicit rules governing speaking, attending, and turn-taking in conversation). Accordingly, Navajo and Polynesian-Hawaiian versions of the program have emerged with clear differences (Vogt, Jordan, & Tharp, 1987, as cited in Weisner, Gallimore, & Jordan, 1988). This finding suggests that instruction is most effective when classroom practices closely match the students' culture (Protheroe & Barsdate, 1991), and it highlights the need for continued research to identify dimensions of home-school discontinuity in specific populations. Examples of such research include the early studies of Polynesian communities in Hawaii (e.g., Jordan et al., 1983), Heath's (1983) study of communicative styles in rural African American families in South Carolina, and Laosa's (1982) research on parental teaching strategies in Chicano families of varied schooling levels (see also Foster, 1995; Garcia, 1995; Mehan, Okamoto, Lintz, & Wills, 1995, for research reviews).

Approaches such as KEEP are typically designed for settings serving a single cultural group. Because nowadays many schools in the United States enroll students from multiple groups (U.S. General Accounting Office, 1994a, b), research is also needed to explore how culturally sensitive approaches can be effectively adapted to a classroom serving children from diverse backgrounds (Protheroe & Barsdate, 1991; Tharp & Gallimore, 1988/1991).

In addition, research is needed to ascertain which dimensions of home-school discontinuity are critical for student outcomes. For example, some analysts (e.g., Protheroe & Barsdate, 1991) have expressed uncertainty regarding what factor or combination of factors caused KEEP's success, because KEEP appears to have introduced the cultural modifications concurrently with a transition from an instructional method based on a basic-skills approach to one based on a meaning-oriented approach (see, e.g., Tharp &
Gallimore, 1988/1991). The last two pedagogical approaches are discussed further later in this paper. Some writers have argued against all educational programs derived from cultural discontinuity approaches, even against those that regard the discontinuities as differences rather than deficits. They have contended that by focusing on home-school discontinuities, one risks fostering the interpretation that differences between families and schools represent deficits in either the families or the schools, and that such interpretations "may provoke mutual blaming between parents and teachers while overlooking the resources for student learning that are available in each setting" (Azmitia et al., 1994, p. 4). Although this risk is real, seeking to avoid it by rejecting all programs that are based on cultural discontinuity approaches is tantamount to throwing the proverbial baby out with the bath water. An alternative, constructive solution would incorporate into the design of programs the safeguards needed to avoid deficit interpretations and to foster mutual respect between educators and families.

For example, a program called funds of knowledge (e.g., Moll, Amanti, Neff, & Gonzalez, 1992) trains teachers to interview their students' parents in order to discover areas of knowledge that the families possess. By thus becoming learners in a sociocultural setting different from their own, teachers may establish a "more symmetrical relationship" with the families, a relationship that may form the basis for a continuing exchange of knowledge about family and school, thereby "reducing the insularity of classrooms" (p. 139). Rather than focusing explicitly on culture in its anthropological sense, this program seeks to incorporate strategically into classrooms specific knowledge essential to the household functioning of particular families. The teachers participate in after-school study groups with researchers in order to reflect on the information gained from the home visits and to determine how to incorporate this knowledge into classroom academic content and lessons (Moll et al., 1992).

Connecting classroom instruction to students' cultural background is also a fundamental principle of pedagogical approaches generally described as "teaching for understanding," "teaching for meaning," and meaning-oriented instruction, which have
recently attracted the attention of many educators and scholars (e.g., Knapp & Associates, 1995; Knapp & Shields, 1991). Advocates of these approaches view them as significant alternatives to the conventional approaches to teaching economically impoverished children. These conventional methods, focusing on what students lack (e.g., print awareness, grasp of standard English), seek to remedy these deficiencies by teaching discrete skills (e.g., decoding skills, language mechanics, arithmetic computation), usually by tightly controlled direct instruction and repetitive practice (Brophy, 1991; Brophy & Good, 1986). In contrast, the meaning-oriented approaches de-emphasize the teaching of skills in isolation from the context in which the skills are applied, foster connections between academic learning and the worlds from which children come, and view the children's cumulative experiences as a resource for learning: "Whatever deficiencies may exist in their capabilities or life circumstances, the children are viewed as being capable and possessing useful knowledge" (Knapp, 1995, p. 7; see also Garcia, 1991; Knapp & Needels, 1991; Knapp & Turnbull, 1991; Tharp & Gallimore, 1988/1991).

In their study of fifteen elementary schools serving high concentrations of economically impoverished students, Knapp and his co-workers made the following observation bearing on these approaches:

Overall, what we observed in classrooms suggests that as teachers move along a continuum of responses—from those that exclude students from learning opportunities because of [the students'] backgrounds to those that ignore such differences to those that build on these differences as learning opportunities—student engagement in and excitement for learning seem to increase. The differences are more striking in reading and writing than in mathematics, perhaps reflecting the way teachers think about these subject areas. (It may be easier for many teachers to find ways for students to read or write about their lives out of school than to express the connections in the language and topics of mathematics.) (Knapp & Associates, 1995, p. 46)

These researchers further noted, however, that attempts to connect instruction to students' lives by itself does not lead to higher engagement, and they cautioned against simplistic notions of the requirements for successful teaching. They expressed doubt about the possibility of simple one-size-fits-all solutions, acknowledging the complexity of the processes involved in teaching and learning, the vast variety of school environments, and the wide
individual and group differences among students (Knapp, Shields, & Turnbull, 1995; Shields, 1995).

To profess, as some educators do, that sufficient research already exists regarding the cultural discontinuities that may contribute to school outcome inequalities is, from the standpoint of cross-cultural psychology and cultural anthropology, to show a profound ignorance of the fine subtleties of culture and of culture's powerful impact on human behavior. Needed are further studies to identify and to gain a deeper understanding of specific dimensions of home-school and intergenerational discontinuities/continuities and of their role in the cognitive, psychosocial, and intercultural development of students and educators. Also needed is research focusing on how to apply this understanding effectively in classrooms (e.g., in teaching specific subjects, including mathematics) and on how to incorporate such applications into current education reform models.

Existing approaches to educational change such as those discussed in this section of the paper aim to modify classroom practices and teacher-student relationships. They typically do not address broader issues such as the shortage of qualified teachers, the uneven distribution of funds, school tracking policies, or poverty. Advocates of these approaches assert that educators cannot wait for broader change to occur and urge teachers to use culturally sensitive instruction as a more readily accessible and immediate way to improve the day-to-day events in their classrooms. Advocates of more highly comprehensive reforms give priority to the broader concerns and urge educators to question the lasting impact of approaches that do not address the systemic barriers that students may face in school and society (Protheroe & Barsdate, 1991). The voices that sound most reasonable argue that reform in society and reform in education must go hand in hand (e.g., Goodlad, 1994).

Regardless of one's position on this debate, an ecological perspective is essential in order to understand past and future efforts to translate theoretical and empirical research into actual classroom practice. Because of practical conditions that teachers encounter daily in performing their job, they often cannot implement externally imposed policies or guidelines
exactly as articulated (see, e.g., Cohn, 1992; Sleeter, 1992); thus, they improvise. As Mehan (1991), Gutierrez (Gutierrez, Rymes, & Larson, 1995), and others have observed, a classroom may evolve its own culture, which may diverge from both the teacher’s and the students’ home cultures. Needed is research to examine the constraints of local ecologies on teachers’ ability to implement culturally responsive programs, the manner in which effective teachers and administrators cope with these limitations, the benefits of particular forms of support, and the impact of these restrictions and opportunities—and of the strategies evolved to address them—on the intellectual, psychosocial, and intercultural development of students and teachers.

**Socioeconomic Characteristics of Families and Schools**

The study of intercultural transitions is complicated both by the correlation that exists in this country between ethnic group membership and SES and by the wide range of SES within each group (e.g., Corcoran & Chaudry, 1997). The intercultural transition issues facing a middle-class child will likely differ from those facing one of lower SES.

Tacitly, socioeconomic issues underlie the debate over bilingualism and bilingual education because language education policies more likely affect the poor than the affluent students. Ironically, as Cummins (1989) and others (e.g., Secada & Lightfoot, 1993) have observed, many supporters of the view that this country needs to develop foreign-language skills among its students argue against public schools’ offering bilingual education to children with a native language other than English; in other words, they argue that these children should not be given an opportunity to develop their native language ability while they are learning English. Opponents of bilingual education contend that the development and maintenance of languages other than English should not be the responsibility of the public schools but rather of the child’s parents through the private sector. Because parents’ ability to provide private language instruction to their child may depend on their ability to finance it, the issues remain partly socioeconomic.

On a more fundamental level, family socioeconomic background can affect a child’s predisposition to learn in school. Circumstances often associated with economically
impoverished households, such as high stress levels, malnutrition, and unmet health care needs can, for example, increase school absenteeism and decrease classroom attention span (Brooks-Gunn, Denner, & Klebanov, 1995; Brooks-Gunn & Duncan, 1997; Crawford, Doyle, Leaf, Leighfield, Ghebremeskel, & Phylactos, 1993). The longer a child lives in poverty, the more deleterious the effects appear to be on his or her academic achievement (Kennedy, Jung, & Orland, 1986; Orland, 1994). Although many studies have examined the effects of SES on scholastic performance, little is known or understood about these effects on intercultural change.

Although the term SES typically refers to the background of individuals, a growing body of research suggests that the SES of a child's school may be as critical an influence on academic achievement as is the SES of the child's family. Individual differences in children's academic performance have been shown to correlate not only with the children's household SES but also with the SES of their schools' student bodies (Kennedy et al., 1986; Laosa, 1998b; Orland, 1994; Puma, Jones, Rock, & Fernandez, 1993; U.S. Department of Education, 1993, 1996b, 1997b; U.S. General Accounting Office, 1992). For example, on the basis of a nationally representative sample of U.S. elementary students, Kennedy et al. (1986) and Orland (1994) concluded that the higher a school's concentration of economically impoverished students, the higher tends to be the incidence of low academic achievers. This relationship held even after statistically controlling for demographic characteristics of the individual students and of their families (Kennedy et al., 1986, chap. 2; Myers, 1985; Orland, 1994). Other studies lead to similar conclusions (e.g., Puma et al., 1993; U.S. Department of Education, 1993, 1996b, 1997b; U.S. General Accounting Office, 1992).

The bearing of these findings on issues of intercultural transition become clearer in light of the results of studies of school segregation: Correlations show that the higher a school's concentration of African American, Hispanic/Latino, or linguistic minority students, the higher is the school's concentration of pupils from economically impoverished households, and the higher the likelihood of the school's location being an economically depressed area (Laosa, 1998b; Orfield, Bachmeier, James, & Eitle, 1997; U.S. Department of
Education, 1996b, 1997b). One may hypothesize that these conditions can affect not only a child's academic achievement but also his or her long-term social development. For instance, a neighborhood with a high unemployment rate will likely provide limited exposure to successfully employed role models (Brooks-Gunn et al., 1995; Wilson, 1995). Children in such schools are largely cut off from a range of options and avenues of opportunity commonly available in middle class schools.

Based on the available research evidence, a U.S. Department of Education (1993) report concluded that "teachers in high-poverty schools face special challenges that often undermine their effectiveness" (p. 31; see also U.S. General Accounting Office, 1994b). Whereas evidence clearly confirms the existence of a relationship between student body poverty and academic achievement, the evidence is weaker concerning the mechanisms, or processes, that may explain this relationship (see, e.g., Barton, Coley, & Goertz, 1991; Taylor & Piché, 1991; U.S. Department of Education, 1993, 1996b, 1997b, for reviews of research). Research is needed to illuminate these mechanisms in the context of intercultural change.

As a group, students facing intercultural transitions need educational services beyond those of the average Euro-American English-speaking child. For instance, teachers require additional support to meet the instructional needs of students learning English as a second language (U.S. General Accounting Office, 1994a). Similarly, immigrants fleeing wars or extreme poverty often have significant health and emotional needs (Holtzman & Bornemann, 1990; U.S. General Accounting Office, 1994a). Researchers need to ask, Do schools serving such students have access to technical support and sufficient funding for planning and staff development; for specialized curricula and student assessment services; and for resources to recruit, hire, and retain faculty and other personnel or consultants with the required expertise? What levels of funding are necessary to provide the quality of education that will foster successful intercultural transitions in populations with particular characteristics and patterns of needs? One possible research strategy (Terman & Behrman, 1997) is to identify successful schools operating in challenging circumstances and analyze in detail the budgets and other factors such as staff stability, focused staff development, or school size.
Deficit Views

A widespread tendency exists in the United States to view cultural differences as deficits or as pathological deviations from the "mainstream" cultural norms. This deficit/pathology model, which continues to dominate much of the field of education and of the social and behavioral sciences, embodies explanatory systems grounded on traditional ethnocentric beliefs (Valencia, 1997). Much of the existing research reflects this orientation, as do many educational policies and practices (Valdés, 1997).

The presence of deficit/pathology thinking will likely add to the psychological burden on individuals in culture-contact situations and hence lead to poor adaptation. If a difference becomes stigmatizing, or if individuals come to perceive their difference as a deficit or as a shameful deviation from the "normal," there will likely be negative psychological consequences. These consequences, perhaps analogous to those of real deficits in ability or of diminished physical attractiveness, may include profound threats to the self-esteem and the perpetuation of an atmosphere of stress. Furthermore, in a milieu suffused by deficit, assimilationist thinking, the psychological consequences of being "culturally different" are perhaps analogous to those of chronic illness. For school-age children, who are frequently judged according to academic, athletic, and social competence, the psychological burden of a persistent medical disorder may be particularly weighty, as Shonkoff (1984) and others have noted. Pless and Pinkerton (1975, as cited in Shonkoff, 1984) summarized a large body of literature showing a higher incidence of psychosocial maladjustment among chronically ill children, but also evidence of successful adaptation among a substantial number. The many variables found to correlate with overall adjustment include the age at onset of disease, its course and severity, the visibility and specific consequences of associated handicaps, individual coping styles, and the quality of the parent-child relationship. These analogies suggest a need for research emphasizing each individual's and ethnocultural group's strengths and potential and seeking a deeper understanding of the factors that facilitate additive-adjusitive intercultural transitions.
Cultural Relativity

As a point of view, cultural relativism opposes ethnocentrism. Cultural relativism means "not assuming, wittingly or unwittingly, the superiority of one's own society and culture" (Bourguignon, 1979, p. 13). It also means that one must expect persons from cultures different from one's own "will be full of surprises, of attitudes and behaviors not to be readily predicted or anticipated" (p. 13). Similarly, it means that any behavior (verbal, nonverbal, or paraverbal) that is highly valued or perceived positively or that constitutes social competence in one's primary culture may be ineffectual, neutral, offensive, or even harmful in a different cultural context.

Cross-cultural misunderstandings often result from cultural differences so subtle that they are exceedingly difficult to identify or articulate, or even to perceive consciously, by members of either culture. For example, during cross-cultural dyadic interactions, the interlocutors are often swept by a vague, uncomfortable feeling that something that either one said or did was not taken as intended, even though neither one can identify the precise source of this feeling (see, e.g., Asante & Davis, 1989; Bialystok & Hakuta, 1994). Because the causes of cross-cultural misunderstandings are thus so difficult to identify, it is extremely difficult to learn how to prevent their reoccurrence.

Competence

A key concept in intercultural change is competence. What constitutes competent behavior in a given cultural context? How is competence defined? Who may define it? These questions embody crucial issues that must be examined with respect to intercultural change.

Whereas socialization, education, and development refer to the processes whereby particular attributes of the individual are transformed or acquired, the concept of competence stresses the end product, namely the person as he or she is after having undergone these processes (Inkeles, 1968a; Laosa, 1979/1989, 1997b; Laosa & Henderson, 1991). But what, specifically, is competence? A competency implies an individual's possessing a particular set of skills, knowledge, strategies, abilities, habits, or behavioral dispositions that are desirable
and functional—which will "work" successfully as intended—in relation to the values and usual life situation of a given ecocultural niche. Thus, individual and group differences in perceptions regarding what constitutes competent behavior in a given situation will depend on the culturally determined systems of meaning used to explain the behavior (Laosa, 1977b, 1979/1989, 1983, 1990a, 1991, 1996, 1997b). Even within any one discipline or field of study (e.g., psychology, sociology, education), scholars have advanced varied conceptions of competence (e.g., Foote & Cottrell, 1955; Inkeles, 1968a, b; Laosa, 1979/1989; Laosa & Henderson, 1991; Luria, 1928, 1976; Smith, 1968; Vygotsky, 1929, 1978; White, 1959, 1979).

An attractive feature of a Vygotskian perspective on competence is the attempt it represents to view the individual's development as an integral part of the sociocultural setting in which the person functions. A central tenet of Vygotsky's formulation is that mental processes originate in social processes. Mediation is a key concept in understanding this relation. Specifically, Vygotsky defined development in terms of the emergence or transformation of forms of mediation, and his conception of social interaction and its relation to mental processes involves mediational mechanisms. He argued that mental processes can be understood only if we understand the tools and signs that mediate them. Tools and signs in this formulation refer to habits and forms of cultural behavior, cultural methods of reasoning, and the cultural meaning of particular stimuli. In short, for Vygotsky the psychological characteristics of persons are a joint, interactive function of the biological features and potentialities of the human species, on the one hand, and on the other, of the forms of psychological functioning and possible sources of development existing in a given culture or subculture at a particular point in its history. It thus follows that the repertoire of psychological processes and outcomes available as possibilities for individual development can vary across cultures or subcultures, and that alterations in social or cultural conditions can bring about decisive changes in forms of behavior and modes of thought (Vygotsky, 1929, 1978; the same line of theorizing appears in the work of Luria, 1928, 1976; see also Moll, 1990; Wertsch, 1985a, b).
Thus, in some respects, Vygotsky's views are similar to the longstanding tradition in psychological anthropology that argues that different environmental demands lead to the development of different patterns of ability (e.g., Bourguignon, 1979; Laboratory of Comparative Human Cognition, 1983; LeVine, 1973; Ogbu, 1994; see also Laosa, 1984a). These conceptions harmonize with the developmental, socioculturally relativistic approach that I have elsewhere proposed (Laosa, 1979/1989), briefly discussed below.

A Developmental, Socioculturally Relativistic Approach

From the perspective of a developmental, socioculturally relativistic approach, competence involves functional adaptation to specific environments. In this view, the development of competence occurs as the individual adapts to (e.g., learns to function in) a particular environment. A competency is thus an outcome of the organism's undergoing a transformation in order to function in a particular environment or situation. In this sense, the term environmental demand refers to the characteristics of a situation that require or elicit a particular response. Because each environment makes its own specific demands for functional adaptation, a person's success in a new cultural context, or situation, will depend largely on the similarity, or match, between the demands of that situation and those of analogous situations in the person's primary culture. In other words, the extent of a person's social competence in the context of a particular culture will depend on the degree of overlap between the environmental demands of that culture and those of the culture in which the person has been successfully enculturated or socialized. This approach is particularly appealing because it provides a useful way of approaching the problems that arise in defining competence in complex, changing, and culturally diverse societies--such as the United States--in which individuals, at virtually every phase of their life span, find themselves in environments with very different demands (Laosa, 1979/1989).

Adaptation and adjustment. In this approach, adaptation as a construct is viewed not as a process of "molding or shaping oneself to things as they are," but rather as an active process by which individuals engage their environment with respect to meeting their needs and attaining their goals. Thus, with regard to intercultural change, adaptation to a new and
unfamiliar environment is a process through which the individual organizes and reorganizes his or her manner of functioning at various levels—cognitive, affective, behavioral, physiological.

In this sense, the meaning of adaptation is very similar to Anthony's conception of coping. Anthony (1987, p. 14) regarded coping as the process of engaging interactively with the environment in an attempt to "master challenges" and "overcome impediments" that the individual confronts. Thus defined, coping is a broader construct than the psychoanalytic concept of defense, because coping "employs many more ego skills than are required for purely defensive purposes" (p. 14). Coping thus implies "something over and beyond intrapsychic defensive maneuvering" (p. 14). Defined in this way, coping includes mastering both the objective and subjective anxiety pertaining to life changes. As Anthony (1987, p. 14) further noted, whereas "defenses need to be analyzed, coping can be taught and learned, which also means that parent figures can serve as appropriate models."

The term adjustment, on the other hand, involves a judgment from a perspective that considers the needs and expectations of both the individual and the social environment. Thus, one is said to be adjusted when one has a "harmonious relationship with the environment" involving the ability to satisfy most of one's needs and meet most of the demands placed upon one by the environment (Wolman, 1989, p. 9).

Thus conceived, both adaptation and adjustment may be viewed as involving the total organism-environment organization (Laosa, 1979/1989). Adaptation implies a process of development or change in the organism-environment organization in the face of the individual's encountering change on any level. In any particular situation, some forms of adaptation will be more effective than others in meeting the individual's needs and objectives. Adjustment implies that the organism-environment organization is judged satisfactory from the standpoint of meeting the needs and objectives of both the individual and a specified other (e.g., school official, mental health professional, parent). Unfortunately, however, judgments concerning adjustment are often made from the perspective of only the other—that is, on the basis of the individual's conformity to only one set of sociocultural standards of
success--thus overlooking the high psychological price that the individual must sometimes pay for certain forms of adaptation.

Needed is research to gain a better understanding of what constitutes, in particular cultural contexts, successful adaptation by children who face demands for intercultural change.

**Pluralism, Diversity, and Intergroup Relations**

An examination of the factors affecting cultural change in individuals must include an examination of the larger society and its people. Relevant factors include the general orientation of the society and of its members toward immigrant or other ethnic or linguistic groups--including the relative value placed on pluralism and on cultural and linguistic diversity as a shared communal resource, and the degree of behavioral acceptance of such diversity. These factors determine the availability of networks of social support to those entering into a new cultural experience. They also determine the existence of policies designed to exclude certain groups (or aspects of their culture) from full participation in the larger society. "To the extent that acculturating people wish to participate in the desirable features of the larger society" (such as educational and occupational opportunities), Berry (1990, p. 249) noted, "the denial of these may be cause for increased levels of acculturative stress."

In comparing the experiences of immigrants in different societies, Berry (1997) and others have suggested that societies supportive of cultural pluralism provide a more positive settlement context for two reasons: First, such societies are less likely to enforce cultural change (e.g., assimilation) or exclusion (e.g., segregation, marginalization) on immigrants; second, they are more likely to provide social support both from the institutions of the larger society (e.g., culturally sensitive health care, multicultural curricula in schools) and "from the continuing and evolving ethnocultural communities that usually make up pluralistic societies" (Berry, 1997, p. 17).

Even where pluralism is accepted, however, well-known variations exist in the relative acceptance of specific cultural, racial, and religious groups. The groups that are less well
accepted experience hostility and discrimination, which are predictive of poor long-term adaptation (Berry, 1997).

In recent years there has been a resurgence of negative attitudes toward ethnocultural and linguistic diversity in the United States. These attitudes are reflected, for example, in frequent public expressions of anti-immigrant feelings, the enactment of anti-immigrant policies, calls for making English the nation's "official" language, decreased support for bilingual education, and the abandonment of affirmative action policies. This growing bias and intergroup hostility suggest that certain groups view themselves as "locked in competitive social relations" with certain other groups (Bobo & Hutchings, 1996, p. 951; see also Olzak, 1992), raising these questions: What are the social and psychological underpinnings of such an outlook? What are the consequences for the future of intergroup relations generally and, specifically, for the availability of options for intercultural change in individuals from particular groups? What are the implications for educational policy and practice?

In order to understand current prejudice and discrimination, it is important to recognize the subtle forms they have taken in this country in recent years. In the context of pluralism—that is, multiple ethnic/racial groups coexisting—racism has been culturalized: Racism has become ethnicity. Racist ideologies are based on the view that social groups differ in value along biological dimensions. This view has been replaced by the view that social groups belong in a hierarchy in which the groups are rank-ordered by values assigned to their respective cultures (Essed, 1991). Similarly, alongside of ethnicity has emerged languageism, an ideology based on the view that languages belong in a hierarchy.

It is also important to note that prejudice and discrimination may persist in a society even when egalitarian beliefs have become a normative ideology. This situation may occur when unacknowledged negative feelings and beliefs about a group coexist with the egalitarian beliefs. In maintaining a positive self-concept, persons who hold these conflicting beliefs will tend to avoid members of the discriminated group. The term for the occurrence that this hypothesis describes is aversive ethnicity/racism (Gaertner & Dovidio, 1986, as cited in Essed, 1991). As Essed (1991) noted, discrimination includes all acts—verbal,
nonverbal, and para-verbal—with intended or unintended negative or unfavorable consequences. Intentionality is not a necessary component of ethnicism/racism.

Ethnic stratification may take varied forms (See & Wilson, 1988). A relevant factor is the acceptance or prestige of the individual’s primary cultural group in the "mainstream" setting. Those less acceptable face barriers that may induce greater stress or even lead to marginalization (Berry, 1990, p. 249). One may argue, as discussed earlier in this paper, that even in the context of the assimilationist ideology that became normative in the United States, certain groups were never meant to assimilate. Also pertinent is the cultural distance (i.e., difference, incompatibility) between the groups; the greater this distance, the greater the change necessary to bridge them (Triandis, 1997).

Also relevant are within-group individual differences and changes over time. These differences include the individual’s entry status into a group relative to his or her status in the primary group. Groups differ with respect to the status or value assigned to specific characteristics of individuals, including, for instance, age, speech accent, gradations of skin color, and the possession of social or human capital resources. Regarding changes over time, alterations within a group may cause changes in another group, in their relationship, or in the larger society. For example, a change in a group’s average schooling level may influence its members’ perceptions of social injustices, their preferred solutions, and their choice and mobilization of resources to address them (See & Wilson, 1988). Similarly, the characteristics of a group’s members may influence the benefit they derive from modifications of the society’s policies (e.g., civil rights legislation, education reform).

Especially in complex societies with elaborate divisions of labor, different segments of an ethnic group may interact differently with particular segments of the other. Thus, inquiry should not be limited to ethnic antagonisms. For example, in multiethnic societies, ethnic groups may become so interdependent as to develop "mutual commitments to the maintenance of order, commitments that discourage radical or disruptive social change" (See & Wilson, 1988, p. 238). All forms of ethnic stratification, however, likely involve differential
power relations, although some forms more likely result from greater force or coercion (See & Wilson, 1988).

Thus, even in a democratic, pluralistic society, the avenues open to an individual for interacting with--for moving in and out of--an ethnic outgroup and hence for undergoing intercultural change appear to depend on relatively subtle but numerous and cumulative intergroup factors. The factors and dynamics shaping these relations typically lie far beyond any one individual's control. They potentially include such social-psychological determinants as each group's collective perceptions of the other, perceived status and power relative to the other, and beliefs about inequality, as well as such variables that reside in objective reality as historical events, which may influence how the groups interrelate, and the presence of structural conditions that may pit the groups in competition with each other for scarce resources. In order to fully understand intercultural change, one needs to understand these societal factors.

In short, a comprehensive understanding of intercultural transitions can hardly be achieved without some understanding of intergroup relations. It is not an easy task. For example, understanding prejudice and intergroup conflict is a research topic involving practically every area of social psychological inquiry, including the study of person perception, social attitudes, aggression, self-esteem, social comparison, equity, cooperation and competition, conformity and compliance, and group identification. Furthermore, the study of prejudice crosses all levels of analysis, from intrapersonal to interpersonal to intergroup processes (e.g., Brewer, 1997). Yet, social psychological research has seldom been put to practical application in education or brought to bear on social or educational policy issues (Brewer, 1997). These considerations bring further forward the need for ecological, multidisciplinary approaches to the study of intercultural change.

**Schools and Communities**

In the past three decades, countless proposals concerning how best to educate ethnic/racial and linguistic minority children have been proffered and implemented in the United States. These developments include policy initiatives at all levels, instruction and
curriculum models, teacher preparation approaches, and all manner of techniques and theories aimed at educating students considered "at risk for educational failure." Indeed, there exists an enormous and expanding research literature replete with accounts of these efforts. Yet, well-known national statistics show little or no significant improvement in the average academic achievement of certain of this country's ethnic/racial and linguistic groups (Campbell, Voelkl, & Donahue, 1997; U.S. Department of Education, 1997a) signifying that the nation, including the education professions and allied disciplines, has yet to solve the longstanding problems that such statistics reflect.

Successful Schooling

Whereas the research literature presents a number of these efforts as successful, they may or may not be so viewed, depending on one's definition of success. Using a narrow criterion, one typically judges an educational intervention successful if it produced an immediate (i.e., pre-post) gain in scholastic achievement. Using a broader definition, one judges the intervention successful if it also produced a longer-term, sustained effect. Regarding these sustained effects, the need for an ecological approach becomes critical because such effects will likely depend, at least partly, on the environments subsequent to the intervention—environments that may vitiate the impact of the intervention.

Using a narrow definition of success, one typically judges educational programs successful if they produced cognitive gains, especially gains in English-language proficiency and subject-matter achievement. A broader definition, in addition, examines noncognitive outcomes. A broader definition also focuses on unintended as well as intended consequences, which may be cognitive or noncognitive, and positive or negative. Examples of unintended negative consequences in the noncognitive domain are the psychological "costs" associated with certain achievements in the context of intercultural change and native-language loss, discussed earlier in this paper. Examples of unintended negative consequences in the cognitive domain may occur, for instance, if the mathematics lessons for a linguistic minority student were regularly cut short in order to give him or her instruction in English-language communication skills (Laosa, 1998a).
An illustration of a positive unintended outcome occurred in the School of the Future project (Holtzman, 1992, 1997), a program designed to enhance the lives of children in poverty by offering an array of health and human services using the school as the center for service delivery. The project's evaluation staff, an integral component of the program, trained and involved parents as volunteer data collectors. By thus going door to door to interview their neighbors about school and community issues, area residents learned about the importance of needs assessment and baseline information in approaching local government for services. From this initial participation, a few community members emerged as local leaders, gaining skills in public speaking and advocacy and ultimately establishing a positive relationship with city officials. Largely because of their ability to document their needs in presenting their case, considerable local funds were directed to the community (Keir & Millea, 1997).

A narrow definition of success considers a program successful if it produced a higher outcome level than that of a control or comparison sample drawn from the target students' socioeconomic or ethnic group or from the same, or a similar, school system. A broader definition considers a program successful if it produced outcomes on the same level as that attained by middle-class, Euro-American native speakers of English attending schools in affluent locations.

A broader definition of success also considers the replicability of program effects. Failure to replicate is a frequent, frustrating research finding. Intervention models proven successful where originally developed have not always proven so elsewhere. Population generalizability issues may explain some replication failures (Laosa, 1988, 1990a, 1991). That is, an effective intervention for a particular cultural or socioeconomic group may be ineffective or even harmful for a different population (see, e.g., Webb & Farivar, 1994). Program quality--how competently a program is actually implemented--may also account for replication failures. Typically, intervention models are developed and initially implemented by experts deeply committed to the model, exceptionally motivated, and often generously funded. Subsequently, in the hands of the average practitioner, perhaps in a more challenging
setting, the "same" intervention will less likely yield the intended effect. Contributing problems may include a dearth of supports for classroom teachers to implement the interventions (see, e.g., McDiarmid, 1992; Sleeter, 1992).

Future research on the effects of programs must examine how the particular programs are implemented, and it must distinguish the effects of properly implemented instances from the effects of instances that, although classified as the same type or sharing the same label, were poorly implemented. Needed is research to test the hypothesis that sweeping, unwarranted generalizations about the lack of success of certain types of programs (e.g., bilingual education) have been based on poorly implemented instances.

Also needed is a better understanding of the association between variables that affect systems and those that directly affect student outcomes (Kagan, Goffin, Golub, & Pritchard, 1995); for example, What is the relationship between infrastructure reform (e.g., professional development, regulation, financing) and efforts to improve direct services (e.g., more services, more equitable distribution of services, higher quality services)?

Studies must "go beyond the question of whether or not a program 'works' to ask what works, for whom, how, when, and why" (Zigler & Weiss, 1985, p. 199; see also Advisory Panel for the Head Start Evaluation Design Project, 1990; Laosa, 1991). These questions require attention to the development of a broad set of outcome measures, the collection of process and implementation data, and well-executed longitudinal designs (Holtzman, 1992; Zigler & Weiss, 1985).

It is often difficult to ascertain precisely what factor or combination of factors accounts for school outcomes. Only through carefully controlled research can unambiguous inferences be drawn about the causes of program success. For example, if a school adopted a new instructional method and concurrently hired a new principal, can this method be credited with a subsequent upturn in student performance?

Needed is a checklist of potentially "confounding" sources of explanatory variance contributing to program outcomes. Such scrutiny is essential in assessing the reliability of past and future research regarding program effectiveness.
Definitions of Culture

The lack of consensus on the meaning of culture is yet another source of confusion. Multiple meanings of the term pose more than semantic difficulty because each connotation influences a program's goals, philosophies, and practices (Protheroe & Barsdate, 1991). More fundamentally, this multiplicity of meanings bears directly on a central question: What is it that changes when an intercultural transition occurs?

The following distinctions help to clarify a program's approach to culture, as Protheroe and Barsdate (1991) noted: One usage of the term culture, often found in the literature on racial/ethnic integration, comes from research exploring how children form racial attitudes. In this sense culture means race/ethnicity or minority status. From this perspective, a culturally diverse population consists of varied races and ethnic origins. School interventions based on this usage of the term address issues of racial balance, equity, intergroup harmony and cooperation, and racism/ethnicism. This usage pertains especially to programs intended to promote students' interracial cooperation and to reduce prejudice (Banks, 1995; Protheroe & Barsdate, 1991; Simpson & Yinger, 1985).

In another usage of the term, culture means historical events and the artifacts of a people. In this sense, a culturally diverse population comprises diverse traditions, contributions, and lifestyles. Interventions based on this perspective address pluralism and the groups' heritages and teach students about the lives of various ethnic groups. From this perspective, intergroup understanding is again an objective, as is the acquisition of information about the specific groups (Protheroe & Barsdate, 1991).

Finally, in a third usage, culture means "ways of being, knowing, and doing" (Protheroe & Barsdate, 1991, p. 6). From this perspective, a culturally diverse population is viewed as comprising diverse learning and communication styles. Educational approaches based on this perspective seek to identify elements of the students' culture and to translate this knowledge into effective methods or techniques of instruction, as discussed earlier in this paper. Originally from anthropology, this usage of the term is often found in research on the impact of culture on cognition, communication, motivation, and behavior (e.g., Laosa,
1979/1989, 1982; Rogoff, 1990). Unlike the first two definitions, this approach to culture does
not address what students learn but rather how they learn (Laosa, 1977a, 1982; Mohatt &

Educational approaches based on any of these definitions of culture are often referred
to as multicultural education, a term with multiple connotations. When considering this broad
rubric, it is helpful to classify existing approaches to multicultural education (i.e., approaches
to teaching that address ethnic/racial diversity) using the five categories articulated by Grant
and Sleeter (Grant & Tate, 1995; Sleeter, 1995b). Three categories correspond approximately
to approaches based on the definitions of culture just noted. The fourth category comprises
programs designed to promote structural equality in society and cultural pluralism. These
programs organize subject-matter content around the contributions and perspectives of
diverse cultural groups and examine how ethnicity/race, socioeconomic status, and gender
inequalities occur in the various sectors of society. The fifth category identifies approaches
that teach students to analyze inequality and oppression in society and to develop skills for
social action; such programs organize the curriculum around contemporary issues of social
justice (Grant & Tate, 1995; Sleeter, 1995b).

Much of the contemporary impetus for multicultural education originated in the civil
rights movement of the 1960s, as part of this movement’s quest for traditionally excluded
ethnic/racial groups to gain greater access to and control of educational and other societal
institutions (cf. Banks, 1995; Sleeter, 1995b). Nowadays, however, multicultural education
seldom emphasizes this spirit (Gollnick, 1995; Sleeter, 1995b). Some advocates of the
original emphasis (e.g., Sleeter, 1995b) oppose the current trend that regards the literature on
multicultural education "as a collection of ideas to use selectively" (p. 167). They argue that
this trend undermines the impetus "for dialog, power sharing, and self-determination that
gave rise to multicultural education" (p. 167).

These concerns imply a need for research to address several questions: Do
programs for "at-risk" students invite genuine dialog about power-sharing? Do they
encourage self-examination about raising the collective status of excluded groups and about
how such groups can gain greater control over their own futures? Are there differences in student outcomes between, on the one hand, programs that emphasize individualism and within-group upward mobility and, on the other, those that emphasize power-sharing and advancing the status of the students’ ethnic/racial groups? If so, what factors determine whether a school embraces a particular emphasis? Under what conditions can separate elements of multicultural education succeed in isolation from the comprehensive approaches for which they were originally intended?

The Researcher’s Ecology: A Practical Note

Bitter and divisive ideological controversies, often based on uninformed opinion, dominate the public and professional discourse on cultural and linguistic diversity, particularly in reference to education. These polemics, including those surrounding "multiculturalism," for instance, frequently stifle the progress of serious scholars, research scientists, program developers, and practitioners whose work could, if properly nurtured, help improve the lives of children facing intercultural change.

This frequently overlooked layer of the ecology of human development must be considered in the formulation of future research agendas. The scientific theories, data-gathering methods, and research-management strategies known to function adequately for middle-class, Euro-American populations will not necessarily produce scientifically valid, reliable, relevant, or prompt results from other populations or contexts (Laosa, 1973, 1990a, 1991). Thus, for example, in planning a research project’s budget, personnel, management, and technical issues, account must be taken of such factors as the time and effort; the scientific, cultural, and linguistic skills; and the specialized instrumentation needed in order to create and execute a scientific sampling design focusing on a population about which little or no previous data exist (Laosa, 1997a) or in order to obtain data from informants of diverse (or changing) cultural, linguistic, and socioeconomic backgrounds in varied contexts--for instance, to observe bilingual classrooms; to conduct interviews in specific dialects or languages; to visit high-crime neighborhoods; to recruit, train, and manage a culturally and linguistically diverse research team (Laosa, 1973, 1997a; Padilla & Lindholm, 1995; Sigel,
1996). For these reasons, the formulation and testing of hypotheses concerning how a scientist can validly and efficiently answer a particular substantive research question for a particular population in a particular cultural context must become a significant, integral part of the formal research enterprise—nay, a prerequisite to addressing the substantive question per se.

**Program Diversity**

This country offers a wide variety of public school programs specifically designed for students who are considered to be at risk for educational failure, including children from linguistic and ethnic/racial minority backgrounds.

The programs for linguistic minority children are typically classified along dimensions regarding native-language use, the mix of the students' linguistic backgrounds, and the program's goals (August & Hakuta, 1997; Laosa, 1998a; Thomas & Collier, 1997). For example, in ESL-only (English-as-a-second-language only) programs, students are placed in a regular English-language monolingual program but receive specified periods of instruction aimed at English-language acquisition, chiefly grammar, vocabulary, and communication skills rather than subject-matter content. In content-based ESL programs, students are also placed in a regular English-language monolingual program but receive specified periods of ESL instruction that concerns subject-matter content (e.g., social studies) rather than focusing merely on generic language skills. Sheltered instruction programs, which include only students with a non-English native language, provide subject-matter instruction through English, modified to render it accessible at the students' English proficiency level. Transitional bilingual education programs, which enroll mostly students with a native language other than English, provide some instruction through the native language, but the goal is to shift rapidly to using only English (August & Hakuta, 1997; Laosa, 1998a; Meyer & Fienberg, 1992; Thomas & Collier, 1997).

These types of programs emphasize shifting to English, whereas others aim to maintain and develop the native language as well as to develop English. For example, maintenance bilingual education programs, which typically enroll students who all share a
particular native language other than English, provide considerable instruction through and in the native language; unlike the transitional programs, maintenance programs aim to develop both English proficiency and native-language academic ability. In two-way bilingual education programs, some students in the class are native speakers of English and the others share in common another native language; the goal is to develop proficiency in both languages for both groups (August & Hakuta, 1997; Laosa, 1998a; Thomas & Collier, 1997).

Besides these types of programs, which center on language and are mostly aimed at linguistic minority students, other programs focus on culture. Among the latter are culture-specific programs, such as Afrocentric programs (Glenn, 1995). In addition, an expanding array of curricular materials for multicultural education is available. They include anthologies of writings by members of particular ethnocultural groups, textbooks for history of African Americans and other populations, curriculum guides for teachers to help students address issues of social justice, and even some multicultural textbook series such as the one adopted by the State of California (Gollnick, 1995; Sleeter, 1995b).

Regarding curriculum development, for instance, the New York City school system (as cited in Sleeter, 1995b), in order to assist teachers in making their seventh- and eighth-grade U.S. history course multicultural, produced a supplementary curriculum guide for lessons and resource material that teachers are encouraged, but not required, to use. The topics coordinate with those in standard history textbooks, helping students to examine events and critique policies from the perspectives of particular groups (such as the impact of U.S. expansionist policies on Mexicans). Such curricular projects have become the focus of much controversy and heated debate over multicultural education in the United States (cf. Schlesinger, 1992; Sleeter, 1995a, b; Takaki, 1993).

At the same time, various school-wide reform models for students from economically impoverished backgrounds have been developed and are being implemented in many schools. These models include, for example, Comer’s School Development Program, the Accelerated Schools Program, the Success for All model, and the New American Schools models (Fashola & Slavin, 1997). In addition, many education reform networks advocate and
support innovations focusing on specific subjects and grade levels. Some of these, such as mathematics education reforms linked to standards formulated by the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (1989, 1991), offer general guidelines for classroom activities and sources of professional development. Others are connected to more formal organizations and typically provide technical assistance in particular approaches to instruction and curriculum; an example is Reading Recovery, a one-on-one tutoring model for first graders. Increasingly, schools are creating their own models of school-wide reform by phasing in a variety of these innovative approaches to curriculum, instruction, assessment, and school organization (Fashola & Slavin, 1997).

As these efforts unfold, however, schools are increasingly being called upon to serve students with a multiplicity of unmet needs. Traditionally, the responsibility for meeting these basic needs has lain outside the role and purpose of schools. Yet, many children must have these needs met in order to learn successfully in school. **Comprehensive school-linked services** constitute an approach to serving the multiple needs of students, particularly students from economically impoverished families (U.S. Department of Education, 1996a, p. 7). **Comprehensive school-linked strategies** are similar to **school-based coordinated services** (e.g., Comer, 1988, 1994) in that comprehensive strategies often provide centralized access to an array of programs and supports; however, although comprehensive strategies may include school-based components, they are broader and more far-reaching (U.S. Department of Education, 1996a). Truly comprehensive strategies build collaboration among all of the community’s major groups and cultures and involve multiple stakeholders in all stages of program planning, design, and implementation.

These strategies are generally described as **holistic** because in principle they consider all the needs of the child and provide services to address multiple and interrelated problems (U.S. General Accounting Office, 1993). By bringing together a range of resources (e.g., education, health, mental health, child care, social, and recreational services) these partnerships seek to respond effectively and efficiently to local conditions, thus strengthening families and promoting children’s healthy physical, social, emotional, and cognitive

Thus, considerable variation exists nationwide among school programs designed for ethnocultural and linguistic minority group children, even among programs of any particular type or label. Moreover, large numbers of such children are placed in school programs not designed to meet the specific needs of a child facing expectations or demands for intercultural change. Implicitly or explicitly, underlying each program instance is a particular model of intercultural change. For example, two-way bilingual education programs imply an additive model of intercultural transition, whereas ESL-only programs imply a subtractive model. In both types of programs, however, the focus is likely to be on the acquisition of language skills and of subject-matter content rather than on the psychosocial dimensions of intercultural change. Moreover, even multicultural education approaches do not necessarily imply an additive model. For instance, a school may adopt a culturally sensitive instructional approach in order to facilitate the students' subject-matter acquisition and subtractive intercultural transition. At the classroom level, such variables as a teacher’s personal beliefs regarding intercultural change, beliefs that may not always accord with the program’s goals, for example, may moderate the effects of the program on pupils' intercultural development.

A series of naturally occurring experiments, this wide variation presents many opportunities for research: windows into the processes of culture contact and intercultural change in distinct contexts. This variety provides not only opportunities to examine the impact of particular attributes of schools, classrooms, families, and communities on
academic and psychosocial outcomes but also occasions for much-needed research on the intersections between these factors and intercultural change in individuals.

In this way, on a practical plane, a national research agenda can stimulate the continuing production of the knowledge needed to help the United States meet the difficult challenges expressed in the question: What can be done--on the part of school teachers and administrators, students and families, counselors and psychologists, curriculum developers and test designers, teacher educators and business executives, and school boards and other policy makers--to ensure that every individual has, continuously throughout the life cycle, fair opportunity for successful intercultural development in our democratic, culturally pluralistic society?
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