Negotiation of Conflict by Beijing Caregivers and Their Toddlers

Twila Tardif

Chinese University of Hong Kong

Abstract

The present paper focuses on the discourse of negotiation that occurred in a sample of 10 Mandarin-speaking toddlers (M = 22 months) and their families in Beijing, China. In contrast to U.S. and British adults, the Beijing adults were more likely to suggest alternative activities and use a variety of other strategies than they were to issue explicit refusals. In addition, their children were more likely to use a strategy of not responding or ignoring the caregivers' requests than they were to refuse or disobey. These cross-cultural and cross-linguistic differences in the negotiation of day-to-day conflicts within the family are consistent with "Chinese" (vs. "American") styles of negotiation that have been reported in the literature on negotiations in the workplace and thus suggest an important avenue for understanding the socialization and emergence of cultural differences in negotiation styles.

In the psychological literature, the effect of conflict on children's development has been given mixed reviews. On the one hand, children whose lives are conflict-ridden are said to have a number of adjustment difficulties (Emery, 1988; Hocker & Wilmot,1985). On the other, conflict has been suggested as playing a positive and fundamental role in children's moral, social, and cognitive development (Erikson, 1959; Piaget, 1928; Shantz & Hobart, 1989; Vygotsky, 1978). It is through conflict and the resolution of conflicts that children are presumed to gain an empathetic understanding of the other that allows true perspective-taking abilities to develop.

In the literature on adult conflicts, disputes and negotiation processes, we find enormous differences across languages, cultures, and situations in how disputes arise and how they are negotiated (Leung, in press; Shenkar & Ronen, 1987; Tang & Kirkbride, 1986). There is a large business-oriented literature on disputes and negotiations in a particular culture (Ding, 1995; Fisher & Ury, 1981). In addition, there is a very large applied focus on how people from one culture can negotiate with people from another culture, varying from tips in tourism books to whole books on communicating and negotiating with, for instance, the Mexicans, Japanese, or Chinese (Condon, 1985; Graham & Sano, 1984; Pye, 1992), and now an entire issue of ICS dedicated to conflict management and resolution in Chinese culture.

However, our understanding of how children come to learn the discourse processes involved in the negotiation of conflicts within their own cultures is much more limited. The present paper is one step towards addressing that issue by asking some fundamental questions about how Mandarin-speaking toddlers and their caregivers resolve everyday conflicts. I start out by asking how early negotiations of conflicts are related to later cultural patterns of negotiation and dispute settlement. To do so, I examine briefly the adult literature on cross-cultural differences in conflict resolution as well as the small but growing literature on familial conflicts in English-speaking families in the U.S. and Britain. Because the present study is a preliminary investigation of disputing in Mandarin-speaking families, I focus on the strategies that caregivers use. However, even toddlers are well on their way to becoming members of a particular culture and thus they may have already begun to develop culturally-specific ways of responding to their caregivers. The present paper treats this as an empirical question by examining whether the strategies used by these very young Mandarin-speaking children are identical to those used by English-speaking children or whether they have already begun to use disputing strategies that are particular to Chinese culture.

For English-speaking children, much of the research on disputes has focused on peer conflicts with very little work examining conflict resolution strategies between young children (i.e., toddlers) and their caregivers (Dunn, 1993; Eisenberg, 1992; Slomkowski & Dunn, 1992). Nonetheless, the basic finding that emerges from this work is that preschool-aged children's abilities to negotiate and resolve conflicts, rather than necessarily avoid them, are highly related to their later social competence (Dunn, Slomkowski, Donelan & Herrera, 1995; Shantz & Hobart, 1989).

In collectivistic societies such as Japan and China (Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Triandis, 1989, 1995) where empathetic understanding and harmony are considered to be part of the very nature of parent-child relationships (Clancy, 1986; Peak, 1986, 1991; Wolf, 1978), we even have less understanding of how early conflicts are managed and resolved. The understanding of conflict management and negotiation strategies between parents and their children in these cultures is important since any conflict would appear to threaten such empathy-based relationships. Moreover, adults in these societies seek harmony (Triandis, 1989) and avoid animosity or open conflict (Leung, 1985, 1987).

When animosity does occur, the conflict is quickly escalated to a level that poses a serious threat to the relationship. According to Ho (1976), a confrontational argument in the Chinese context is a direct challenge to the relationship (guanxi) because it results in a loss of face (mianzi) for both participants, and thus should be avoided. And yet, a recent report on adolescents' conflicts with their parents in Hong Kong suggests that conflicts are no less common in Chinese families than they are in Western families (Yau & Smetana, 1996). Moreover, Ting-Toomey (1991) reports that conflicts in intimate relationships are no less frequent in Japan than they are in the West. This is puzzling in that, according to the models of collectivism proposed by Triandis and others, one would expect relationships within the family to be even more focused on preserving harmony and avoiding conflict than the relationships between familiar others (e.g., friends, colleagues) and strangers (Leung, 1988).

The present research is directed towards resolving these apparent paradoxes -- between harmony seeking and conflict avoidance amongst familiar adults in collectivistic cultures versus

the prevalence of conflicts in Chinese and Japanese families, as well as the role of conflict in children's social development in individualistic versus collectivistic cultures. I argue that in order to understand the nature and frequency of adult-child disputes in a Chinese familial context where one might expect norms of harmony and empathy to govern interactions, it is important to look at the very early types of negotiations that occur in conflicts between children and their caregivers. In this study I look specifically at the language used in these disputes and, using the methods of conversation analysis (Schiffrin, 1988), examine the utterance-by-utterance strategies used by Mandarin-speaking adults and their toddlers. Although the focus is primarily on the caregivers' strategies, I also demonstrate how culturally-specific disputing strategies can be acquired very early and used effectively, whether intentionally or not, by children as young as two years of age, when surrounded by the necessary cultural supports for such strategies.

Methods

Subjects

The data discussed in this paper are from Tardif's (1993) sample and include ten families (eight boys, two girls) with 20-month-old toddlers who were selected from hospital immunization records in Beijing, China. They were told that the researcher was interested in how young children learn language in naturalistic settings. All of the families agreed to participate in a 6-month longitudinal study which involved audio-recordings (and occasional video-recordings) of the children and their caregivers interacting in naturalistic settings for a minimum of one hour, every two weeks, over the entire course of the study. Five of the children (four boys, one girl) had parents who were classified as "intellectuals" (zhishifenzi: college-educated or above, professional and semi-professional occupations), and five children (four boys, one girl) had parents who were classified as "workers" (gongren: no more than a high school education, manual or semi-skilled laborers). The mean age of these Mandarin-speaking children was 22 months (range 20-23 months) at the time of the recordings , and their mean utterance length was 1.82 (SD = 0.60) morphemes per utterance.

批注 [C1]: 1

Procedure

Each family was recorded for one hour after an initial warm-up period in which the researcher simply visited with the family and played with the child. During the recordings, following the standard instructions for naturalistic observations in developmental psychology, the caregivers chose their own activities after being told to "do whatever [they] normally do" at that time of day. In all cases, the families were told to ignore the researcher as much as possible. Given that this was the second or third visit to each of the family's houses, they were relatively used to the tape recorder and complied with the researcher's request as much as possible. The actual activities of these families varied quite a bit and included both indoor and outdoor toy play, mealtimes, dressing, social interchanges, and occasional book reading episodes.

Caregiving was shared quite widely amongst adults and older children within the extended family in this community and many people (e.g., mothers, fathers, grandmothers, aunts, neighbors, and live-in nannies) appeared in the child's environment on a day-to-day basis. Thus, the disputes that arose occurred with a variety of different adults. Many of the analyses reported in

this paper are based on pooled data from these caregivers and their children. Analyses from the families in which only the mother and father were present are also reported.

Transcribing and Coding

The hour-long recordings were transcribed into pinyin by the author and a native The transcripts were coded by at least two coders (the author and a native Mandarin-speaking research assistant) for each of the following: the total number of disputes, the main issue of each dispute, the dispute initiator, the number of conversational turns in the dispute, the type of dispute, the topic of dispute, the particular strategies reflected in each utterance, and the means by which the dispute was resolved. Coding disagreements were resolved through consultation between the two coders and, on occasion, a third coder (a visiting scholar in developmental psychology from Beijing). If a consensus could not be reached, the utterance (or dispute) in question was coded as "uncodable".

A "dispute" in the current analyses was defined as 3 or more turns of ongoing speech in which an oppositional turn has occured. It had to include, at the least, an initiating oppositional turn, one or more additional oppositional turns, and a dispute terminating turn. An oppositional turn was defined as a refusal or lack of response to the conversational partner's suggestion, request, or command, or a disapproval of the conversational partner's ongoing activity (cf. Slomkowski & Dunn, 1992). An example of a very short dispute between a caregiver and her daughter (aged 22 months) follows

Dispute 1 (3 turns)

*MOT:	kuai4	lai2.			
		quickly	come		
		wo3	wei4	ni3	ba.
		I	feed	you	SFP
		kuai4	zhe!		
		quickly	ASP		
		en!			
		yao4bu4 ni3 yi4-huir2 jiu4 gai1 nei4 shen2me le +...			
		if-not you (in)-a-while just should that what(ever)			
		[if you don't, that whatever will (happen)...]			
		+, kou4 di4xia4 le.			
		flip	ground	SFP	
		[+, (your bowl) will flip over onto the ground]			
		hao3	ma: ?		
		Okay: ?			
*CHI:		0.			
%com:	4 seconds of silence, child is playing with the chair.				
*MOT:	bu4	xi3huan1	ni3	le.	
		NEG	like	you	SFP
		[(Well, I won't/don't) like you, then!]			

In this case, the dispute-initiating turn consists of several utterances in which the child's mother is trying to get the child to stop playing and come to be fed her breakfast. The interaction is coded as a dispute because the child does not respond to her mother's suggestions, and the mother responds to this failure to comply with a threat (bu4 xi3huan1 ni3 le!), which is the dispute-terminating turn. Note that a turn here is not synonymous with an utterance or a meaning-unit. Rather, a turn is defined as an uninterrupted string of one or more utterances by a single speaker. If there is a pause of 2.0 seconds or more between utterances, the turn is presumed to have shifted to the other speaker. This is a rather long time to take to respond to another speaker. However, given the very young ages of these children, it seemed a reasonable and yet still rather conservative benchmark for deciding whether or not a "no response" had occurred. In this case, a full four seconds went by without any response on the part of the child. Although the child's silence, or lack of a response, is not an obviously intentional device here, it is important to note that the mother clearly waits for the child to respond before she completes the sequence with a final threat.

In addition to the global features and topics of disputes between caregivers and their toddlers, each utterance within a dispute was also subjected to analysis. The coding system for these strategies was adapted from existing literature on the use of justifications and pretend frames in adult-child disputes in English (Dunn & Munn, 1987; Eisenberg, 1992; Garvey, 1993). In addition, certain categories (prompt, threat, entice, challenge, imitate, change topic, run away) were developed by a team of three people familiar with the corpus and who had experience with young children in Beijing and the developmental psychology literature. These additional categories were created to accommodate the entire range of strategies used in all utterances within a dispute episode rather than focusing only on utterances that met certain target requirements and thus they represent an extension of previous research in this area.

Results and Discussion

Overall, there was a mean of 13.1 (SD = 9.1) disputes per child in these hour-long transcripts of adult-child interaction. The range was from 3 to 32 disputes across the 10 children. These data are extremely similar to the frequency of disputes between mothers and their children in English-speaking samples (Eisenberg, 1992). Thus, it appears that disputes between toddlers and their caregivers are no less frequent in a Chinese sample than they are in more individualistic societies such as the U.S. or Britain. This corroborates with findings from adolescents in Hong Kong (Yau & Smetana, 1996) and on relational conflict in Japan (Ting-Toomey, 1991), which claim that the frequency of disputes and conflicts is no lower among intimate familiars in collectivistic societies, despite the strong preferences for conflict avoidance amongst colleagues reported in the literature.

However, one might want to argue that perhaps there is pressure to end disputes as soon as possible, once they occur, in order to maintain harmonious family relations. Again, however, the data do not appear to bear this out, at least in terms of the day-to-day types of disputes that occurred in these families. The mean length of each dispute was 10.0 turns (SD = 4.4), which is quite long for such young children. Moreover, all but one family had one or more disputes that lasted 10 or more turns (range 3 to 36). Thus, it was quite common across all of the families in this sample to have extended disputing interchanges with their young toddlers.

The next set of analyses focused on the topics of disputes in the Beijing sample. One might expect, given the description of Chinese society as "collectivistic" and Chinese socialization practices as not highly focused on independence (Ho, 1986), that disputes about independence would be less likely to occur. However, the opposite argument could also be made with respect to these very young children. In other words, it might also be possible that Chinese children become members of a collectivistic society precisely because they have resolved many of these early disputes about independence with their caregivers. If we look at toddlers, an age at which independence is an issue of focus in Anglo-American samples (1991; Gralinski & Kopp, 1993; Harwood & Miller,; Lin & Fu, 1990), we might find just as many or perhaps more disputes centered on independence issues in this Chinese sample.

Insert Table 1 about here

As seen in Table 1, most of the disputes between caregivers and their toddlers in this Beijing sample were about dirty or destructive behavior on the part of the child, attempts by the caregiver to introduce a stimulating physical or social activity, and caretaking issues such as feeding and dressing. Very few disputes (9%) were centered around independence issues per se. Comparing these to the existing English data (Dunn & Munn, 1987; Eisenberg, 1992), we find first that even though independence is a major issue in children's development at this age, it is not a major topic of disputes between caregivers and their children - in either the Chinese or the British and American samples (8 percent and 6 percent in Dunn & Munn, 1987, and Eisenberg, 1992, respectively). Moreover, destructive or dirty behaviors and caregiving issues were also among two of the three largest categories of disputes in Dunn and Munn's (1987) study, accounting for 28 and 16 percent of all adult-child dispute topics, respectively. Thus, there appear to be some very general similarities across Anglo-European and Chinese samples.

However, there are some major differences as well. Specifically, many of the disputes that occurred between these Beijing caregivers and their children centered around a category that native Mandarin-speaking research assistants and colleagues insisted was necessary in understanding disputes between Chinese caregivers and their children - stimulating physical or social activities. This category did not occur in the coding systems of the American samples, and thus its absence could be in part an artifact of the coding system. However, there was a second difference that occurred between the samples which suggests something else may be motivating disputes across the two cultures. Namely, possession and rights talk was a major topic of dispute in both Dunn and Munn's (1987) and Eisenberg's (1992) samples, accounting for 12 and 19 percent of all disputes, respectively. In contrast, not one of the disputes between the Beijing caregivers and their children was coded in these terms despite a definition of the category that was identical to that used by Dunn and Munn (1987).

Thus, although disputes about independence per se do not appear to differ across the two cultures, disputes about independence-related issues such as rights, possession, and caregiver-initiated activities that are judged to be in the best interests of the child show large differences across these samples. Again, the differences are consistent with more global differences in individualistic and collectivistic orientations across these cultures, although the specifics of how these issues play out in actual dispute topics are difficult to predict in advance.

Overall, in terms of the very global issues of frequency, length, and topics of disputes between caregivers and their children, the present data tend to corroborate those looking at much older children and adults. That is, there are some minor differences in these global features between Chinese and American populations that may or may not be upheld with more rigorous analyses of comparable datasets. And yet, there still appear to be strong qualitative differences in how a dispute occurs across these populations. In order to understand these differences more fully, the utterance-by-utterance strategies that were used by these caregivers and their children were also examined. The following extended dispute between a 22-month-old boy from an intellectual family and his live-in babysitter illustrates how these strategies follow one another in practice.

Dispute 2 (21 turns)

*AYI: ni3 you4 qi2 ma3 le, You2You!
you again ride horse ASP, (CHI's name)
You're riding (your) horse again, YouYou?!
ni3 bu4 chu1 menr2 zhao3 ma1ma qu4 la: ?
you NEG exit door find mommy go SFP (then)
Aren't you going to go outside to look for mommy?

*CHI: *shi4 de.
COP (yes, I will go)

%com: Error in question-answering strategy again; responds to Y/N question with "yes" when he means "no".

*AYI: zou3 ba!
go SFP-sugg
(Let's) go then!
chu1 menr2, jie1 ma1ma qu4 ba: .
exit door, meet mommy go SFP
(Let's) go outside to meet mommy (then).

*CHI: bu4 hao3: .
NEG okay

*AY-R: ta1 yao4 qi2 ma3: .
he want ride horse

*CHI: wo3 yao4 (.) qi2 ma3 .
I want ride horse

*AYI: qu4 ba, jie1 ma1ma qu4 ba .
go SFP, meet mommy go SFP
(Let's) go and meet mommy (then).
zou3 .
go

*CHI: bu4 jie1 ma1ma qu4 .
NEG meet mommy go
(I'm) not going to meet mommy.

*AYI: You2You ting1 hua4: .
YouYou listen speech (obey me)

bu4 ting1 hua4 a1yi2 bu4 xi3huan1: .
NEG listen speech auntie NEG like (you)
(If) you don't listen (to me), auntie won't like you.
*CHI: bu4 ting1 ma: .
NEG listen SFP-emph
(I) won't listen.
*AYI: hao3: a!
okay SFP (then)
x:ing2 la!
fine SFP (then)
ni3 bu4 ting1 hua4, wo3-men zou3 le a: .
you NEG listen speech, we go SFP-then SFP
(If) you won't listen (to me), we'll leave (you know).
*CHI: (7.0 seconds of silence)
*AYI: wo3-men jie1 ma1:ma qu4 ba.
we meet mommy go SFP-sugg
yi4-huir2 ma1ma jiu4 hui2 -lai2le!
a-while mommy just return come SFP
Mommy will be back in just a short while.
hei! si4-dian3-ban4, xiao3 huo2zi, ni3 kan4 kan4@rv.
hey! (it's already) four-thirty, little guy, you look-ASP (a bit)
(1.0 seconds silence)
ni3 kan4 kan4@rv, si4-dian3-ban4 .
you look-look, four-thirty
(1.0 seconds silence)
zou3!
go
qu4 bu2 qu4 xxx ban1 na?
go not go xxx <meet mommy from> [?] work SFP
wo3-men shi4 bu4 gai1 qu4 jie1 ma1ma qu4 le ?
we COP NEG should go meet mommy go SFP
Shouldn't we go and meet mommy?
*CHI: bu2 qu4:.
NEG go:
... (8 more turns)
*AYI: na4 ni3 jiu4 qi2 ba.
then you just ride SFP-sugg

Here, the dispute was initiated by the child's live-in babysitter (AYI) who was responding to You2You's desire to ride on his rocking horse with (indirect) disapproval and suggested that he goes outside to find his mother instead. You2You's apparent response to this was an acceptance, and so a1yi2 prepared to go outside. This response, however, was an error on the part of You2You who made similar errors in answering yes-no questions at the time (he was responding to the "truth" value of the proposition rather than accepting the suggestion per se -- see Kim,

Shatz, & Akiyama, 1990 for developmental and cross-linguistic differences in sentence verification and denial). He clarified his intent by a direct refusal when a1yi2 then suggested that they go outside and further clarified it by imitating a1yi2's explanation (to the observer) that he wanted to ride his horse. This was followed by a further suggestion that he go outside, and a further refusal by You2You which a1yi2 finally responded to with a stern command that he obey her and a threat that if he did not obey, she would not like him. What is remarkable about this entire interchange is that not once did a1yi2 say You2You was not allowed to or should not ride his horse. Instead, she suggested that he do something else - go outside - and offered various prompts and justifications for doing the activity that she thought was more optimal for him at this time. In contrast,You2You frequently refused a1yi2's suggestions and even the premises for her justifications. On occasion, however, You2You took a less confrontative approach to a1yi2 by simply not responding. As in the previous dispute, above, however, a1yi2 did not consider the dispute to be over with You2You's lack of response and she continued to press for her suggestion that they go outside until she finally let him ride the horse for a while. This dispute, which was coded as being about a "stimulating social or physical activity" (going outside after being inside all day), is a rather typical dispute in terms of both the adult and child strategies that occur throughout this sample, as can be seen from Tables 2 and 3.

Insert Table 2 about here

Table 2 shows that the most common adult strategy in this sample was to issue some form of suggestion, command, or request. Many of these directive utterances were actually repetitions or rephrasings of initial suggestions, commands, or requests on the part of the mother, and this appears to be similar to American samples such as that studied by Eisenberg (1992). However, one of the most obvious differences is that these Beijing caregivers very rarely issued utterances that were direct refusals or disallowals of the child's behavior. Together, these types of strategies made up less than 10 percent of these Chinese caregivers' dispute-relevant utterances, whereas explicit declarations of "no" made up a large proportion of the English-speaking mothers' strategies in Eisenberg's (1992) sample. Even though Mandarin does not have a general word for "no" (bu4 must be used to negate a specified verb), this meaning certainly could have gotten across through direct refusals, which are expressible in a number of ways. Nonetheless, refusals made up less than one percent of all adult-child utterances within a dispute. Instead, the Mandarin-speaking caregivers chose to express their disagreement with the child through a number of other strategies such as offering a new directive, disapproval (which was almost always either indirect or highly mediated with linguistic markers if direct), prompting the child, threatening or enticing the child with various types of consequences or rewards, and challenging the child's premises or actions, or requesting clarification of the child's desires.

One possible explanation for this result is that in collapsing across various caregivers, the data included domestic workers (such as the live-in nanny, above) who were more polite to the children than their parents simply because of the distance in their relationship and their positions as hired helpers who could be dismissed for not treating the child with respect. However, when a separate analysis of the seven families in which only the mothers and fathers took part in the disputes was conducted, similar results were found. The only major difference was that this

subset of parents-only used a slightly higher proportion of threats (12% of 886 coded utterances) and a lower proportion of disapprovals (9%) than the larger sample. Otherwise, both the relative frequency of the various strategies and the absolute proportions were remarkably similar to the results from the whole sample. Nonetheless, further analyses on a larger sample of utterances is necessary to determine whether there are systematic differences in the strategies used by particular caregivers within this context.

Threats, while not the most frequent strategy for these Beijing caregivers, also occurred with greater frequency than one would expect from both the English-language literature and the knowledge that these are relatively well-educated parents with only children on "good behavior" in front of an observer. Moreover, although they were used in only 10 percent of utterances, every one of the children in this study received at least one threat from their caregivers. Thus, threats are a common and pervasive strategy in disputes between these Beijing caregivers and their children. In both of the disputes presented above, the phrase "bu4 xi3huan1 ni3 le" appears, which is a threat about the withdrawal of love from the caregiver that means more than just "I won't like you." Instead, it is more closely related to something like "I won't love you anymore." Although it sounds harsh to English-speakers' ears, it was a very common threat, together with other threats about leaving the child alone, appearing in the disputes of 9 out of 10 of these Beijing families. However, these threats were perceived by native Mandarin-speaking coders as being made in a playful context that presumed the caregiver would not really stop loving the child. Nonetheless, they are effective for the very reason that there is uncertainty about this and that it would be a very negative consequence to be rejected or left alone by one's own caregiver.

Another strategy which differed from the English-language literature on early adult-child and child-child disputes is the use of justifications. Justifications were used relatively infrequently by the Mandarin-speaking caregivers, whereas in the British and U.S. data, justification occurred frequently (roughly 35 percent of all disputes) and is seen as an important strategy for children's subsequent cognitive and social development (Dunn, 1993; Dunn & Munn, 1987). While these previous data were coded somewhat differently from the present data, it is unlikely that differences in coding strategies alone can account for the differences in the use of justifications. In fact, several of the caregivers appeared to use almost no justifications when disputing with their children, despite the fact that these disputes went on for several turns. Instead, these differences in strategies across the different samples appear to be reflective of underlying differences in cultural approaches towards disputing and negotiation as they are entirely consistent with the adult cross-cultural data in these respects (Adler, Brahm, & Graham, 1992).

Insert Table 3 about here

Similarly, You2You's strategies are not unique, neither with respect to the types of strategies used in this sample of Beijing children, nor by comparison to those strategies used by Chinese adults. You2You is like other Beijing children in that "no response" is his most frequent strategy in dispute sequences, despite the fact that he is clearly able to make use of a variety of other strategies. Overall, "no response" was the most common child response for this sample,

appearing as 55% of all dispute-related child utterances, even though refusals and other strategies did not have to be as explicitly verbal as You2You's (e.g., a fuss in direct response to a suggestion was also coded as a refusal, and there was an "uncodable" category available for all kinds of other vocal behaviors). Again, however, this is consistent with the adult data. Chua and Gudykunst (1987), in particular, found that Taiwanese students were more likely to maintain silence, whereas American students were more likely to communicate about a dispute directly.

Conclusions

The data reported in the present paper are a preliminary look into the types of disputes and disputing strategies that Mandarin-speaking children in Beijing use with their caregivers. They specifically address two sets of questions: those of cultural differences in disputes and negotiations; and how children come to learn the disputing processes in their own culture.

For the first issue, there are certain types of disputes and strategies that appear to be highly culturally-specific (e.g., "stimulating activity", "threats" and "no response" vs. "rights/possession" and "justifications", for Chinese and Anglo-European samples, respectively). At the same time, there were many similarities both in terms of the overall number and length of disputes, and in topics of dispute between toddlers and their caregivers in both Chinese and Anglo-European cultures.

For the second issue, children's resolutions of disputes and mothers' use of justifications in the U.S. and British samples have been found to be related to children's later social and cognitive development (Dunn et al., 1995). In the present sample, however, the Mandarin-speaking mothers rarely made use of justifications. This raises a number of interesting questions that are worthy of further study.

First, are there implications for these differences in strategies that adults use which go beyond disputing (i.e., do they have implications for children's social and cognitive development?), or are they simply reflections of cultural differences in the style of resolving a conflict? Similarly, do the strategies used by these not-quite-two-year-olds and their caregivers reflect cultural strategies in disputing behaviors as a whole, or should we expect differences across different types of interactants according to their familiarity and social roles? Finally, do the strategies used by these Chinese parents reflect differences in more general pragmatic phenomena across languages and cultures?

These data are suggestive of links with the literature on adult disputes, and they demonstrate that the expectations one might derive from a superficial reading of "individualistic" and "collectivistic" tendencies are not confirmed by the overall frequencies or topics of disputes amongst family members. Moreover, they suggest a need for more attention to the utterance-by-utterance strategies that occur in disputes, as well as closer attention to mediating variables rather than global dimensions such as "collectivism/individualism" to further illuminate the nature of cultural differences in conflict resolution and its socialization.

* *The author wishes to thank the Beijing children and their families for participating in the study, as well as Professor Jing and the Institute of Psychology, Chinese Academy of Sciences for making this research possible. Help in coding the data was provided by Xiang Zongping and Wang Lei. Special thanks also to Michael Bond, Susan Ervin-Tripp, Kwok Leung, and Catherine McBride for reading and commenting on earlier versions of this manuscript. Portions*

of these data were presented at the 5th International Pragmatics Conference, Mexico City, July 1996 and at the University of Hong Kong in January, 1997. The analyses for this study were supported by a Canadian Social Sciences and Humanities Postdoctoral Fellowship and by a Fellowship in the Michigan Society of Fellows, University of Michigan.

References

Adler, N.J., Brahm, R., & Graham, J.L.
1992 Strategy implementation: A comparison of face-to-face negotiations in the People's Republic of China and the United States. *Strategic Management Journal, 13*, 449-66.

Clancy, P.M.
1986 The acquisition of communicative style in Japanese. In B.B. Schieffelin & E. Ochs (Eds.), *Language socialization across cultures*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Condon, J.C.
1985 *Good neighbors: Communicating with the Mexicans*. Intercultural Press.

Ding, Daniel Z.
1995 *Exploring Chinese conflict management styles in joint ventures in the People's Republic of China*. Hong Kong : Dept. of Business and Management, Faculty of Business, City University of Hong Kong Working Paper.

Dunn, J.
1993 Social interaction, relationships, and the development of causal discourse and conflict management. *European Journal of Psychology of Education, 8*(4), 391-401.

Dunn, J. & Munn,
1987 Development of justification in disputes with mother and sibling. *Developmental Psychology, 23*, 791-8.

Dunn, J., Slomkowski, C., Donelan, N. & Herrera, C.
1995 Conflict, understanding, and relationships: Developments and differences in the preschool years. *Early Education and Development, 6*(4), 303-16.

Eisenberg, A.R.
1992 Conflicts between mothers and their young children. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 38*, 21-43.

Emery, R.E.
1988 *Marriage, divorce, and children's adjustment*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Erikson, E.H.
1959 *Identity and the life cycle*. Psychological Issues, 4, Monograph 1. New York: International Universities Press.

Fisher, R. & Ury, W.
1981 *Getting to yes: Negotiating agreement without giving in.* New York: Penguin.

Garvey, C.
1993). Diversity in the controversial repertoire: The case of conflicts and social pretending. *Cognition and Instruction, 11*, 251-64.

Graham, J.L. & Sano, Y.
1984 *Smart bargaining: Doing business with the Japanese*. Cambridge: Ballinger.

Gralinski, J.H. & Kopp, C.B.
1993 Everyday rules for behavior: Mothers' requests to young children. *Developmental Psychology, 29*(3), 573-84.

Harwood, R.L. & Miller, J.G.

1991 Perceptions of attachment behavior: A comparison of Anglo and Puerto Rican mothers. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 37*(4), 583-99.

Ho, D.Y.-F.
1976 On the concept of face. *American Journal of Sociology, 81*, 867-84.

Ho, D.Y.-F.
1986 Chinese patterns of socialization: A critical review. In M.H. Bond (Ed.), *The psychology of the Chinese people* (pp. 1-37). Hong Kong: Oxford University Press.

Hocker, J.L. & Wilmot, W.W.
1985 *Interpersonal conflict* (2nd ed.). Dubuque, IA: William C. Brown Publishers.

Kim, J.L, Shatz, M., & Akiyama, M.M.
1990 Effects of language and task on children's patterns of sentence verification and denial. *Developmental Psychology, 26*, 821-9.

Leung, K.
1985 *Cross-cultural study of procedural fairness and disputing behavior.* Ph.D. dissertation, University of Illinois, Champaign-Urbana.

Leung, K.
1987 Some determinants of reactions to procedural models for conflict resolution: A cross-national study. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 53*, 898-908.
1988 Some determinants of conflict avoidance. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 19*,(1), 125-36.
in press Negotiation and reward allocations across cultures. In P.C. Earley & M. Erez (Eds.), *New perspectives on international industrial/organizational psychology*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Levinson, S.
1983 *Pragmatics*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Lin, C.Y.C. & Fu, V.R.
1990 A comparison of child-rearing practices among Chinese, immigrant Chinese, and Caucasian-American parents. Special issue: Minority children. *Child Development, 61*(2), 429-33.

Markus, H.R. & Kitayama, S.
1991 Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion and motivation. *Psychological Review, 98*, 224-53.

Peak, L.
1986 Training learning skills and attitudes in Japanese early educational settings. *New Directions for Child Development, 32*, 111-23.

Peak, L.
1991 *Learning to go to school in Japan: The transition from home to preschool life.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Piaget, J.
1928 *Judgment and reasoning in the child.* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Pye, Lucian W.
1992 *Chinese negotiating style : commercial approaches and cultural principles.* New York : Quorum Books.

Schiffrin, D.
1988 Conversation analysis. In F.J. Newmeyer (Ed.), *Linguistics: The Cambridge survey*, Volume IV, 251-76.. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Shantz, C.U. & Hobart, C.J.
1989 Social conflict and development: Peers and siblings. In T.J. Berndt & G.W. Ladd (Eds.), Peer relationships in child development (pp. 71-94). New York: Wiley.

Shenkar, O. & Ronen, S.
1987 The cultural context of negotiations: The implications of Chinese interpersonal norms. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 23*, 263-75.

Slomkowski, C.L. & Dunn, J.
1992 Arguments and relationships within the family: Differences in young children's disputes with mother and sibling. *Developmental Psychology, 28*, 919-24.

Tang, S.F.Y. & Kirkbride, P.S.
1986 Developing conflict management skills in Hong Kong: An analysis of some cross-cultural implications. *Management education and development, 17*(3), 287-301.

Tardif, T.
1993 *Adult-to-child speech and language acquisition in Mandarin Chinese*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Yale University.

Ting-Toomey, S.
1991 Intimacy expressions in three cultures: France, Japan, and the United States. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 15*, 29-46.

Triandis, H.C.
1989 Cross-cultural studies of individualism and collectivism. In J.J. Berman (Ed.), *Cross-cultural perspectives, Nebraska Symposium on Motivation*, Volume 37 (pp. 41-133). Lincoln, NB: University of Nebraska Press.

Vygotsky, L.S.
1978 *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambrdige, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wolf, M.
1978 Child training and the Chinese family. In A.P. Wolf (Ed.), *Studies in Chinese society* (pp. 221246). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Table 1: Topics of disputes in Beijing Sample

Topic	% of disputes	N of fam's
destructive/dirty behavior	25	9
stimulating physical or social activity	23	4
caretaking	21	7
independence	9	3
house rules	8	4
stimulating cognitive act	7	4
manners/politeness	5	5
hurting/aggression	2	2
possession/rights	0	0
personal space	0	0

Table 2: Adult Strategies in Beijing Disputes

Strategy	% of Total Utts
Suggest/Command/ Request	30
Disapprove	13
Prompt	11
Threat	9
Disallow	6
Challenge	6
Request Clarification	6
Entice	5
Justify	5
Uncodable	3
Change Topic	2
Refuse	<1
Praise	<1
No Response	<1
Imitate	<1
Accept	<1
Request Justification	<1

*A total of 1588 adult-to-child utterances were coded over 133 disputes.

Table 3: Child Strategies in Beijing Disputes

Strategy	% of Total Utts
No Response	55
Suggest/Command/Request	10
Refuse	8
State Proposition	7
Uncodable	6
Accept S/C/R	5
Change Topic	3
Accept Challenge/Threat	3
Refuse Challenge/Threat	1
Threat/Challenge	<1
Request Clarification	<1
Justify	<1
Imitate	<1
Run Away	<1
Disapprove	<1
Prompt	<1

* A total of 661 child utterances were coded over 133 disputes.