Master's Theses   Graduate College

8-2004

Dialectics in Mother-Child Relationships Among First-generation Asian Indian Women in the United States

Chitra Akkoor

Recommended Citation

DIALECTICS IN MOTHER-CHILD RELATIONSHIPS AMONG FIRST-
GENERATION ASIAN INDIAN WOMEN IN THE UNITED STATES

by

Chitra Akkoor

A Thesis
Submitted to the
Faculty of The Graduate College
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the
Degree of Master of Arts
Department of Communication

Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan
August 2004

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

My heartfelt thanks go to my advisor Dr. Maria Lapinski for guiding me through the long and ardous task of writing a thesis. I thank my committee members Dr. Leigh Ford, and Professor Sue Ellen Christian. I would like to add a very special thanks to Dr. Ford for all her warmth and encouragement throughout my three years of graduate school.

How can I forget the participants of this study? It was their enthusiastic participation that made this study possible. Next, I would like to thank my husband for giving me the space to spend virtually all my time on this project. I also thank my parents and my brother for their moral support. I would like to acknowledge my good friend Tammy Jeffries with whom I have had wonderfully stimulating conversations throughout graduate school. I would like to apologize to other friends who at some point I'm sure became tired of hearing about my thesis woes.

As I move on to begin my Ph.D. program, I feel that all the hard work that went into this thesis was worthwhile. I know that this experience will be extremely valuable to me in the years ahead, opening up wonderful possibilities for future research

Chitra Akkoor

DIALECTICS IN MOTHER-CHILD RELATIONSHIPS AMONG FIRST-GENERATION ASIAN INDIAN WOMEN IN THE UNITED STATES

Chitra Akkoor, M.A.

Western Michigan University, 2004

The purpose of this study was to explore the experiences of Asian Indian immigrant women raising children in the U.S. as value contradictions between Asian Indian culture and U.S. culture. Relational dialectics in parent-child relationships among Asian Indian immigrant women and their children was also explored using the dialectcial perspective. Participants for the study were 20 Asian Indian women chosen randomly from the Kalamazoo-Battle Creek (MI) AI community who participated in one-one-interviews. Results of the study showed that participants experienced value contradictions in child-rearing. All four contradictions addressed in research on relational dialectics were also discovered in the context of the present study. Secondary tensions emerged for autonomy-connection, and judgment-acceptance dialectics. Finally, communication strategies used by the participants of the study were explored and it was determined that internal communication (within the mother-child relationship) was used more frequently by participants than external communication (with family, friends and others), and intrapersonal communication.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents – Continued

Table of Contents - Continued

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

India's connection with the United States (U.S.) dates back more than a century.

There is evidence that Asian Indian (AI) indentured laborers came to the U.S. on British

ships as early as the 1800s (Fong, 2000), followed by Asian Indian farmers and laborers

in the early 1900s (Sheth, 1997). It was not until 1965 that Asian Indians began arriving

in the U.S. in large numbers as a result of the Immigration Reform Act, which

significantly increased quotas allocated for entry into the U.S. from Asian countries

(Rangaswamy, 2000). Unlike the earlier arrivals, this population was comprised of

primarily urban professionals and students from India, who eventually settled in the U.S.

as immigrants. Since then, the Asian Indian population in the U.S. has been growing

steadily and was estimated at more than 2 million in 2002 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2002).

First generation AI immigrants in the United States are, in general, the most

highly educated and economically affluent among recent immigrant groups (Bacon, 1996;

Fong 2000). For example, according to the 1990 census, 58% of Asian Indians had a 4

year degree or more, compared to 40.7% of Chinese immigrants, 34.5% of Japanese,

17.4% of Vietnamese, and 5.7% of Cambodians (see Fong, 2000). Similarly in terms of

employment in 1999, AI immigrants had the highest percentage of professionals, when

compared to other immigrant groups (Fong, 2000). In terms of median income, AI

immigrants were second only to Japanese immigrants. One reason for this success is the

emphasis placed on education by AIs in general. A second reason is that AIs unlike some

other immigrant populations in the U.S., did not leave India, fleeing political or religious

persecution; their aim in leaving India and was to seek economic prosperity

(Rangaswamy, 2000). A number of AI immigrants to the U.S. were therefore, already qualified professionals in the areas of engineering and medicine (Bacon, 1996).

In leaving India, AI immigrants also left "a cultural heritage they cherished" (Rangaswamy, 2000, p. 330). AI families, therefore, like to maintain close ties with their homeland and the AI community in the U.S. Retaining the AI culture in the form of traditional practices, religion, education, marriage, familial values, food, and speaking the native language, is extremely important to many AIs (Mattai, 1997; Saran, 1985; Sheth, 1997). The role that AI women play in retaining traditions is an important one. A review of literature demonstrates that India's 5,000-year-old tradition prescribes for women the primary identities of wife and mother, together with a number of cultural and social norms related to these roles. Studies have found that family and marriage, stability of marriage as an institution, traditional gender roles in the family, and motherhood continue to be salient to immigrant AI women (first-generation) in the U.S. (e.g. Inman, Constantine, Ladany, & Morano, 2001; Segal, 1991; Singh & Kanjirathinkal, 1999).

On the other hand the U.S. culture in which these women live, also exerts its influence on them, particularly through their children (Bacon, 1996). Further, comparisons of cultural values among nations (e.g. Chinese Cultural Connection, 1987; Hofstede, 1980; Hofstede, 2001; Inglehart, Basanez, & Moreno, 1998) reveal differences between India and the U.S. in cultural values, particularly in terms of collectivistic versus individualistic orientations. Literature specific to AI immigrants support these findings in terms of AI immigrant perceptions of U.S. culture, specifically with regard to marriage and family (e.g. DasGupta, 1997; Mattai, 1997). Studies show that AIs living in the U.S, particularly those with children, take a highly critical view of U.S. culture (Bhutani,

1994; DasGupta, 1997; Roy, 1985). One objective of this thesis, therefore, is to specifically explore AI women's perceptions of specific AI and U.S. values in the context of their familial relationships.

As "guardians of tradition" (Singh & Kanjirathinkal, 1999, p. 320), AI women are expected to pass on the traditional culture to their children (Khare, 1997; Mani, 1993; Sheth, 1997). Their perceptions of the mainstream U.S. culture exert an influence on their daily lives, likely creating certain challenges for first-generation AI women (Prathikanti, 1997; Singhal, 1997). This study will additionally examine the challenges that first generation AI women face in raising children between two cultures.

Studies further show that living amidst two cultures results in conflicts within the family. Such conflicts arise for a number of reasons: (a) first-generation AI women having to place family before individual needs, (b) increased assertiveness of first-generation AI women which is perceived by spouses as negative effects of Westernization, (c) trying to assimilate into U.S. culture while retaining AI traditional practices, (d) raising children between the two cultures, and (e) maintaining harmony and peace in the family (e.g. Jayakar, 1994; Kakaiya, 2000). This thesis will examine these conflicts as contradictions between opposing sets of values of the AI culture and the U.S. culture.

While studies have provided insight into cultural aspects of psychological responses to conflicts in AI immigrant families, the role of communication in negotiating such conflicts is less well understood. Thus, another objective of this study is to understand the role of interpersonal and intrapersonal communication in resolving or coping with such value-related conflicts by first-generation AI immigrant women.

The issues AI women face, can best be understood through the theoretical lens of the dialectical perspective. In the dialectical perspective (Baxter, 1988), two forces coming into opposition create a contradiction. The resulting contradiction may be experienced by relational partners, or by individuals, as a tension between opposing poles; relational maintenance entails continuous negotiation of these tensions. Research on contradictions among relational partners has mainly included romantic couples, among primarily Euro-American populations (see Baxter, 1990). The present study offers an opportunity to extend this line of research into the contexts of familial relationships with particular focus on child-rearing, in a non-Euro-American population. By examining contradictions in the context of cultural values, this study extends the dialectical perspective to an intercultural context.

The overall purpose of this thesis then, is to examine the interplay of two cultures in the context of raising children in the U.S. by AI first generation immigrant women. The specific objectives of the study are (a) to understand AI women's perceptions of AI and U.S. values as they impact their personal and familial lives, (b) to examine the contradictions and dialectical tensions that emerge from raising children among two cultures, and (c) the role of interpersonal and intrapersonal communication in coping with the resulting tensions. The heuristic value of this study would be the valuable insight it could provide AI parents in relationships with their children, and extend the dialectical perspective to an intercultural context.

In addressing these objectives, Chapter 2 of this thesis will review literature on cultural values, norms, and practices, literature specific to AI women, followed by a discussion of the theoretical framework for the present study, the rationale for the study,

and research questions. Chapter 3 of the thesis will describe the methodology used to examine the research questions, including description of the participants, and details of how the study was conducted. The findings of the study are presented in Chapter 4; discussion of the results, implications for future research, and limitations of this project, are presented in Chapter 5.

CHAPTER TWO

Review of Literature

The focal point of this study is the interplay of two cultures in the lives of immigrant AI women - AI culture and the U.S. American culture. The chapter begins by making the conceptual distinctions between the terms culture, cultural values and norms, and reports findings on values research in multiple countries. The next section provides an overview of what have been found as AI values and U.S. values. Next is a discussion of Schwartz's (1992) universal structure of values and how contradictions are likely to arise from competing value types. This is followed by a historical perspective on AI cultural values, norms and practices, the continuity of such practices in present-day India, and their prevalence in the familial lives of first-generation immigrant AI women in the U.S. The Dialectical Perspective is presented next as a theoretical framework for understanding contradictions faced by AI women in the U.S. The final section of the chapter provides the rationale for the study and research questions.

Cultural Values and Norms

The term 'culture' has generally been defined by intercultural communication scholars as a sharing of specific beliefs, symbols, values, behavior, religion, and patterns of knowledge among groups of people (see Samovar, Porter, & Stefani, 1998; Ting-Toomey, 2002). Although individuals may have their own personal values, there are those that "tend to permeate a culture" (Samovar & Porter, 1995, p. 68); these are described as -'cultural values'- which in turn give rise to certain practices unique to a culture. Values, thus, form the essential core of a culture (Kluckhohn, 1951).

Lustig & Koester (1996) describe values as "what a culture regards as good or bad, right or wrong, fair or unfair, just or unjust, appropriate or inappropriate ..." (p. 97). Schwartz (1992) sees values as concepts connected to desired outcomes which people use as criteria to guide behaviors. Similarly Rokeach (1973) defined values as beliefs that influence one's conduct or behavior, and which are related to certain goals in life. Further, according to Rokeach, there is an "oughtness" (p. 9) related to values. Based on values certain modes of behavior are considered appropriate and others are not; these form the 'norms' of a culture, which serve a prescriptive function within a society (Lustig & Koester, 1996).

Values are learned over time through socialization (Rokeach 1973). They are also passed on in the form of traditional practices from one generation to the next (Neuliep, 2000). The continuity of certain values, norms and cultural practices is evident among the AI immigrant population in the U.S. The next section provides an explanation of what the existing literature indicates as AI cultural values and norms.

Values in AI Culture

Certain sets of values consistently emerge in literature. The majority of the studies of values are large-scale studies not focusing exclusively on AI values, but more on cross-cultural comparisons of values among countries around the world (e.g. Bond; 1988; Hofstede, 1980; Inglehart, Basanez, & Moreno, 1998). Hsu (1963), on the other hand, specifically compared the U.S., Chinese, and AI cultures in terms of family values. Some mention of values is also found in literature on AI immigrants in the U.S. (e.g. Mattai, 1997; Rangaswamy, 2000).

Hofstede's (1980) global research among 41 nations, measured nations along four cultural dimensions, namely individualism-collectivism, power distance, uncertainty avoidance, and masculinity-femininity. To summarize the study's findings with reference to India, the study found AI culture to be a collectivistic culture characterized by loyalty, duty and obligations to the family. Marriages in collectivistic cultures are considered a contract between families and are therefore arranged by the family (Hofstede, 2001). Cultures with high power distance accept inequality as inherent in relationships, and are hierarchical in nature, with the hierarchy based on power, wealth, age, social status, or caste. Authority is recognized and respected requiring unquestioning obedience. India was found to have high power distance; thus hierarchical power structures were considered necessary and were adhered to in society, and within the family. For example, respect for parents and the elderly is considered a "basic virtue" with parental authority continuing well into adulthood (Hofstede, 2001, p. 107). Uncertainty avoidance refers to the extent to which cultures are able tolerate uncertainty about the future. India displayed low uncertainty avoidance scores, which meant greater tolerance for ambiguity. The masculinity-femininity dimension mainly refers to gender roles in a society. Therefore, a highly masculine society has stronger gender differentiation with males occupying positions of authority. India was found to be high on the masculinity index. Combined with a large power distance this meant that family relationships are hierarchical based on gender and age, with the oldest male in the family having the ultimate authority (Hofstede, 2001).

India was among 21 countries surveyed by Bond (1988) using the Chinese value survey (Chinese Cultural Connection, 1987). This survey was an effort to create an

instrument to measure cultural values from an Eastern perspective. Results showed that India was oriented towards cultural inwardness emphasizing loyalty towards family and culture, including values such as filial piety, respect for tradition, chastity in women, and the importance of rites and rituals. Bond's study further revealed that AIs valued security, (e.g. family security) over independent thought and action, personal morality over social power, and self-restraint over pleasure in daily life. Hsu (1963) in a comparison of China, India, and the U.S. found AI culture to be primarily male-oriented. Hierarchies based on patriarchal authority were common in AI families. Further, the values of duty and obligation towards the family was valued in the AI culture over "Western pattern of freedom and rights" (Hsu, 1963, p. 28). He also found that protection of women was of great importance in the AI culture.

AI values that emerge from literature on AI immigrants in the U.S. are consistent with the findings of the studies discussed above with the primary emphasis on family values. Important family values mentioned in literature are, family connection and stability, centrality of marriage and children specifically for women, arranged marriage, stability of married life, chastity, clearly defined gender roles, hierarchy within families based on age and gender, respect for the authority of elders, duty, sacrifice, compromise, and emphasis on education (see Ahluwalia, 2002; Bhutani, 1994; Inman, Constantine, Ladany, & Morano, 2001; Mattai, 1997).

U.S. Cultural Values

Based on previous research, Hsu (1963) listed U.S. American values as, (a) self-interest, self-expression, self-gratification, and independence; (b) valuing privacy; (c) authority as suspect; (d) acceptance among peers; (e) organized religion; (f) equality of

men and women; (g) emphasis on materialism; and (h) need for progress and change. Hofstede's (1980) findings lend support to Hsu's (1963) taxonomy of values, many of which are characteristic of an individualistic society. In individualistic cultures self-interest is valued over group interests. Self-interest is characterized as emphasis on the individual self, autonomy, privacy, hedonism, speaking one's mind, and self-respect (Hofstede, 2001). The U.S. was also found to have low power distance. Low power distance cultures believe in equality in relationships. The United States is a low PDI culture where although hierarchies exist, equality is generally valued. In the United States, a low PDI culture, children are expected to participate in their life choices. In terms of uncertainty-avoidance the U.S. displayed low tolerance for ambiguity. In the masculinity-femininity index, the U.S. was found to be a masculine culture. U.S. values emerge as emphasizing individual choice, freedom, and equality.

The above studies highlight some basic differences between AI and U.S. cultures. In order to explore the interplay of these cultures in the lives of first-generation AI women, the universal content and structure of human values developed by Schwartz and Bilsky (1987, 1990) and Schwartz (1992) provides a useful framework. Although this structure was not developed specific to the U.S. or AI cultures, it nevertheless provides a model to examine the interplay of AI and U.S. values.

Schwartz's Structure of Human Values

The structure of human values was first proposed by Schwartz & Bilsky (1987, 1990) as a way of organizing 56 human values identified by prior research (e.g. Hofstede, 1980; Rokeach, 1973). Values were conceptualized as beliefs that guide behavior. According to Schwartz and Bilsky (1990) each value is based on motivations and goals

driven by certain inherent human needs. Based on research in 20 countries, Schwartz (1992) organized previously identified values into ten categories and named them based on the motivational goals represented by the values. Ten categories which Schwartz (1992) called *motivational value types* were self-direction, stimulation, hedonism, achievement, power, security, conformity, tradition, benevolence, and universalism. The motivational goal of self-direction is independent thought and action, expressing the human need for autonomy. Some values related to self-direction are independence, freedom, and personal choice. Stimulation is motivated by excitement and daring; values related to stimulation express the need for novelty. Hedonism is characterized by values that emphasize enjoyment, and is motivated by the need for "pleasure and sensuous gratification for oneself" (Schwartz, 1992, p. 8). The value type of achievement is related to the goal of being competent and motivated by a need for personal success. The goal of power is related to attaining social status and prestige; values related to power express the need for control over people and resources. Security is motivated by the need for safety, harmony and stability in relationships. Conformity includes the values of self-restraint, obedience, and honoring parents and elders with the goal of conforming to social expectations or norms. Tradition is characterized by values such as religious beliefs and acceptance of norms imposed by one's culture, and is motivated by respect for one's culture. Benevolence expresses concern for people in close relationships and is motivated by the goal of maintaining welfare of others in personal interactions. The final value type of universalism is related to the motivational goal of understanding, appreciation and tolerance of all people including ones outside the primary group (see Appendix A for details).

Schwartz (1992) presented the results of his research in 20 countries in the form of a model in which certain motivational value types were compatible and others were conflicting. For example the value types of self-direction, stimulation, and hedonism, were compatible; similarly tradition, conformity and security were compatible; however, self-direction/ stimulation/hedonism were found to oppose tradition/conformity/security. The value types of power, achievement, hedonism, stimulation, and self-direction were found to serve individual interests; the value-types of benevolence, tradition, and conformity served collective interests, while universalism and security served mixed interests. Thus, according to Schwartz (1992), conflict occurs when an individual or individuals try to simultaneously pursue values from opposing sets of values.

Viewing AI and U.S. cultural values reviewed in the previous section (e.g. Bond, 1988; Hofstede, 1980; Hsu, 1963) we find that the U.S. values serve individual interests while the AI cultural values serve collective interests. According to Schwartz (1992) individual interests are likely to oppose collective interests. Before discussing how such opposition influences the lives of first-generation AI women in the U.S., a historical perspective of AI culture is provided. As stated by Samovar & Porter (1995), "Unless we have had experience with people from other cultures, it is quite natural to assume everyone thinks the way we do" (p. 71). The values, norms, and practices of one culture, thus seem strange to members of another culture. A historical perspective can help situate such practices in a context, for those unfamiliar with that culture. A historical perspective is also important because, "cultural values, ideals, and behaviors originate in a culture's history. History can therefore help answer such questions as to why one type of activity evolved over another." (Samovar and Porter (1995, p. 70). The next section, therefore,

provides an overview of the origins of AI values that continue to influence the lives of AIs in the U.S. Because the focus of this study is on first-generation AI women and the contradictions they face based on living between two cultures, this discussion mainly describes values, norms and practices as they relate to AI women.

Historical Overview

According to the ancient Hindu religious texts such as the *Veda* (scriptures), *Dharmashastra* (law books or codes of conduct), *Purana* (legends), and *Ithihasa* (histories or tales) feminine energy has been considered equal in status and complementary to masculine energy (Sharma, 1995). The animating energy of the universe called *Shakti* has been considered as feminine and is worshipped through goddess images of Durga, depicting strength and power, Saraswathi, the goddess of intellect, and Lakshmi, the goddess of wealth (Diwakar, 1992).

Consistent with this ideology, Dube's (1976) review of early the Vedic scriptures (1500 B.C – 500 B.C.) shows that women were held in high status in Indian society during this time period. Throughout this period, women were educated on par with men in theology and philosophy, and enjoyed considerable independence and individual freedom (Altekar, 1962; Subbamma, 1992). Women also engaged in important social and religious functions, were held in high esteem within families, and were not only able to choose their own marriage partners but were also able to remarry if widowed (Dube, 1976). Due to various internal and external social forces, (which are beyond the scope of this literature review), by 400 B.C. the status of women in society had deteriorated considerably.

In the 2nd century B.C, the laws central to Hindu society were compiled and centralized by Manu in the *Manusmriti* (Laws of Manu). According to Manu's laws, women's power was to be harnessed and controlled by men (Wadley, 1977), or it could "wreak havoc on the male world" (Reynolds, 1978, p. 456). Thus, according to the Manusmriti, a woman was to remain "under the protection of her father in childhood, her husband during her youth, her son in her old age being thus forever dependent" (Manu, 2 B.C., p. 9, as cited in Wadley, 1977).

Manu's laws laid down clear rules of conduct, prescriptions and duties for women (*stridharma*), the most important duty being that of a *pativrata*, a woman dedicated to her husband. The basic tenets of stridharma emphasized "fidelity and loyalty with which a married woman served her husband and his family" (Mukherjee, 1978, p.12). For instance, women were not to act independently without the consent of the men in her life. The family was to be central in the life of a married woman.

Historically, motherhood has been another defining aspect of AI womanhood. In this capacity a woman was expected to care for her children as well as extended family (Mukherjee, 1978). The mother is venerated in the scriptures as "godlike in her unlimited love and devotion" (Gupta & Prakashan, 1982, p. 221). Although seen as godlike, the AI woman was also not expected to have a sense of individuality. The duty of motherhood confined her to the home, at once making her "queen and slave" (Subbamma, 1992, p.3). Qualities such as chastity, endurance, adjustment to circumstances, fidelity, uncomplaining acceptance of the husband, protecting the reputation of the family, and sacrifice were considered the hallmark of *stridharma* (Altekar, 1962; Boyle, 1999; Pearson, 1996;). The honor of the family rested on its women (Gupta & Prakasan, 1982).

The emphasis on the chastity and purity of women gave rise to pre-puberty marriages for girls, which were arranged by the parents and elders in the family (Altekar, 1962). Thus, the arranged marriage became the cultural norm, with no possibility of divorce. While the rules for women were stringent, a double standard existed; for example, men could remain unmarried until the age of 20 while the women were often married at the age of 8 or 10 (Mukherjee, 1978). A man was also free to divorce a wife if she could not beget a son and heir, while divorce was not an option for women under any circumstances (Sharma, 2002). Young (2002) summarizes the decline in women's position in ancient AI society as follows:

> Whereas once their womb was understood as the fertile field, now it became but a vessel for male seed. Whereas once they were married only when mature (after puberty), now they were married before puberty. Whereas once they had real input into the choice of marriage partner, now they were marginal to the process of arranged marriage. Whereas once both daughters and sons were viewed as important, now sons were not only highly preferred, but daughters came to be viewed as liabilities. (p. 9)

The Moslem invasion in the 12th century and their subsequent rule for five centuries introduced other customs such as *purdah* (segregation of women from men), *sati* (burning of war widows on the husband's funeral pyre), (Altekar, 1962; Dube, 1976). Although sati and child-marriage were legally abolished in the 1900s, the practices of arranged marriage, emphasis on the values such as chastity, centrality of marriage, motherhood, and family, prevailed. As the following discussion will demonstrate, many of these values and practices continue to be salient among AI women in present times.

Tradition and Women in Contemporary India

According to Mitter (1991), one cannot dismiss the traditions of India as artifacts of some remote past.

These are inculcated by one's kinfolk, reinforced by clan and community, and perpetually represented in art, mythology, and popular culture... They are alive and well and living just about everywhere. (p. 2).

Images of the ideal woman have traditionally been emphasized and passed on to succeeding generations through telling and re-telling of stories from mythology that continue to the present day through mass media such as movies and television (Rangaswamy, 2000; Roland, 1987). For example, the epic *Ramayana* keeps the ideal of the perfect wife alive among contemporary women. It tells the story of Sita, who followed her husband into exile and remained loyal to the end in spite of many trials and tribulations. Another example of the devout wife is that of Savitri who was able to bring her dead husband back from Yama, the god of death, due to her steadfast devotion to her husband (see Mukherjee, 1978; Pearson, 1996; Young, 2002).

Other researchers have observed that many traditional rituals performed by AI women demonstrate the centrality of the family in a woman's life. Pearson (1996) observed the importance of *Vratas* (special rituals involving penance and austerities) performed by women for the longevity of their husband's life and well-being of their children. These rituals related to *stridharma* have been handed down through the generations to emphasize the centrality of marriage and children in the lives of AI women.

Marriage arranged by parents and extended family members continues to be the norm in India, regardless of differences in education, wealth or status of Indian women (Mitter, 1991). Bumiller (1990) noted how her assumption that arranged marriages were common only among rural people and the poorer sections of society, was incorrect; instead she found "college women in big cities to gladly give their parents the task of finding them good husbands" (p. 30); further many women agree to the marriage within a very short time of meeting the prospective groom. Similarly, Boyle (1999) found that women in her study across educational levels and social class, perceived arranged marriages as "sensible" (p. 54), because parents were more experienced and therefore better able to make the right choices of a spouse. Although a number of Boyle's participants indicated that times were changing and that they could no longer expect their children to unconditionally agree to marrying a partner selected solely by their parents, the family would nevertheless be involved in the process of finding a suitable spouse for their children.

Motherhood continues to be a defining aspect of an AI woman's life (Wadley, 1977). Reynolds (1978) observed that in the Indian culture, "a woman with a husband but no children is, indeed, a barren woman" (p. 460). A woman's status in her husband's family improves when she gives birth, particularly to a son, as a son is considered the carrier of the lineage (Boyle, 1999). Roland (1987) notes that although the AI family system follows a complex male oriented hierarchical structure, the mother plays an important role in the family. It is frequently the mother who acts as the harmonizing influence between the various family members in the hierarchy, mediating between the children and the father, and between brothers in a family. Her role in raising children is

pivotal. It is the mother who preserves and passes on cultural traditions to the children (Roland, 1987). From his experience as a therapist in India, Roland further notes that in India "the degree of maternal gratification and close mother-child relationship are of a completely different magnitude from normal mothering in the northern European-American culture belt" (p. 231). This importance of motherhood in the AI culture transcends educational and geographical boundaries, evidenced among rural and urban women alike (Mitter, 1991).

Many of the values discussed above continue to influence the lives of first-generation AI immigrant women in the U.S. The next section discusses literature specific to the familial lives of AI immigrants in the U.S., the importance of AI values in their lives, and the ensuing conflict as they between U.S. mainstream culture and traditional AI practices.

Asian Indian Immigrants in the U.S.

The immigration of Asian Indians to the U.S. occurred in large numbers mainly after the passage of the Immigration Act in 1965, which opened immigration quotas to skilled foreign professionals. Although these immigrants were by no means the first wave of AI immigrants to arrive in the U.S., (the first wave occurred in the early 1900s), these AI immigrants were primarily male urban professionals who sought better economic prospects in the U.S. It was common for these men to go back to India and have arranged marriages (Bumiller, 1990; Rangaswamy, 2000) and then return to the U.S. Thus, a majority of AI women, particularly in the 1960s and 1970s, came to the U.S. mainly as wives and dependents of students and working professionals in the U.S. (Kakaiya, 2000).

Although many Asian Indian immigrants adapted to life in the U.S., they continued to maintain strong ties to their homeland and cultural heritage instead of attempting total assimilation to the U.S. culture (Prathikanti, 1997; Rangaswamy, 2000; Singhal, 1997). Saran (1985) found that it was important for Indians to maintain their Indian identity for psychological as well as practical reasons, the most important of which was to instill Indian values in their children. Traditional culture is evident not just at home in the form of cooking Indian food, speaking the native language and performing religious worship (Hegde, 2002; Singhal, 1997), but is also enacted through the many AI cultural and religious organizations established in different areas of the U.S. (Bacon, 1996). Cultural practices such as religious worship, festivals, and religious discourses, or popular culture such as movies, help maintain the AI cultural identity (Bhutani, 1994). Research also indicates that AI cultural values and norms in family life, such as duty to the family, sacrificing individual needs for the family, chastity, centrality of marriage and motherhood, arranged marriages, traditional gender roles, and hierarchy based on age and gender, are still relevant to the lives of first-generation AI women in the U.S. (Segal, 1991; Singhal, 1997).

First-generation Asian Indian Women in the U.S.

First generation AI women in the U.S. in general find their roles as wives and mothers as being important (Bhutani, 1994; Rangaswamy, 2000). The term 'first-generation' refers to AI women who came to the U.S. as immigrants. The term 'second-generation' refers to their children who were born and raised in the U.S. Although some AI women express a desire to pursue a profession for their own growth, being a wife and mother is central to the lives of many AI women (DasGupta, 1997). Research indicates

that first-generation AI women are generally content with their husbands pursuing careers while they themselves focus on providing a supportive environment at home (Kakaiya, 2000; Singhal, 1997). Among first-generation AI women who work outside the home, the primary motivation for seeking a job appears to be the financial well-being of the family rather than the assertion of individual needs (Ashcraft, 1986).

Stability of family life and commitment to marriage remains strong among first-generation AI women (Prathikanti, 1997).). Divorce is generally not considered an option and has considerable stigma attached to it (Bhutani, 1994). In a study of first-generation AI immigrants, Singh and Kanjirathinkal (1999) measured commitment in arranged marriages on three levels: (a) institutional commitment based on cultural and societal norms, (b) rational commitment which is characterized as commitment based on mutual satisfaction of marital partners, and (c) emotional commitment voluntary in nature and not driven by extraneous factors such as culture or social norms. The study found that first-generation AIs in general, displayed a high level of institutional commitment to their marriages. AI women in particular viewed marriage as a sacrament and did not consider divorce as an option to an unhappy marriage.

Research indicates that traditional gender roles prevail in many AI households and continue to impact the lives of AI women in the U.S. (Gupta, 1999; Khandelwal, 2000). The husband is considered the authority figure and ultimate decision-maker, and the wife primarily as care-taker (Ashcraft, 1986; Saran, 1985). Housework is considered the domain of the woman even in dual-income households where the wife works outside the home and contributes financially to the family (Singhal, 1997).

The commitment to motherhood is also demonstrated by research that indicates that AI women frequently forgo individual goals in the interests of their children (e.g. Khandelwal, 2000; Nandi & Fernandez, 1994). Leaving young children in a day-care with strangers is for the most part not acceptable; therefore AI women often choose to stay home and with children over pursuing a profession (Balgopal, 1999). AI women identify "stable home environments and selfless parenting as their special contributions to the lives of their children" (Bhutani 1994, p. 80).

Many AI parents are fearful of "losing their children to dominant (i.e. American) culture" (Kakaiya, 2000, p. 142). AI's in general perceive U.S. American norms for marriage, divorce and remarriage, the emphasis on autonomy, sexual promiscuity in mainstream society, and breakup of family values, as threats to traditional Indian family values (DasGupta, 1997; Roy, 1985; Singhal, 1997). The perception that American society has a "casual attitude towards sexuality and teenage promiscuousness" (Bhutani, 1994, p. 75) is a source of concern for AI parents, particularly for their daughters. Further, as the "keepers of Indian culture" (Sheth, 1997, p. 50), AI women face the task of retaining the traditional role at home, keeping cultural practices alive, and imparting them to their children. Yet they must also adapt to the mainstream U.S. culture, particularly when they pursue work outside the home. Retaining the AI cultural heritage and simultaneously accepting or incorporating certain U.S. mainstream practices appear to create the most challenging situations in the context of raising children. Areas of conflict reported frequently in literature center around values and beliefs related to marriage, dating, gender roles, and parental involvement in children's lives (DasGupta, 1997; Gupta, 1999).

A second-generation perspective illustrates some of the conflicts related to marriage in AI families. In a recent study among second-generation women Ahluwalia (2002) found that conflict in AI families was a result of excessive pressure from both immediate and extended family on children to get married. The women in the study reported getting "mixed messages" (p. 284) as they were growing up. In the early years these women reported experiencing a great deal of pressure to achieve academic excellence. Mothers in particular encouraged them to pursue careers and achieve financial independence. This pressure changed over time to focus on marriage. Participants reported "pestering" (p. 287) and pressure to become more "domesticated and learning to cook and keep house" (p. 287). In spite of their academic and professional accomplishments, these women were made to feel that they "should be married, have sons, and take care of the home" (p. 290).

In the AI culture marriage has been traditionally regarded as a contract between families (Hofstede, 1980). Arranged marriages involve both the immediate and extended family. AI parents generally prefer their children to have some type of arranged marriage. This may involve the parents introducing the prospective bride or groom (Gupta, 1999). Thus, the practice of finding one's own partner through dating in the U.S. culture is cited as a major source of conflict in AI families. From a traditional point of view dating is in taboo, because first, dating is perceived as negating the Indian cultural norm of arranged marriage (Gupta, 1999). From the parental perspective the expectation that they will be introducing the prospective spouse precludes the need for dating. Second, dating negates family involvement in the process of finding a spouse. The idea of not being involved in the selection of a mate for one's child is difficult for most AI parents to accept because

parents see themselves as working for the well-being of the child (Boyle, 1999). Third, AI parents are concerned that dating involves premarital sex, which is culturally unacceptable, particularly for women (Prathikanti, 1997; Segal, 1991; Singhal, 1997). A fourth issue related to dating is the fear parents have that their children will marry outside the AI community (Helweg & Helweg, 1991) resulting in the loss of cultural identity and heritage (Prathikanti, 1997; Segal, 1991). Dating is sometimes allowed if a prospective spouse is introduced by a family member; if the prospective spouse is from the Indian community; or if the dating relationship is expected to result in marriage (Gupta, 1999).

Another area of contention is the AI culture's emphasis on obedience and respect for parental authority (DasGupta, 1997). First-generation AI women report that living in the U.S. culture with its emphasis on individual autonomy, makes it difficult for them to instill traditional values in their children; such values include respect for parents and elders, family orientation, norms related to hierarchy in the family, and appropriate sexual and moral conduct (Bhutani, 1994; DasGupta, 1997). The second-generation on the other hand report too much interference by parents. This issue arises particularly in the emphasis placed on education, as well as the involvement of both the immediate and extended family in matters related to education and career choice (Ahluwalia's, 2002). Second-generation children who wished to pursue their individual choice in education and career had to contend with parental pressure. One participant in Ahluwalia's (2002) study mentioned "unspoken rules for Indian children raised in the U.S. - becoming a doctor and marrying an Indian" (p. 290).

Problems in parenting are exacerbated by what DasGupta (1997) calls a "time-warp" (p.64) a term used to describe how immigrants often preserve practices that may

not exist anymore in their country of origin (Wong, 2002). In an attempt to teach their children traditional values, AI mothers "enforce on the children a yardstick of Indian cultural propriety" (Hegde, 2002 p. 263). Differing perceptions of first-generation AI women and their second-generation children, thus, play an important role in such conflict. As a result, second generation children often experience confusion and conflict due to pressures from the family in matters of dating, choice of career, career versus marriage, behavioral expectations, and a general lack of understanding by AI parents about U.S. American values and norms (Inman, Constantine, & Ladany, 1999). In the same study, first generation women perceived their daughters as being self-centered, individualistic, not valuing the family, and as being career oriented.

When reviewed in the light of Schwartz's (1992) universal structure, the challenges faced by first-generation AI women and related conflict seem to occur as AI culture clashes with U.S. culture in daily life. U.S. culture values individual freedom over family connection while AI culture values duty and sacrifice by the individual for the family (Hsu, 1963). Thus, it is likely that as AI values and norms come into opposition with U.S. values and norms, first-generation AI women experience certain contradictions. In order to understand these contradictions in the lives of AI women raising children in the U.S., the Dialectical Perspective provided a theoretical framework.

Theoretical Framework

Dialectical Perspective

Background

The concept of dialectics was an integral part of the philosophy and religions of ancient Greece, China and many Eastern cultures (Altman, Vinsel & Brown, 1981). The

Greek philosophers Plato and Socrates viewed the dialectic method as "the search for truth through reasoned discussion and the resolution of contradictory arguments" (Baxter & Montgomery, 1996, p. 19). Early application of dialectics in the field of interpersonal communication was first proposed by Bochner (1984), and later expanded upon by Baxter (1988) in an attempt to consolidate research on dialectics in interpersonal relationships.

The dialectical perspective (Baxter, 1988; Baxter and Montgomery, 1996), recognizes the inherent complexity and duality in interpersonal relationships as a dynamic process that is in a state of "ceaseless flux" (Riegel, 1979, p. 14). The focus of the perspective is on the *process* of relating, the communicative challenges posed by this process, and possible strategies used to cope with such complexity (Baxter & Montgomery 1996; 1998). The dialectical perspective is based upon four key assumptions: contradiction, change, totality and praxis.

Key Assumptions of the Dialectical Perspective

Contradiction. The basic premise of the dialectic approach is "the dynamic interplay between unified opposites" (Baxter & Montgomery, 2000, p. 32) called contradictions. Contradictions give rise to dialectical tensions between the opposing forces. A contradiction is characterized by three conditions. First, each pole derives its meaning from the existence of the opposing pole. Second, the opposite poles together depict a whole, known as the unity of opposites (Altman, Vinsel, & Brown, 1981; Baxter & Montgomery, 1996). Third, there is a tension created by the opposing pull of the unified opposites. For example, autonomy-connection has been found to be a common contradiction in interpersonal relationships (see Baxter, 1990). People seek connection to

others through relationships. Seeking connection, however, means sacrificing a certain amount of independence or autonomy. On the other hand, too much connection can become a threat to an individual's need for freedom. Here the need for connection opposes the need for autonomy, creating a contradiction. Thus, much of the process of relating involves managing dialectical tensions arising from the pull between these contradictory poles.

Change. The negotiation of contradictions leads to *change*, another central idea of the dialectical perspective. The "teleological view" (Baxter & Montgomery, 2000, p. 34) of change proposes that change takes place toward a resolution, with transcendence of the opposing poles as the ultimate goal. This follows the path of thesis in which one pole is dominant, antithesis in which the other pole becomes salient, and finally synthesis in which both poles are transcended (Baxter & Montgomery, 1996). For example, when one relational partner seeks connection, and the other partner seeks autonomy, the negotiation may take the form of a mutually acceptable solution by which the contradiction no longer remains a contradiction.

The indeterminate view of change suggests that total resolution is not possible because some opposition will always exist, causing a back and forth movement between poles where one or the other is dominant. "Total resolution yields the paradox of no opposition thereby destroying a dialectical system" (Altman, et al., 1981, p. 124). The back and forth movement between poles occurs either in a circular fashion or in a spiraling pattern. For example, in the beginning of a relationship relational partners typically experience novelty as they get to know one another. At this stage they may also seek more predictability in the form of permanence in the relationship. In time as the

relationship settles down into a routine, one or the other partner may once again seek

novelty. In this example, there is a back and forth movement at different stages of the

relationship.

Praxis. The third key idea of dialectics, *praxis*, refers to the practices of relational

partners. Key to understanding relationships is the fact that "individuals both act and are

acted upon" (Baxter & Montgomery, 1998, p. 9). Because interactions in the present are

products of past interactions, dialectical tensions experienced in the present arise from

experiences of the past. Praxis also encompasses strategies employed by relational

partners to negotiate dialectical tensions based on past experiences and desired future

outcomes. For example, a person may experience an openness-closedness dialectic due to

past experiences of openness having led to unsatisfactory outcomes such a loss of trust in

a confidant. In a current situation, therefore, the person may choose to remain silent,

thereby favoring the closedness pole of the contradiction.

Totality. The fourth assumption of *totality* recognizes the interdependence of

relational partners among themselves or their communities, cultures and society

(Montgomery & Baxter, 1998). Totality encompasses the location of contradictions

within the individual or in the relationship, interdependencies among contradictions, and

the context in which contradictions occur (Baxter & Montgomery, 1996).

The location of contradictions in a relationship implies a struggle between

relational partners; for example, one partner may need time alone (autonomy) at a

particular instance and the other partner seeking closeness (connection) at that instance.

On the other hand some contradictions may also be experienced within the individual as

an internal struggle, such as a woman wishing to pursue individual goals in the form of a

career (autonomy), but also wishing to be a mother taking care of her children (connection).

Interdependence implies the interwoven nature of contradictions. For example, the wish to be open with a relational partner may stem from the need for connection, while being closed may signal the need for privacy or autonomy. Further, Cornforth (1968) used the term "knot of contradictions" (p. 111) made up of principal contradictions and secondary contradictions which are hierarchical in nature. Montgomery and Baxter (1998) view the knots as a "range of associations" (p. 157); for example the openness-closedness tension could also occur as openness-lying, openness-discretion, or openness-silence depending on the situation in which the contradiction occurs.

The dialectical perspective further recognizes that contradictions may be specific to a context. For example, Rawlins (1983) explains how friends are candid with one another in some circumstances and more restrained in other situations that require tact, revealing the openness-closedness dialectic. How open one is with someone may thus depend on the context of the relationship.

Common Contradictions

Three basic contradictions namely, autonomy-connection, predictability-novelty and openness-closedness have been found to occur commonly in relationships (Baxter, 1990). Baxter (1994) describes these contradictions as manifesting internally or externally. An internal contradiction is experienced by a dyad in relation to one another. An external contradiction occurs between the dyad as a unit and those outside the relationship, such as friends or larger society.

Autonomy-connection is seen as a significant contradiction in interpersonal relationships. Situated within a dyadic relationship this contradiction manifests as the need for closeness to the relational partner, yet a desire to retain one's independence. Externally, it is known as inclusion-seclusion (see Baxter, 1994), where a dyad might experience the need to stay connected with the larger network of friends or family, yet feel the need for privacy.

The predictability-novelty contradiction implies a need for certainty and stability in a relationship, but also the desire for novelty in order to prevent "emotional deadening" (Baxter & Simon, 1993, p. 227). Externally this contradiction occurs as conventionality-uniqueness or a tension between conforming to conventional ways of relating based on societal expectations, versus asserting a unique identity as a dyad.

The openness-closedness dialectic describes the tension between partners of what to reveal and what not to reveal. For instance, open exchange of information is seen as necessary to build a sense of trust and intimacy; however, openness can also make the individual vulnerable in the relationship (Baxter, 1990). The external occurrence of revelation-concealment takes the form of a tension between the relational partners and larger network of friends or family; a tension between keeping relational information private versus sharing it with third parties.

While Baxter's dialectical research is based on the assumption that contradictions are experienced and negotiated between two parties, Dindia (1998) argues that they are also experienced by an individual as an intrapersonal struggle between two opposing forces. For example, people who are gay typically experience an openness-closedness contradiction as an inner struggle that takes the form of whether to reveal one's gay

identity or to keep it secret; how much information to reveal, how to come out and to whom. The negotiation of the tension also takes place within the person. Thus, contradictions and their negotiation have internal, external and intrapersonal dimensions.

Werner and Baxter (1994) further clarify that contradictions do not always imply conflict. Contradictions have an "antagonistic version" (p. 357) in which typically relational partners align themselves with one or the other pole. For example, if one partner consistently wishes for more independence and rejects attempts at connection made by the other partner, it can result in conflict. Similarly if one partner wishes for stability and certainty in the relationship and the other partner needs excitement and spontaneity, the resulting predictability-novelty contradiction could lead to conflict. On the other hand, according to Werner & Baxter (1994), the dialectical perspective recognizes the need for both poles of a contradiction. Thus, dyads who accept and even celebrate both poles, experience the pull between poles, but are likely to avoid conflict. In other words, contradictions do not necessarily lead to conflict if the contradictions are recognized and negotiated by relational partners in a mutually acceptable manner (Werner & Baxter, 1994).

Research on Relational Dialectics

Baxter (1990) examined the contradictions of autonomy-connection, openness-closedness, and predictability-novelty, and their negotiation in various stages of relationship development in romantic dyads. She found that all three contradictions were reported in approximately three-quarters of relationship stages identified by participants. The three contradictions, however, did not occur equally in all stages. For example, the openness-closedness dialectic was experienced more in the initial stages of the

relationships, and also in short-term relationships, while autonomy-connection was experienced as a contradiction in later stages. In another study, Baxter and Simon (1993) examined the three contradictions in the context of relationship maintenance and related satisfaction among romantic couples. They found that effectiveness of the strategies of contact, romance, and avoidance varied depending on which pole of a given contradiction was dominant in the relationships at the time the strategy was employed. For example, if one partner perceived autonomy as being pre-dominant, then a move toward connection by a partner was well-received. Similarly, if the relationship was perceived as being overly predictable, then any indication of novelty was positively evaluated.

Apart from the three basic contradictions, Rawlins (1992) proposed the judgment-acceptance contradiction in the context of close friendships. This contradiction came up in the context of the ideal image of friendship and reality (Rawlins, 1989). Ideal friendships are built on mutual acceptance and understanding; the reality is that friends do experience situations where they experience a tension between unconditional acceptance of the friend versus being critical of the friend; this contradiction was described by Rawlins (1992) as a judgment-acceptance dialectic. The judgment-acceptance dialectic was also discovered among close friends who were colleagues in the workplace (Bridge and Baxter, 1992). Other research on dialectical tensions examined loyalties and betrayals in personal relationships (Baxter, Mazanac, Nicholson, Pittman, Smith, & West, 1997), and perceptions of contradictions during turning points in relationships (Baxter & Erbert, 1999).

Both quantitative and qualitative methods have been used in dialectics research. Quantitative approaches have used questionnaires with statements representing various

contradictions, and Likert items (e.g. Baxter & Ebert, 1999; Bridge & Baxter, 1992).

Qualitative methods have used the retrospective interview technique (e.g. Baxter & Ebert,

1999), written accounts of dilemmas in loyalty/betrayal in romantic relationships (Baxter,

Mazanac, Nicholson, Pittman, Smith, & West, 1997), and the critical incident technique

to understand friendships and work-related roles among close friends (Bridge & Baxter,

1992)

Although the dialectical perspective has been used extensively to study

interpersonal relationships among Euro-American populations, Baxter (1990) urges the

need for "cross-cultural replication of particular contradictions" (p. 87) to provide other

perspectives. This thesis will examine the dialectics in this context. Moreover, there is

little evidence of relationships between mothers and children having been examined

through the dialectical lens. Further, given Schwartz's (1992) structure of conflicting

value-types, together with cultural challenges faced by AI immigrants in the U.S., the

dialectical perspective serves as an ideal lens to consider the contradictions of living and

raising children between two cultures.

Rationale and Research Questions

The research presented above demonstrates the continuity of traditional cultural

values in the lives of AI immigrants in the U.S. Important cultural values and norms for

Asian Indians that emerge from research are: the centrality of arranged marriage,

commitment to marriage, stability of family life, salience of traditional gender roles, and

emphasis on education. (e.g. Gupta, 1999; Rangaswamy, 2000; Saran, 1985; Singhal,

1997). These values become the source of conflict in raising children in the U.S.

particularly in the contexts of dating, marriage, and pursuit of career. Although these issues have been found to be problematic for second-generation children growing up within two cultures (see Ahluwalia, 2002), there are important reasons to consider the first-generation AI women's perspective as well. The importance of traditional values is particularly important to the AI immigrant population in the U.S. in order to maintain its cultural heritage (Bacon, 1996; Saran, 1985); the responsibility of inculcating traditional cultural values in children falls primarily on the shoulders of women. It is evident from literature that the traditional identity of a mother is central to the lives of first-generation AI women (e.g Mitter, 1991; Wadley, 1977).

As purveyors of the culture and mediators within the family, first-generation AI women are thus likely to experience contradictions of living in two cultures, which they must negotiate on a daily basis. Yet, studies on AIs typically describe general life-styles of AI families (e.g. Bacon, 1996; Rangaswamy, 2002; Saran, 1985), or the challenges faced by second-generation AIs in reconciling two cultures, (see Ahluwalia, 2002; Inman, Constantine, & Ladany, 1999; Segal, 1991). In one of the few studies focusing exclusively on first-generation AI women, Bhutani (1994) examined their assimilation experiences. Other literature has focused mainly on extreme conflict such as domestic violence (see Krishnan, Baig-Amin, Gilbert, El-Bassel, & Waters, 1985) and or mental health perspectives (e.g. Jayakar, 1994; Kakaiya, 2000). However, no clear picture emerges of how first-generation AI women cope with the daily challenges of raising children in the U.S. It is evident from literature that there are a number of issues that AI immigrants must deal with as they try to retain their culture and adapt to the U.S. culture.

Yet, what is the first-generation AI woman's perspective of such challenges? What are the unique challenges of raising children in an alien culture? Understanding the second-generation perspective gives us only a partial view of the challenges and their negotiation. The rationale for this thesis therefore, was one, to provide a first-generation AI women's perspective on such challenges; two, to view the challenges of raising children between two cultures, as contradictions rather than conflict; and three bring a communication perspective on how such contradictions are negotiated.

Schwartz's (1992) model was proposed as the ideal structure for classifying values salient to first-generation AI women in the U.S. because it provides a way to consider relationships between values. Studies on human values (e.g. Bond, 1988; Hofstede, 1980, 2001; Inglehart, Basanez, & Moreno, 1998) report cultural orientations of different nations and provide a broad perspective. Schwartz's (1992) model on the other hand, offers a way of specifically classifying values in a manner that reveals relationships between the values and how these values can come into conflict in the life of an individual. The idea of opposing values is particularly useful in the context of immigrant populations because they must negotiate between two cultures. From the literature on AIs in the U.S. it is evident that AIs place a great emphasis on retaining their AI culture (Rangaswamy, 2000; Saran, 1985). Yet living in the U.S., together with differences between U.S. and AI cultures pose problems between first-generation AI immigrants and their second-generation children (see Inman, Constantine, Ladany, Morano, 2001; Segal, 1991). Schwartz's (1992) model therefore offers a structure to

examine values that are salient to first-generation AI women and a way to consider the interplay of the AI and U.S. cultures in their lives.

The Dialectical Perspective was also chosen as a lens for examining the first-generation AI women's experiences, because the focus of the thesis is on contradictions posed by two sets of differing values and on tensions that emerge in the mother-child relationship. Literature on AIs paints a picture of conflict due to opposing values between U.S. and AI cultures. Werner & Baxter (1994), however, suggest that oppositions can lead to contradictions, but contradictions do not always create conflict. Thus, it would be more productive to view the opposition of value systems as ongoing tensions or pulls that may or may not be resolved, and may or may not lead to conflict. Thus, the dialectical perspective was chosen as a means to consider what contradictions arise for AI women in the context of raising children, and how they are negotiated.

Before addressing the contradictions of living and negotiating between two cultures, the first two research questions are posed to understand the perceptions of first-generation AI women on what they consider salient AI (Indian) values, and U.S. (American) values. Therefore, the following research questions are posed:

RQ1: What are the Indian cultural values that AI women describe as salient in their family lives?

RQ2: What are American cultural values that AI women describe as salient in their family lives?

Literature specific to AIs in the U.S. suggests that AIs in general perceive the U.S. culture as being very different from the AI culture, which in turn leads to familial conflicts (e.g. Bhutani, 1994). Schwartz (1992) found that values are of differing kinds and can oppose each other. In order to examine whether participants in the present study perceive the AI culture and U.S. cultures as being contradictory in the context of their own life as a parent, the following question is posed.

RQ3: Do AI women perceive a contradiction between Indian values and U.S. American values in their lives as parents?

Literature specific to AI families reveals several challenges in the context of child-parent relationships. For example, motherhood and involvement in the lives of children are important to first-generation AI women; second-generation AI children, however, may seek more autonomy, based on their mainstream peer culture (DasGupta, 1997; Segal, 1991), leading to an autonomy-connection dialectic. Further, in the AI culture the family is involved in the life of the individual such as in the choice of a spouse, choice of career and so on. Connection to the family is important; on the other hand children, based in part on their exposure to the U.S. culture, may seek more privacy and individual choice in such matters as marriage and career (see Ahluwalia, 2002). This has the potential to lead to the autonomy-connection dialectic in the mother-child relationship.

There is less evidence of the predictability-novelty dialectic occurring in parent-child relationship. It is likely, however, that AI children seek stimulation and excitement, which may come into opposition with AI norms of seeking predictability in terms of

maintaining tradition and stability in life. For example, the issue of dating may involve a predictability-novelty contradiction. While AI mothers may seek the predictability of an arranged marriage for their children, the children on the other hand may seek the novelty and excitement of dating (Bhutani, 1994).

The openness-closedness dialectic could be a related to a number of the issues AI women face in child-rearing; for example how open are AI mothers with their children? Do they prefer open discussion about relational issues? Do they open up to others such as family and friends? Thus, AI women may experience a contradiction between needing to be open, at the same time not wishing to reveal their concerns or problems.

A judgment-acceptance contradiction (Rawlins, 1992) is likely to occur in the form of judgment of U.S. values as a threat to AI family stability; at the same time AI mothers may experience a need to accept that the children will be influenced by the U.S. culture. Moreover, it is likely that parents struggle to determine when to be accepting of the behaviors and attitudes of their children and when to pass judgment. Thus, this contradiction may be common in the parent-child relationship.

The contradictions of autonomy-connection, predictability-novelty, and openness-closedness, have been mainly explored mainly in the contexts of romantic relationships (e.g. Baxter, 1990; Baxter, Mazanac, Nicholson, Pittman, Smith, & West, 1997). The judgment-acceptance contradiction has been found in long-term friendships (Bridge & Baxter, 1992; Rawlins, 1992). Because there is little research on dialectics in child-rearing contexts, the following question is posed to explore whether these contradictions are experienced by AI women in raising children in the U.S.

RQ4: Do AI women experience the contradictions of autonomy-connection, openness-closedness, predictability-novelty, and judgment-acceptance in relationships with their children?

Because of the unexplored nature of the present context, it is further likely that other contradictions will be revealed by this study. The following question is posed to understand what other contradictions arise for AI women in parenting roles.

RQ5: What other contradictions arise for AI women in relationships with their children?

Although Baxter (1994) distinguished internal dialectics as contradictions occurring within a relationship, from external dialectics as occurring between the relational partners and the external social network, it is assumed that contradictions are always negotiated jointly between parties. This view does not take into account intrapersonal contexts where open communication on issues may not be an option (see Dindia, 1998). Although poor communication within the AI parent-child relationships has been noted as a problem (Segal, 1991), no clear picture emerges as to how contradictions are handled. This study will therefore examine communication that takes place in negotiating the contradictions internally within the mother-child relationship, and externally with sources outside the relationship. Because there is evidence that there is stigma attached to seeking outside help, AI women typically do not seek such help (Kakaiya, 2000), it is further possible that AI women cope with many of the contradictions intrapersonally.

Intrapersonal communication is commonly viewed as self-talk, where the individual is "both the source and object of interaction" (Vocate, 1994, p.6). This

includes dialogue that goes on internally, in silence, or externally in the form of speaking to oneself. Self-talk, may occur spontaneously or it may be deliberate as in instances where one tries to adjust to situations or change one's own attitudes (Vocate, 1994). In examining the intrapersonal aspect of contradictions by AI women, this study will consider self-talk as a possible mechanism for negotiating contradictions. In order to explore how AI women negotiate the contradictions experienced in the context of child-rearing, the RQ following is posed.

> RQ6: Are the contradictions experienced by AI women in the context of child-rearing negotiated, internally, externally or intrapersonally?

Chapter Summary

This chapter included a review of literature on cultural values, norms, and practices, literature specific to AI women, followed by a discussion of the theoretical framework, rationale and research questions for the study. The first section defined cultural values, norms, and practices, reporting findings on values research in multiple countries, followed by a discussion of AI and U.S. values, norms, and practices. The next section provided a historical perspective of AI cultural values, norms and practices, the continuity of such practices in present-day India, and their prevalence in the familial lives of first-generation immigrant AI women in the U.S. The third part of the chapter proposed the dialectical perspective (Baxter, 1988) as the theoretical framework for this study with an explanation of the key assumptions and concepts of the theory. Finally, the rationale for the study was discussed, together with research questions to address the issues being explored by this study.

CHAPTER THREE

Methodology

Design

The primary method used to answer the research questions posed by this study was the structured interview (see Appendix B for interview protocol). Following a pilot of the protocol, twenty interviews were conducted over a period of two weeks. The following sections describe the participants, and interview procedures.

Sampling and Recruitment

Participants for the interviews were identified from a directory containing names and phone numbers of AI families in the Kalamazoo - Battle Creek area, published annually by the India Association of Kalamazoo. There were 325 families listed alphabetically in the directory. Names of single members, not married, or divorced or widowed, were listed in the directory individually; other names are listed as couples. The directory also listed the number of children, names of children, and in some cases, the date of birth of children, making it easy to identify families with children. Based on this information a list of potential participants was created. The criteria for inclusion in the list was marital status and children. Forty names were selected from the list through random sampling using a random numbers table. Potential participants were contacted by phone, using a script (see Appendix C) until the target of 20 was reached. Of the women contacted, two refused participation for unknown reasons; four women could not participate due to travel plans or health reasons.

In the recruitment phase, potential participants were contacted through phone calls; the nature of the study was explained, and their participation solicited. Once interest was indicated, the time and meeting place was agreed upon by the researcher and each participant. Whenever possible, the interviews were held in a meeting room at the local AI temple. However, most of the interviews were conducted in participants' homes due to convenience of the participants. The time for the interview was also set according to the participant's convenience. No remuneration was offered to the participant; the researcher provided refreshments when the interview was held at the temple meeting room.

Participants

Participants for this study included 20 first-generation AI immigrant women from the Kalamazoo-Battle Creek AI community. The participants represented several different parts of India (e.g. Gujarat, Punjab, Karnataka, Tamilnadu, U.P, M.P). Age of participants ranged from 31 to 58 with a mean of 46.25 (S=7.83). All participants had between 1 and 3 children, with most having 2 children. In terms of education, all participants had attained a minimum of a Bachelor's degree and several had Master's (n=6) or some other advanced degree (n=4). Participants had lived in the U.S. an average of 21.95 years (S=8.65). All 20 participants had a traditional arranged marriage where they did not know their husband before marriage or knew them briefly between the engagement and wedding. Thirteen of the participants indicated marriage as the primary reason that brought them to the U.S. Four participants came independently as students, and three participants came to work in the U.S.; these women had arranged marriages later either by going back to India for the wedding or having the wedding in the U.S.

Pilot

The interview protocol was piloted in order to assess both the flow and the appropriateness of the questions. The pilot involved a discussion of the content of the interview protocol with a group of 5 women who were similar in demographics to the final sample but were not part of the final sampling frame. The session was audiotaped.

At the beginning of the session the researcher described the purpose of the focus group. As they answered each question, participants were asked to make note of any difficulties they encountered in answering the question, due to phrasing or nature of the question. The researcher also noted any problems encountered during the session. The researcher went through the questions from the protocol as she would in an interview. Other than intervening with additional probes or re-directing the conversation when it digressed, the researcher simply observed and listened. All the women participated actively, interacting with each other in answering the questions. At the end of the session, the participants provided feedback on the questions in the interview protocol.

Discussion with the pilot participants indicated that the participants found the questions to be –"thought-provoking"- and pertinent to their lives. They felt the questions opened up dialogue. However, they found the first question, *"I would like you to think of me as someone who does not know anything about Indian culture. If I wanted to know more about the Indian culture, how would you describe Indian culture and Indian values to me?"* difficult to answer. In their opinion the question was too broad in scope. One participant suggested that term 'culture' be defined upfront. The researcher also found that in answering the question, the participants digressed to present-day India and the changes they noticed on their visits. On re-examining the question in light of the first

research question in the study, *"What are the Indian cultural values that AI women describe as being salient in their family lives?,"* it was decided to make the question more specific to values and beliefs that AI women saw as being important to them in the context of their familial lives in the U.S. The question was then modified to ask, *"What are some aspects of Indian culture that you find are important to you in your life in the U.S.?"* Probes were added to examine participants' views on both positive and negative aspects of the culture. In order to bring out the salience of the AI culture in their lives, a probe was added to address values the mothers specifically tried to teach their children. A decision was made not to define the term 'culture' but leave it to individual interpretation. Similar adjustments were made to the question on examining the salience of U.S. culture.

Interview Procedure

The primary method of data gathering was the structured interview consisting of questions designed to answer each research question being posed. The structured interview is a means of ensuring that certain standard questions are asked of all participants, at the same time giving them the opportunity to give open-ended responses. Asking the same questions, in the same order can minimize interviewer bias and ensure efficiency in data collection (Lindlof, 1995), p. 72). For the most part the researcher followed a set order however, there were occasions when a participant's answer created the need for additional questions to bring out further details.

At the beginning of each interview, the researcher explained the nature of the study, assuring participants of the confidentiality of their responses. Following consent procedures, participants were asked to fill out a questionnaire with demographic

information (see Appendix D). Interviews took approximately 1 to 1 ½ hours and were audio-taped with participant's consent. There were two interviews in which the researcher had to take notes because the participants refused to be audio-taped. Following the interview, participants completed a short survey to collect demographic information (see Appendix D).

The Critical Incident Technique (CIT) was used during the interview process to assist participants in formulating and articulating their thoughts about culture, contradictions and negotiation. Originally proposed by Flanagan (1954), CIT is essentially based on the narrative paradigm (Fisher, 1984), in which individuals share their experiences through stories. Critical incidents can be compared to short stories involving specific incidents or situations that are illustrative of specific behavior. An important strength of the narrative paradigm is its ability to capture the lived experiences of participants (Query, Kreps, Arneson, & Caso, 2001). CIT has been employed as a data collection method in a study of dialectics between friendships and work roles (Bridge & Baxter, 1992), in which participants were asked to recall and describe in writing, an incident of how their friendship impacted their work roles positively or adversely, and ways in which their work roles affected their friendships. In the present study CIT was incorporated into the interviews as a tool to understand perceived contradictions between AI and U.S. culture and the negotiation of such contradictions by the participants.

Interviews were conducted in English after participants declined conducting the interviews in other Indian languages (Hindi, Tamil, Kannada, and Gujarati). With the exception of a few participants, most interviewees appeared to be comfortable speaking

English. In some interviews, participants switched between English and the participant's native language. The switching did not pose a problem since the researcher had knowledge of these AI languages and was able to translate those portions into English during transcription.

After the first two interviews were conducted, it became necessary to modify the interview protocol slightly. The first question on cultural values was problematic. Thus, the interview protocol was modified to add several simple, rapport-building questions, addressing the participants' length of stay in the U.S., their purpose in coming to the U.S., and their general experiences after coming to the U.S. In order to set the participants thinking about cultural aspects of their lives in U.S., a question was added that asked them to compare and contrast India and the U.S. The rest of the protocol remained intact.

Analysis

The analysis of transcripts was done in two phases. The first phase involved the coding of AI and U.S. values by the researcher and an independent coder who was trained by the researcher. The cultural values described by participants in response to questions addressing research questions one (AI values) and two (U.S. values) were coded using Schwartz's (1992) universal value structure. The researcher highlighted the sections of the transcript that were pertinent to the two research questions. After coding one transcript together, 4 transcripts were selected randomly. Both coders coded the same 4 transcripts independently.

Each value mentioned by the participant was coded into one of Schwartz's (1992) value types: self-direction, stimulation, hedonism, achievement, power, security, tradition, conformity, benevolence, and universalism (see Appendix A). The sentence was

used as the unit of analysis. The results from each coder were entered into SPSS and intercoder reliability was calculated using Cohen's Kappa; the obtained Kappa was .74, an acceptable level of reliability for this type of exploratory research (Lombard, Snyder-Duch, & Bracken, 2002). In reviewing the disagreement between coders it was found that the primary disagreement centered around discriminating between those messages that were indicative of values as compared to non-relevant messages. This discrepancy seemed to arise from one coder's unfamiliarity with AI traditions, with the result that several of the sentences that described AI traditional beliefs were coded as non-relevant. The second area of disagreement centered around the conceptual distinction between Schwartz's categories of *security* and *benevolence* (see Appendix A for descriptions). These disagreements were resolved by discussion between the coders and coding proceeded on the remaining transcripts.

The second phase of the analysis involved thematic analysis of the transcripts to answer research questions, 3, 4, and 5, addressing the contradictions and their negotiation. This part of the analysis was completed by the researcher, who read each transcript multiple times with each research question in mind. During the first reading, the researcher highlighted sentences that described contradictions between U.S. and AI norms to answer RQ3. In the second reading the researcher identified specific contradictions of autonomy-connection, predictability-novelty, openness-closedness, and judgment-acceptance (RQ4), and new contradictions (RQ5). Variations within these four contradictions were also noted. The final reading identified any references to communication (RQ6) and were classified as 'internal' (between mother and child), 'external' (mother with father, friends or family), and 'intrapersonal' (thinking, resolving

within self). Other recurrent themes that emerged but were not related specifically to the research questions were identified during the readings as 'other'. The findings from this analysis are presented in Chapter 4 along with excerpts from the interviews to illustrate and support the findings.

CHAPTER FOUR

Results

The findings of this study will be presented in the order of the research questions, from RQ1 to RQ5. Each research question will be identified, followed by the results from the data analysis, supported by examples and selections from the interviews.

Asian Indian Values

The first research question was designed to understand what AI women identified as AI values that were salient to them in their family lives. The participants identified a number of values that they considered as AI values. As described in Chapter 3 these values were coded into Schwartz's (1992) value types. The most frequently represented value-types for AI values were conformity, tradition, and security. Achievement showed up only in the context of the value placed on academic excellence. The value-types of power, benevolence, and universalism, self-direction, hedonism, and stimulation were not represented at all in the AI data. The findings are presented below according to these classifications and related themes that came up for each. The themes are labeled based on value items included in Schwartz's (1992) survey of values (see Appendix A). When direct quotations from participants were used as exemplars, the quote is followed by the participant's unique identifier (e.g. P14).

It is important to note that not all participants were able to identify AI values. Of the 20 participants, four were unable to identify specific AI values when asked about them. One participant stated that she had lived in the U.S. for so long that she no longer knew what was Indian or American any more. However, as she related some incidents with her children she would make remarks like, "well that I think is very Indian" or "that

was my Indianness coming out". Another participant attributed her inability to identify AI values to having grown up in a non-traditional family in India. The third participant responded to the question in general terms talking about things such as food, clothing, jewelry, and language. The fourth participant did not state any reason but simply stated that she was unable to articulate what AI values were. However, values that were salient to them often came out in discussions of other issues and these instances were included in the analysis.

Conformity

A number of AI values mentioned by participants fell into the category of conformity. Frequently mentioned values were obedience, honoring parents and elders, politeness, and self-discipline. All of these values were represented in the data as AI values salient to participants.

Respect for elders. All 20 participants stated respect for elders as an important AI value. Respect was described by some as "taking care of parents and older family members," "being respectful," "being polite," and as "respecting parents, grandparents and teachers." Respect for elders was also described in terms of not speaking out or speaking back to an older person. As one interviewee described it, "In India I think we always think we have to respect our elders. We don't speak out even if it may not be good for us, we accept it, and we don't stand up for what we are thinking" (P3). Another example given by an interviewee was "not taking older people by their names" (P19).

Obedience. Obedience was mentioned frequently by participants as a central value in AI culture. A number of participants made references to the obedience that was required of them as they grew up in India. For example one participant said, "Whatever

my father said we used to do it and no questions asked. That's the way we all grew up and that is what I tried to instill in them [children]" (P19). Obedience therefore, took the form of unquestioning acceptance of parental authority particularly that of the father. Speaking of AI children in the U.S. challenging their parents this interviewee continued:

> In our family they do once in a while but it is not common practice because I cut it right then and there. Sometimes he [son] may say, "mom why can't I do this? Why is dad saying this?" and I just tell him that dad is the boss in the house. You have to listen to your father. Whatever he says he is right. He has your best interests at heart. And that is what I have told them from childhood. (P19)

Thus, obedience was a salient value among the majority of the interviewees.

Politeness. Only one mother specifically spoke of politeness specifically. She mentioned this value in context of teaching her daughters.

> I don't want you to be involved in adult conversations unless you are asked specifically. Not be a big-mouth. You are a child and you don't have to give an opinion unless you are asked to and when you are asked, give it as discreetly as possible. (P10)

Self-discipline. Being thrifty and knowing the value of money usually came up in the context of teaching children this value. These values corresponded with the "resistance to temptation" and "self-restraint" as described in Schwartz's (1992) classification of values (see Appendix A). Many of the participants felt that these AI values were important to teach their children, particularly because they felt that the U.S. culture fostered the habit of spending. They expressed concern that their children had access to too many comforts in the U.S. and therefore didn't understand the importance or

need to share with others. "Kids grow up with so much I think it is hard to get them to like the concept of making do with less," said one mother. Another parent described how she tried to instill the value of being thrifty:

> We want them to know the value of things. Like if it is his birthday I don't want to spend $200 because all his friends are having a party at Chuckie Cheese's or someplace. I will make them realize that it's OK. (P3)

Similarly another mother expressed her concern with teaching her children the importance of sharing and valuing money. Having grown up in a traditional joint-family in India where the father's parents and sometimes father's brothers and other extended family members lived in one household under one roof, she emphasized the value of sharing.

> I grew up in a joint family and my mother always told us we should share. So I've always told them that whatever money we have we would rather spend on things that we feel they need to have, rather than give them pocket money to spend on CDs and movies. (P18).

Some mothers who had adult children indicated that they thought they had been successful in instilling this particular value in their children.

Security

The motivational goal of security according to Schwartz is safety, harmony, stability of relationships, and stability of self. Values included in this value-type are cleanliness, national security, reciprocation of favors, social order, family security, sense of belonging, and health. Of these values, family security came up as being the most salient to participants in this study. The stability of relationships, and harmony mentioned

as a goal of this value-type was also discussed frequently by participants in the context of marriage. Stability of marriage was considered an important aspect of AI culture.

Family security. In response to the question on AI values, the importance of family in their lives, was discussed by all participants. Their descriptions included family stability, family support, closeness, and "family values". The participants described the importance of family in their lives, not just immediate family, but extended family such as uncles, aunts, cousins, grandparents, and close friends. They spoke of family as not only something they could "count on" but also something that entailed duty on part of the individual. This participant who was a professional working in information technology in a large corporation, spoke of the importance of sacrifice:

> You have your duties toward the family and no matter how hard or easy it is, it'll be done. So and that's a day to day thing. We plan around the family. Plan for the kids, but also give up your own individual desires. Those are Indian values. You don't want so much independence, you want to be with the family and we want to do what is good for the family, and not just me, me, me. That is definitely our culture. (P4)

When they talked about the importance of family, participants said that grandparents were a major influence on their children. Many of the women recalled their own upbringing in India under a joint-family system where the grandparents lived with the family. One participant mentioned that having at least one set of grandparents living with them when her children were young would have made her feel more "secure" (P20). One participant said that "kids learned traditions" (P12) from grandparents. Another

mother felt her sons "learned how to respect parents" (P19) because her in-laws lived with them in the children's formative years.

Stability of relationships. The importance of a stable marriage, a central component of security, was mentioned typically when participants talked about the prevalence of divorce in U.S. culture as compared to the AI culture. One woman said there was "less accountability in the West in relationships" (P17); she went on to speak about the importance of sacrifice in marriage and "constantly working towards more harmony" (P17). Several interviewees emphasized a stable marriage as a means of giving their children a stable family life. As one participant stated, "Because divorce is not common in the AI culture our children don't have to worry about their lives getting messed up" (P7).

Protection. Protectiveness was brought up frequently as another dimension of security; both in terms of protecting children from physical harm and protecting them from exposure to ideas or values counter to AI culture. A number of women talked about protection particularly with regard to their daughters. Several mothers recollected the protected lives they had growing up in India. Examples such as "not knowing anything about gay and lesbian people until I came here" (P9), and "not knowing anything about sex" (P20), were given to illustrate the protective environment of their childhood.

Tradition

Values included under tradition in Schwartz's (1992) classification are, accepting one's portion in life, being devout, humble, respecting tradition, and being moderate. These values according to Schwartz are motivated by respect, commitment, and the acceptance of customs and ideas one's culture or religion impose on the individual.

Traditions manifest in the form of religious rites, beliefs and norms of behavior. For the participants in this study, religion was important and respect for tradition was evidenced in the context of marrying within the AI community. Acceptance of traditional gender roles was evidenced by the emphasis placed on motherhood through the qualities of sacrifice and duty; the notion of compromise, chastity, and modesty were addressed by participants, particularly for women.

Religious rites and beliefs. The importance of religion and traditional practices were mentioned as being important by 16 women. Traditional worship at home, prayer, rituals, celebrating AI festival, and attending AI gatherings were frequently mentioned as means of maintaining tradition. Some mothers found it important to teach their children religious ideas and practices by praying at home as a family, reading the Indian epics of Ramayana and Mahabharata, in addition to festivals, and visits to the temple. For others it was very important to follow certain age-old traditions. Describing her husband and herself as placing a high value on traditions, one participant described a ceremony for boys that she wanted her son to go through. This ceremony is akin to baptism, and entailed wearing an icon as a permanent indication of having been initiated, which she wished her son to keep.

> Like we are 'Madhva' [a sect in Southern India]. So we pray to 'Raghvendra Swami' [a religious teacher]. We tell the kids about it, that it is important. We teach these things. I want them to know that. Everyday he [son] applies a 'naama' [religious mark on the forehead] and goes to school too. He didn't like it at first, but now his friends know what it is…. I also want him to have his

'poonal'[icon]… And just because he is growing up here, I don't want him to take

it off. (P3)

Other ways to maintain tradition included the practice of vegetarianism, not

wearing shoes inside the house, and speaking the native language. It was considered

important to give children a good foundation in AI religion through traditional practices,

while they were young, meaning before they came into their teenage years. Once they

were in high school, mothers said it became difficult to instill these values in the children.

Although religion was salient to all participants, a few women said their beliefs did not

necessarily involve rites or rituals specific to AI culture; instead they tried to inculcate in

their children a general belief in one God, and the universal ideals of truth, honesty, and

morality.

Maintaining tradition. Reference to tradition was most evident in women's talk

about marriage. Most women hoped that their children would adhere to tradition and

marry other AIs because "I think they will be more fulfilled with their lives down the

road," (P10) or "if she marries a American there will be a lot of cultural adjustment. Our

foundations of marriage are so different" (P9). A few participants were very sure that

their children would marry other AIs or even within their own particular community. This

included having an arranged marriage where the parents or family introduced the

prospective spouse. One participant said she believed this was because of the respect for

tradition that they had instilled in their children.

I think my kids will be with Indians. They will get married to Indian kids. N__

[son] wants a Patel girl [same community as participant], he says. So we will be

looking for a girl for him. (P12)

Two other women also mentioned that their children were agreeable to the modified version of the arranged marriage.

The term "conservative" was used by more than one participant to describe AI cultural values related to marriage. As one participant stated, "We Indians you know, we are more conservative I think. Our roots are deeper. We go back to more traditions" (P19). Marrying an AI or within one's own community was thus seen as maintaining continuity of tradition and one's heritage.

Duty and sacrifice. Many of the participants stated that children were a priority in their lives, emphasizing the traditional norm of motherhood as a defining aspect of AI culture. One participant linked this to "duties and responsibilities ingrained in you by our culture" (P4). Being a mother also involved sacrifice, which most mothers accepted willingly. A number of participants chose to stay home to care for their children, although it had meant sacrificing their own careers or further education. The women did not mind this because, "raising kids is important for us. I am OK with that, because some sacrifice we have to do" (P6). Women who had careers also emphasized the salience of motherhood in their lives. One participant, who was a physical therapist by profession and worked full-time, stated that as much she loved her profession she would gladly give it up if necessary. Another mother who was a physician said:

> That was the reason I worked two days a week. I wanted to be home. So everyone
>
> teases me that I am a mom and not a doctor. And I say I don't mind. I like the
>
> mom title better than the doctor title and I don't care. (P5)

Sacrifice was also salient to some participants in marital relationships. However, they used the term 'compromise', which they saw as being necessary for a woman to do in the

AI culture. For example, one mother who worked as a medical technologist said that in the part of India she came from, women were expected to follow certain norms. She spoke of this in relation to her older daughter who argued with her about marriage.

> In our Gujarati community (a region of India), as a woman you do need to give up some of those things [like independence]. We need to compromise. Even though we might like to think we are equal to men, we are not. (P13).

Another mother in her 30s described her marriage as being very traditional. Although she worked, she took care of all household work, while her husband took care of things outside the home. She described her husband as being very conservative, but she did not see a problem with that. Instead she tried to teach her 11 and 12-year-old daughters the value of sacrifice, or 'compromise' as she called it:

> I have two girls, and I am teaching them not to constantly fight the situation to become equal to boys. It doesn't always work that way. I don't know what their spouses are going to be like, but to have life go on smoothly, you have to really make a lot of compromises. You can't just constantly have an ego. (P10)

Chastity. Chastity was salient to most participants in the study although most did not refer to it directly. Two participants referred to chastity as, "Indian values like you know you don't have sex before marriage..." (P17). Another participant referred to this value as she spoke about the liberal attitudes about sex in the U.S. culture, "I don't think you should lose your virginity before marriage" (P15). Other participants did not use the term 'sex' openly; instead they referred to it more discreetly in the context of not allowing their children to date. Importance of chastity was referred to in as "not crossing the line" (P9) or "not crossing boundaries" (P7). The salience of chastity was also evident

among women with daughters who indicated that they felt it was more difficult to raise daughters than sons. Those who had sons also spoke about being relieved at not having to raise daughters in the U.S. On being asked why, they made references to women as being more "fragile" (P13; P15), and the fact that traditionally, family reputation depended on the daughter's chastity. As one mother explained it to her daughter:

> I always said, "S__[daughter] you are a girl, if something happens it's on your body it's going to happen. So that is the most concern"… Especially the daughter, she is the one who enhances the reputation of the parents and family. If she remains pure then she takes that purity to her in-law's home. For the boy it's different… (P20)

Modesty. The salience of modesty revealed itself more in terms of the lack of it in the way many young people dress in the U.S. Participants with daughters made references to "tank tops" (P13) and "skimpy clothing" (P13), and clothes that teenagers wore as being "too revealing" (P9).

Achievement

The value-type of achievement is motivated by the need for success and includes the values of being successful, capable, ambitious, influential, and intelligent (Schwartz, 1992). Findings of this study revealed that AI mothers placed a great deal of emphasis on education and academic excellence as a means of success for their children.

Success. Education and academic success was identified as an AI value and a highly salient one. As an example of the academic excellence she expected from her children, one mother said, "I do have high expectations for them. I don't tell them to do their homework, I just tell them to get all A's" (P17). Another mother said, "We do stress

education a lot. That I think is very Indian" (P9). One parent said that even the toys she bought for her 5 and 7 year old were "educational stuff" (P7). The reason given for additional stress on education was that academic excellence was "the only passport to success for our children" (P5). As one participant put it,

> We are aware all the time of our color, that we are different. So we have to do well in education to be successful. We have to excel where we can. I think that is part of being a minority. (P9)

One participant mentioned that education is central to AI culture, "because education they cannot be taken away from you. You need it to survive. A better life, let's put it that way" (P12).

U.S. American Values

The second research question explored the U.S. American values that were salient to AI women. These were also coded into Schwartz's value types. The participants identified a number of values that they considered as U.S. values. Among U.S. values mentioned by participants, the most frequently occurring value-types were self-direction, hedonism, followed by the value-types of benevolence, universalism, and power. The value-type of stimulation, conformity, tradition, and security were not represented among U.S. values discussed by the participants. The findings are presented below according to these classifications and related themes that came up for each. The themes are labeled based on value items included in Schwartz's (1992) survey of values (see Appendix A).

As was the case with AI values, not all participants were able to identify U.S. values. The same four participants who had difficulty identifying specific AI values also stated not being able to distinguish specific U.S. values, for the same reasons reported

previously. In each case, values emerged from the context of discussions about other issues during the course of the interview.

Self-direction

The value-type of self-direction includes such values as being curious together with creativity, freedom of thought and action, choice in personal goals, independence and self-respect (Schwartz, 1992). Among the U.S. values mentioned, independence, freedom of choice, freedom of expression, self-confidence, and exploring/experimenting were found to be salient for AI women as it impacted their family lives. Creativity was mentioned by two participants as it related to the applied nature of education in the U.S. Self-respect was not mentioned specifically but implied in their responses about independence.

Independence. Participants spoke of independence in terms of individual autonomy. They spoke of how such independence influenced their children and their own actions. Divorce was seen as a consequence of too much independence, as was lack of parental guidance for children. As they spoke about independence, some participants compared the AI and U.S. cultures, as seen in this example:

> They [children] are more independent here, more aggressive, more educated. At
>
> the age of 18 I would never have thought of leaving home, and my mom. But I
>
> think here there is more independence, more confidence. (P13)

Similarly another participant had this to say, "It [the U.S. culture] makes kids very independent. They learn to make choices"(P14). Women also spoke about the influence of independence on themselves as individuals. This physician who had come to U.S. as a student for higher education spoke of how the U.S. culture had influenced her.

It has influenced me a lot. I can speak for myself. I have changed a lot. My tastes, my dressing has changed, eating has changed. You feel, you develop more independence. You learn to be more independent. (P16)

At least one participant said she admired the American way of independent living practiced by older people in the U.S. She expressed her preference of not being dependent on her children when she was old. For the most part AI women appreciated this value in their lives. However, too much independence particularly in girls was seen as being problematic. "Half the marriages break up because girls are so adamant and want to go their own way" (P13). The high rate of divorce in the U.S. culture was seen as a consequence of such independence. As seen in the previous comment by participant, divorce was perceived as a consequence of a need for independence. Because the U.S. culture values independence, one participant observed:

I think Americans don't put as much effort into working things out. You know some of my American friends even have separate [bank] accounts among married couples. That amazes me. How can you separate things like that? That's where I think there is a problem. (P9)

Divorce was thus perceived as a result of individual autonomy at the expense of the relationship.

One participant spoke about lack of parental guidance in U.S. culture as a result of the emphasis on independence of the individual. She gave the following example of her son's friend:

In this society [U.S], parents let children do what they want, but actually they are not guiding their children. He has this American boy who is learning mridangam

[Indian percussion instrument] from him. He has finished his Bachelors and is going on to do Masters, and wants to do Ph.D. That boy had done everything on his own. He makes his own decisions. Finding an apartment, what to study, what not, everything he has to do. Sometimes kids don't know. They are children; they want someone to guide them. (P7)

Freedom of expression. In speaking of the U.S. values participants frequently drew comparisons with AI culture. One participant talked about her "individuality coming out more in this country whereas a lot of things just die in ourselves in India" (P7). The emergence of individuality was attributed to the influence of open expression in U.S. culture. Another woman found the U.S. culture to be forgiving; it was acceptable to make mistakes, and be honest about not knowing something, without the fear "of getting trashed"(P4). The same participant also felt that the U.S. values of independence and open expression influenced her marriage. She found that she could be more open with her husband, more assertive. Speaking from her own experience, she believed that AI husbands in the U.S. learned to respect their wives as individuals, recognizing "their need for privacy and freedom" (P4).

Hedonism

Some of the U.S. values that were salient to AI women corresponded to values described by Schwartz (1992) under hedonism, those of enjoyment and gratification of desires. Both of these values were represented by the findings of the study. AI women talked about the pursuit of pleasure in U.S. culture as related to sexuality, drinking, and staying out late. Gratification of desires came up in relation to spending and expectations of instant gratification by their children.

Enjoyment of Hedonistic Pursuits. A number of references were made to liberal attitudes about sexuality in U.S. culture. For example, one participant mentioned being shocked by the large number of single mothers who are not married in the U.S. Others felt that U.S. society was too "promiscuous" (P13). Another participant stated that, "the whole sex thing is overrated here" (P15). Speaking of the liberal attitudes that prevailed in the U.S. culture, one participant said, "children who are 13 and 14 are having sex. I have a major problem with that" (P10). The issue of sex was most salient to participants when it came to raising children; the discussion of the issue occurred most frequently in the context of dating. One of the main fears about letting their children date was related to AI mother's perceptions that dating lead to premarital sex. Although some mothers stated that they did not mind their children going out in a group, they did not allow them to go on dates.

A frequent topic of conversation for parents with teenage children was allowing children to stay out late. Most mothers reported having strict curfews. The perceived lack of restraint in U.S. culture among teenagers enjoying late into the night posed problems for some AI mothers with their children, as described by this mother, when she wanted to know why they were coming home at night; her daughters would respond , "wow mom, life starts in the United States at midnight. Are you crazy?" (P11)

Drinking was mentioned frequently as an exemplar of hedonistic pursuits. One mother said her kids experienced a lot of peer pressure in college because "in this society every kid is drinking" (P8). Another participant (P7) commented on "so much drugs and alcohol. When they think of partying, kids in this society, all they think about is alcohol" (P7).

Gratification of desires. Instant gratification came up in the responses of some mothers in the context of trying to teach their children the value of money. Participants with younger children talked about how "Americans have tons of toys for their kids" (P3); another participant echoed this sentiment, "Kids here you know they buy whatever they want, but my kids know the value of money" (P1). The need for gratification was attributed by several interviewees to the U.S. emphasis on individualism and pleasure for oneself, "In the U.S. it is mainly you as an individual and really there are no ties. So if you feel like doing certain things you do it, if you don't, you don't do it" (P10). Another reason given for the pursuit of pleasure among teenagers was related to their ability to earn their own money by working, which several mothers mentioned they did not let their children do.

Other value-types

Values that related to achievement, power, benevolence, and universalism were mentioned by some participants mainly as they compared U.S. and India. The value of hard-work which characterizes achievement were mentioned in relation to U.S. values. Logical thinking in the form of questioning and reasoning, also a part of the achievement value type, was seen as a U.S. value that was salient in AI women's lives as an influence on their children. Interviewees reported that their children were never satisfied with the statements parents made; they needed a reason and logic for those statements. AI mothers encountered this particularly in relation to teaching their children AI traditions. The reference to power as a value-type came up mainly in references to wealth, opportunities for success, and comforts in the U.S. Success and money were seen as the driving forces in the U.S.

Other values mentioned by participants as U.S. American values were honesty, openness helpfulness, charity and willingness to work for the benefit of others through social work. These values depict the value-type of benevolence in Schwartz's (1992) classification . Values under universalism could be seen in descriptions of Americans as "welcoming others with open hearts" (P16), as having "respect for others" (P3), and as being "open-minded" (P5). One woman mentioned that in terms of broad-mindedness and acceptance of others, "there is no place on earth like the United States" (P16).

Contradictions between U.S. and AI Values

The third research question asked about whether or not AI women experience contradictions between Indian values and U.S. American values in their lives as a parent. Schwartz's (1998) value structure was used to address the third research question in terms of contradicting values.

The contradictions that AI women described between U.S. values and AI values were mainly between U.S. values of self-direction/hedonism, versus AI values of tradition/ conformity/security. One issue that was at the heart of this contradiction was well summarized by one participant, "You know when they are kids, you are torn between two cultures. You don't know how to raise them, do you raise them as an American or do you raise them as Indian?" (P16). Another participant said that the "outside influence" (P14), meaning the U.S. culture was so prevalent in the lives of children that mothers had to put extra effort into teaching them AI values. This placed a great strain on the mother as well as children. In talking about her persistent attempts to teach AI values, one participant said: "They ask, 'why are you hammering?' They argue, and they cry, because [there is] no solution, and parents feel bad too" (P20).

Self-direction Versus Conformity

There were multiple examples of the contradiction between self-direction and conformity. In describing these contradictions references were made to the specific values described in the previous section. One of the frequently arising contradictions was between the AI values of respect for elders, and obedience under the value-type of conformity, versus U.S. values of independence and freedom of expression under self-direction. One participant described the freedom in U.S. as opposed to Indian culture as follows, "Here a 5 year old can say things to parents, and there even if you are 25 years old you have to think before saying anything to your parents." (P14)

On the one hand participants admired the independence and freedom of expression of the U.S., while on the other hand they found outspokenness among their children problematic as exemplified by the following excerpt:

In India I think we always think we have to respect our elders. We don't speak out because we always respect the head of the family, and no matter what he says, we think we accept it. But here I think it is the other way around; they just speak up, because they think it is his or her choice. I feel that my kids should not speak up because I know I am always looking out for their good. (P3)

Participants generally found such outspokenness, particularly argument and questioning of parental authority contrary to AI standards of obedience and unquestioning acceptance of things, as demonstrated by the following observation from a participant:

I would never question my dad, but kids here have no qualms you know. They [her children] have no problem asking why. They want an explanation for everything. Dad is the eldest of the house, and if he says so I didn't ask for

explanation like my A__ [daughter] does, "why dad, why can't I do that?" That's

what I see in children here... (P13)

Another participant who said she did not have a strictly traditional upbringing and had

enjoyed plenty of freedom growing up in India, nevertheless felt the contradiction

between the self-direction her 15-year-old son displayed and the need for conformity to

parental authority.

The thing that amazes me is that they sit and argue with us. How can you do that

with your parents? If my dad shouted, we wouldn't have the courage to say one

word. But here there is no stopping them. They keep arguing away. I think it's the

whole thing about freedom of speech and all that. (P18)

One participant mentioned that her children staying out late at night with friends

also contributed to her perception of a contradiction between the U.S. emphasis on

freedom of expression and the AI value of obedience. "They sometimes go out late at

night and we are uncomfortable. But you have no choice. They won't listen to you. They

will do what they want to do. It's the freedom here see. (P16)

One mother attributed such problems to the confusion AI children experienced because

they were taught conformity at home but assertiveness outside the home.

The contradiction between the values of respect for elders and freedom of

expression was of great concern for mothers as they tried to teach their children AI

values. Mothers felt the children questioned their parents a great deal, as illustrated by

this example of a mother who tried to teach her 11 year-old son AI religious practices.

They ask questions about what you do, and you are baffled, because you really

don't know because you did not ask your parents questions. Here you are being

bombarded. Especially when I try to teach him Sanskrit slokas (chants) for which

I don't know the meaning. I know a little in a general way but not in depth. And

he will ask, "why are we doing this. What is the purpose?" (P4)

Faced with her son's questioning this mother attempted to explain things to him but

found that she lacked the in-depth knowledge about these matters herself because she had

never thought to question her parents or teachers in this manner. Mothers therefore

experienced their children's questioning as a contradiction to AI values of unquestioning

acceptance.

Another mother felt that the U.S. culture did not teach respect for elders. She said

that she did not mind her children asking questions if the motivation behind it was to

learn; outspokenness or questioning intended to challenge elders was not tolerated.

Recalling an incident from her son's childhood she said:

…when he was young I told him, if you talk out of turn with an older person I am

going to slap you right there. I don't care if you get insulted. No matter how right

you are you never speak out with adults. (P20)

Thus, many of the participants in the study provided examples that illustrated the

contradiction between conformity and self-direction. This contradiction generally

centered around obedience to and respect for elders in AI culture in the face of what they

felt was a general lack of a respect for older people and an emphasis on free expression in

U.S. culture.

Self-direction Versus Tradition

The US value of self-direction with its freedom of choice in matters such as dating

and marriage were seen as opposing the value of tradition in the AI culture. One reason

for this contradiction, was the U.S. tradition of dating opposed to the AI tradition of arranged marriage. Some participants felt that Americans had to choose their own mates and hence it was necessary for them date, but that this was not necessary or appropriate for AI children. Participants indicated that some of their children wanted to date and they would not allow it; at the same time some mothers reported feeling bad because their children were under so much peer pressure. One woman reported that "girls are so aggressive here" (P18) because they would frequently call her high-school aged son. Other women recognized that by not letting their children date, AI mothers were depriving their children of the opportunity to develop the necessary skills to find their own mate, making the issue of marriage problematic.

Because of the dating issue, participants indicated that marriage was also problematic for AI children. As one participant stated, "dating is not an option, but arranged marriage in the traditional sense is also not an option" (P16). AI mothers realized that the traditional concept of arranged marriage (no choice of partner or not knowing each other before the wedding), would not work for their children. In many cases, their expectation was of a modified version of arranged marriage for their children where a family member would introduce the man and woman. Second-generation AI children, however, were not always prepared to consider that as an option. AI girls raised in the U.S. culture are reportedly more conscious of their independence, which poses a problem when it comes to marriage. One participant who had daughters aged 22 and 18 spoke of the struggle she was experiencing with her 22-year-old daughter who was completing her Masters degree in psychology. The mother felt it was time for the daughter to be thinking of marriage, while the daughter had other ideas.

We are having a conflict with her [daughter] now about marriage. She asks, "mom how can I get married to a guy just by talking to him a few times?" … . See the other problem is that these girls are so highly qualified too, they want somebody equally or more qualified. It doesn't work. Then, she is like, if her job is in one place she's not going to give up her job. I tell her, "no that's not how it works. Husband's job is the main job." She won't buy that. She says, "Ok whoever makes more money stays." See that is different in our culture. We don't even think like that. (P13)

Another mother described the argument she had with her daughter regarding the contradiction between the mother's emphasis on tradition and the daughter's desire for self-direction. This mother described herself as not being too traditional, but the situation of marriage still posed a dilemma for her and her 20-year-old daughter.

Sometimes when we talk about arranged marriages and all she will ask, "How do you know it's going to work?" We say, we don't know, but historically it has worked. We are not saying it is perfectly foolproof, but at least 50% of the marriages are not ending up in divorce in India like it does in this country. S___ [daughter] says, "I cannot marry someone without knowing that person. There is no way." (P7)

An interesting example of the contradiction between self-direction and conformity also came up in the context of one participant's daughter's wedding preparations. In the AI tradition the groom's mother holds an important place and must be respected by the daughter-in-law. One of the traditions was that the mother-in-law would select the bridal dress. The participant was concerned because her daughter did not like grand jewelry or

clothing and would prefer to pick her own wedding attire. The mother explained her dilemma like this,

> I am a little worried. Should I tell K__ [the mother-in-law] that I will pick her [daughter's] clothes and she can pay me later? But I feel bad. Because she is the mother-in-law. It is her choice and right to pick what she wants. So I tell S__ [daughter], "in that case, just accept whatever she brings" (P20).

Here the mother experienced the contradiction as a tension between favoring her daughter's freedom of choice in the matter of her marriage versus conforming to AI tradition.

Although the participants found their children's independence unnerving in some instances, those with daughters acknowledged that they appreciated the independence and self-confidence fostered by the U.S. culture in their children. As much as they advised their daughters to adjust and compromise, they also appreciated that their daughters could stand up for themselves if "something went wrong in their marriage" (P13), or in the event that they were abused in their marital relationship. In this manner they recognized self-direction and conformity as complementary rather than contradicting values. For example, one mother with pre-teen daughters mentioned that she taught her daughters the value of compromise and adjustment, yet told them they should stand up for themselves if the situation demanded it.

Self-direction Versus Security

The self-direction versus security contradiction occurred mainly in the context of individual

independence emphasized by U.S. culture versus family support in the AI culture. One participant spoke of how the AI emphasis on family leads to a loss of privacy for the individual; on the other hand the U.S. cultural emphasis on independence leads to a loss of support when the need arises. She explained the contradiction as follows:

Sometimes it [independence] looks positive and sometimes it doesn't look so positive. Positive in the sense that if you are healthy if you are capable of being independent you should be independent. But if you have a need, then you should have people to take care of you, which is lacking in this culture. (P4)

Another participant who said she valued everything about Indian culture and felt that it was important to take care of one's parents and elderly in the family, also expressed this contradiction in two ways. On the one hand she described how she had performed her duty by taking care of her mother over the years; on the other hand she felt she had made her mother too dependent on her. Although she saw the importance of family security in AI culture, she also saw value in the U.S. emphasis on independence. She declared that she would not want to be dependent on her children in her old age.

The prevalence of divorce in the U.S. culture was seen as a threat to family stability emphasized in the AI culture. Some participants attributed the high rate of divorce in the U.S. to too much emphasis on individual autonomy. Although it did not pose a direct contradiction for AI women within their families, it sometimes concerned them in regard to their children. As one participant explained, "That [marriage] is the only thing I am worried about. As parents of a daughter we don't want her to marry a

non-Indian. We don't want her to marry an American have two kids and get a divorce like they do here." (P7)

Thus, in some cases participants recognized the need for both family security and personal independence; in other situations the U.S. emphasis on self-direction over family security was a source of concern for AI mothers with older children.

Hedonism Versus Conformity

This contradiction occurred in the opposition between gratification of desires versus the value of being thrifty that AI mothers tried to inculcate in their children. One mother spoke about the difficulty of trying to instill the value of money in her teenage son who demanded more "pocket-money." She attributed this to the U.S. emphasis on self-gratification.

> Kids grow up here with so much I think it is hard to get them to like the concept
> of making do with less. The thing is they grow up with friends who get a lot. One
> of the big things is pocket money. I know, that is a part of their life but they look
> around and they feel somehow that they are not getting what other kids are
> getting. (P18)

The value-type of hedonism contradicting conformity was also evident in the participants' discourse about their children staying out late with friends. The contradiction occurred mothers expected children to obey curfews, while children wanted to pursue the pleasures of enjoying themselves. One mother reported feeling pulled because she understood that in the U.S. culture teenagers typically stayed out late, at the same time the mother did not wish her daughter to stay out past 10:00 at night. Asked if the pull the mother faced was one of cultural differences or simply what any parent might

face, the mother emphatically said it was because of the cultures; Americans she felt were more liberal about such matters.

> I think it is definitely because of the two cultures. In India I don't think I would have had this problem. Because there everyone would be the same, here it is very different. Here American kids stay out late, so obviously our kids feel that they are missing out on life. K__, A__ [daughters] always feel, "oh my gosh they are having so much fun, we are missing out." Just like here, Americans don't think there is anything wrong because that [enjoying] is their way. (P13)

Hedonism Versus Tradition

The values identified as hedonism appeared in opposition to those of tradition mainly in the context of sexuality. Most participants mentioned being fearful of the liberal attitudes that prevailed in U.S. culture regarding such things as pre-marital sex, teenage pregnancies, and drinking. Pre-marital sex strongly opposed the AI value of chastity as illustrated by this example of a mother who believed that the emphasis on sex in the U.S., placed a great deal of pressure on AI children.

> Then of course if you talk about U.S. and India, about sex, there is no doubt it is much more free and open here. I don't think you should lose your virginity before marriage. You can go out and have fun, go out and eat, but I think you should not lose your virginity before marriage. I don't care what the pressure from society is, that if you don't have sex you are not normal. I think children should not be put under that kind of pressure but here they are. (P15)

Speaking about her daughters who were 11 and 12, another mother spoke of how she was trying to raise her daughters so that they were not influenced by the liberal views of the

U.S. culture in matters of sexuality. "Children who are 13 and 14 are having sex. I have a major problem with that. That's why we are giving them such a tight background." (P10)

No Contradictions

Among the 20 participants, not all women reported value contradictions. One participant who strongly favored the AI culture described why she did not feel a pull living in two cultures, personally for herself or in child-rearing. This participant had a Ph.D. in molecular biology and had come to the U.S. as a post-doctoral student in the early 1980s. She currently worked for a major corporation as a scientist, but had not felt pressure to change herself to assimilate into the U.S. culture. She reported her AI identity as being very important to her.

> Nothing here influences me. I raise them based on how I was raised. I cook
>
> Indian, I dress Indian. If issues like dating come up I'll say no, and as long as they
>
> are in my house they will have to abide by my rules. (P15)

Another participant said that she could not distinguish between AI values and U.S. values. She attributed her perception to the number of years (33) she had lived in the U.S. and the fact that she had worked as a professional for most of those years. Recalling her early years in the U.S. she said that perhaps she had been more "Indian", but her exposure to the U.S. way of life through her profession as a banker had given her a different perspective than perhaps other AI women had.

A third participant also did not find many contradictions. She indicated that her exposure to the U.S. culture was minimal since she did not work outside the home. Having always stayed home to raise her children, the few Americans she knew were

neighbors and her children's friends who she described as being "nice and helpful." She had been successful in teaching her sons many of the AI traditions she held important.

Other women who did not report feeling any pulls attributed it to having "good kids" who were accepting of parental authority. One woman said her 18-year-old son took a great deal of pride in the AI culture and therefore she did not have to make a special effort to teach him those traditions.

Dialectical Tensions

This section will address the findings for research questions 4 and 5. Research question 4 addressed the basic dialectical tensions mentioned in literature between autonomy-connection, openness-closedness, predictability-novelty, and judgment-acceptance in parent-child relationship between AI women and their children. The analysis of the transcripts indicated the presence of all four dialectics. In addition a secondary tension also emerged in the form of autonomy-protection. Many of the tensions described in the following sections do not necessarily represent a contradiction between AI and U.S. values; at least some of the tensions might occur in any mother-child relationship. Those that were prompted by differing values did indicate some overlap with the results reported as value contradictions in the previous section.

Autonomy-Connection

The dialectical tension between autonomy-connection arose in the relationships between AI mothers and their children in two ways. First, the tensions were explicitly tied to perceived contradictions between U.S. and AI values by the participants. For example, as the findings of AI values revealed, the focus on children, and making them the priority in life, was found to be salient to AI women, however, a number of them

addressed how this created a dialectical tension in their relationships with their children. Second, responses of interviews displayed general autonomy-connection dialectics that might occur in any mother-child relationship; for example a mother torn between her career and children.

The autonomy-connection dialectics appear to take several forms, each of which will be discussed below. First, there is the need for autonomy on the part of mothers, juxtaposed with their desire to be connected with their children. Second, the participants perceived that there is a desire on the part of children to be autonomous from their mothers, while the mothers desire connection. A secondary tension emerged as being central to the mother-child relationship, namely, autonomy-protection, where connection took the form of wishing to protect the children.

Autonomy-connection contradiction was seen in one participant's account of how as much as she valued her connection to her children and family in accordance with AI values, it also prevented her from pursuing her own individual interests, which she attributed to U.S. influence.

Sometimes I do feel it. You want to do something but you cannot do it because of your own family values. If I were an American I would have wanted a lot just for myself. But as an Indian you know you want to do something, but if that doesn't fit the family you end up not doing. Then there is a feeling of "oh I couldn't do it." So that's definitely there. (P4)

She added that the U.S. culture had an influence on her in that she was more assertive than she was in India. But she reminded herself that, "we always have a check and it doesn't go beyond that."

One participant who was a molecular biologist by profession said she had always had a career and said she could not imagine being home full-time. She mentioned feeling pulled sometimes between career and her children. This pull was not related to being Indian as much as it was related to being a mother and having a career.

> Sometimes you feel caught between two things; should I go to my son's talent show or go to a meeting? Both are equally important. But I make sure I participate in their activities, because childhood is such a short time. But there are times I have wondered if I should have stayed home. Especially when they fall sick.
>
> (P15)

Some women spoke about how the AI emphasis on connection might place a burden on children.

> Children come first no matter what. Our life is focused on children. But the downside of that is that they feel stress because of that. I sometimes wonder by placing too much focus on them if we make them feel obligated, you know like they have to do certain things for us, or that they have to take care of us in later years or whatever.
>
> (P9)

The autonomy-connection dialectical tension was also experienced by participants when it became apparent that their children wanted autonomy and they wanted extensive involvement in their children's lives. For example, one woman who was a medical doctor

herself, reported the following experience with a child who wished to make his own choices:

> Study wise he [her son] was going to go to med school. First year he was OK then he said I'm quitting. I don't like biology. We didn't want to force because our kids always think, "Indian parents are very pushy. They don't know so many choices in life except medicine." So he did economics major. (P5)

The son completed his degree but soon after that had a change of heart and was now going back to school to begin his pre-med. The mother spoke of the wasted time, money and effort, and how children were so bent upon making their own choices. Thus, while parents wanted to be involved in the lives of their adult children in making life choices, children perceived parents' attempts as depriving them of the autonomy in making their own decisions.

Although some of the participants indicated "pleasure in doing things" (P9) for their children, and supporting their children emotionally and financially, the autonomy displayed by children was difficult for some participants to accept. One participant spoke of the expectation that she and her husband had regarding their son's wedding. The son was marrying a U.S. American girl whom he had dated for some time. The parents had let him make his own choice of a life partner and had no trouble accepting a non-Indian. However, they did have expectations that they would be involved in the wedding arrangements as well as paying for their share of the wedding expenses. This was a part of being a parent that she reported having looked forward to. It came as a disappointment when the son refused their offer.

Doing things for your children is part of your life. Like my son got married and he didn't want us to do anything for his wedding. He doesn't want monetary help or anything. That's a big step back for us. We are proud of him in a way. But at the same time you want to help them. Oh how are you doing this. The money is there. It's no big deal. We can do it and when he says, "no… no..no.. I don't want you to do anything. I want to pay for this." That's a hard thing, to stand back and not do anything. Um so things like that, we have to learn to give that space or freedom. (P2)

In situations such as those described above, mothers experienced tension between wishing to be involved in their children's lives, at the same time trying to be conscious of the children's need for autonomy.

The word 'protection' came up often in relationship to children seeking autonomy and the mother seeking connection. This formed a secondary tension of autonomy-protection. Connection for a number of mothers took the form of being protective towards their children. The participants spoke of how they didn't want their children to make mistakes or get hurt, while the children perceived them as being over-protective. One participant had a 16-year-old son who was a musician and traveled to different cities quite frequently for concerts. The participant recalled an incident related to her feelings of protectiveness toward her son. Talking about an incident where a friend's son died in an auto accident while he was out with a friend's family, she warned her son about not driving when he was in other cities.

But you know when you hear all this, you feel so scared. But when we say that these kids think we are overprotective. I tell R__ [son], now you are going to LA for your concert; in case they say why don't you take the car for something, I don't want you to drive. And he laughs. (P7)

Gender dynamics added an interesting dimension to the autonomy-protectiveness contradiction. AI mothers reported being more protective of daughters than sons. One mother reported that her daughter argued about mother's decision to let her brother stay out past 11 p.m. when she had to be home by 10 p.m. The way this mother explained the reason to her daughter was:

I always said S__, you are a girl, if something happens it's on your body its going to happen. So that is the most concern. I know what goes on at parties after 10. I know after 10 is when parties start. (P20).

Other participants shared incidents about their experiences when their children began driving. This participant attributed her protectiveness to her AI upbringing:

...like when they turn 15, they have to learn driving. I would say, they are only 15 is it necessary? He [husband] said no, if they have to learn, they have to learn, but I am more protective. You know how it is in India, we were always protected so even now I don't feel all that comfortable with some things. (P17)

One participant recalled her son driving at 16 had been an issue for her. He was due to get his driver's license in February and she wanted him to wait, because she didn't want him driving in winter. Her son viewed that as being deprived of his autonomy. This participant stated that looking back at the incident later she realized how unfair it was of her to deprive a teenager of what he perceived as a major event in his life.

Being protective meant placing certain restrictions on the children; some mothers reported a struggle between giving their children autonomy versus being restrictive.

> There were times when I did mind A__ or K__ [daughters] going out staying late at night. I understand that they have to mingle in American society. I do want to give them more freedom. I do trust them but we don't trust the society. So we feel pulled whether we let them go or not. Sometimes we extend their curfew, but we worry all through that time. Like we let them go camping then we worry. Did we do the right thing? Will they be OK? Things like that. We do give them freedom against our wish sometimes, and feel pulled. (P13)

In the above example the tension is evident even though the mother favored the autonomy pole of the contradiction.

Together with the protectiveness they naturally displayed, many participants also expressed the realization that they needed to let their children learn to be independent. For example this participant said, "Sometimes it is not good to be so protective, because we are always there and it doesn't make them independent. They need to experiment sometimes" (P3). Others described it as challenging:

> It is definitely challenging. You wonder if you are doing the right thing. Every step you think that. And yet you have let them make their own mistakes. That's a challenge. To know that they are doing something wrong, and let them do it so that they can learn. You want to be protective all the time. It's hard to let go. And there is a constant struggle and there are lots of times the protective part gets the better of me. (P17)

A few mothers acknowledged that freedom was important but children had to learn that freedom was a privilege and not something to be taken for granted. This mother describes how she and her husband were raising their pre-teen daughters.

> U__ [husband] is very conservative. He made sure that they (children) understood that there are things that are not going to be allowed. Simple things like going to a school dance or to a prom…. When the time came we allowed them to go sometimes if I could chaperon. But they understood that they are being allowed the privilege. (P10)

Thus, the autonomy-connection dialectics played a central role in participants' relationships with their children, particularly as it related to being protective, and having to place certain restrictions on the children. Most participants appeared to be leaning more towards the connection pole of the contradiction but many also indicated a need for allowing their children greater autonomy. They did not, however, generally perceive that they themselves should have more autonomy from the family structure, as evidenced by a number of participants in their choice of staying home rather than pursuing a career or education.

Openness-Closedness

The tension between openness-closedness was sometimes closely interwoven with the opposition of the values between the AI and U.S. cultures, as mothers tried to keep their minds open to the norms of U.S. culture for the sake of their children growing up with two cultures. This tension was most often revealed in the context of marriage and dating. The other context in which the openness-closedness dialectic manifested itself was less clearly related to cultural values. The openness-closedness dialectic in this

context was exemplified by participants' perception of a tension between the need for open and closed communication with their children.

In the cultural context, the dialectic manifested as a tension between the mothers' wish for their children to marry within the AI culture versus marrying someone from outside the culture; this was a primary concern for all participants with older children. While these mothers expressed the wish that their children marry within the culture, they also struggled to keep an open mind. One mother in her late 40s who described herself as being Indian in every way and truly valuing her heritage expressed her dilemma as follows:

> And I begged her, S__ (daughter) please, please, please don't marry a Christian or Muslim. I want her to marry an Indian but I don't know if my dreams will happen. I hope it will happen but I don't know, because they did not ask to be raised in this country. So I have to be more open. (P11)

Like this mother, most mothers recognized a need to be open to possibilities where children's marriage was concerned. This mother who had younger children didn't face the dilemma yet, but she still talked about it:

> In the future I can only tell them I would like you to get married to an Indian girl but I also keep my options open because if something other than that happens then I don't want to be shocked. You never know what will happen. (P15)

Not all mothers faced this contradiction or the situations mentioned above. For example, one mother was open to her son marrying someone according to his choice, "because once you decide to live in this society and the kids are raised here you have to be prepared for anything" (P8). She told her son that because he was in medical school, it

might be easier for him to find someone on his own, perhaps someone who was in school with him; illustrating her desire to be open to his desires.

Almost all women mentioned open communication as extremely important to resolving differences within the mother-child relationship. For example one participant discussed how in the AI culture open communication between parents and children is not common. She indicated that she has learned the importance of being open with her children. In fact she sees openness as a necessity in raising children in the U.S.

> I told them to bring any questions to me and not to take wrong information from other kids. Whereas my mom and I never had that conversation. I don't think I knew anything until I was much older. I don't think though that our kids here can survive with so little information. So I think they need to have a little more education, though they don't need to know everything. (P10)

One mother felt that there was a time to be open and a time to be closed. This woman was in her mid-thirties with two young daughters. She said that when she denied her daughters something she was open with them, explaining to them the reason for her decision. But she also chose not to do that on occasions:

> We may tell them something right now that we can only explain to them two years from now because there are things that we can't tell them now. They should have the capacity to follow things without having to argue about everything. We pulled them out of classes related to sex education in school, and I said, "I'll tell you when the time is right. I don't want you sitting in a class and learning everything the way it is shown because I think it is too early." A year later I kept my promise and slowly introduced them to things that I thought were right. (P10)

Openness-closedness thus emerged mainly as a tension between keeping an open mind to the possibility that children would not marry within the AI community versus having a closed mind.

Predictability-Novelty

The predictability-novelty contradiction mainly occurred in contexts where participants reported being unsure of the situations they found themselves in with their children. Most women sought predictability in their relationships with their children in the form of what they knew in India, which opposed the novelty of situations they encountered in the U.S. Although not necessarily related to value contradictions, a number of women reported that the protective environment in which they were raised in India often made them insecure about allowing their children to indulge in certain things. One participant explained it like this,

> We had such a protected life in India. I didn't know anything about gays and lesbians, child abuse, and all that until I came to the U.S. It is hard, hard to let go sometimes even when you know that is the right thing. See dating is totally an unknown territory for us. What does dating mean? Is it just going out to eat; to a movie maybe? That's what we think, but here it is different. Sex is the thing we are afraid of. We don't know how far to let them go. (P9)

According to participants, much of the novelty AI women experienced in their relationships with their children was based on not being familiar with the U.S. cultural values, norms or practices. The "horror stories" (P7) they heard were mainly from the media portrayals, which increased their feelings of novelty in terms of what was "out there" (P9).

At other times the contradiction was experienced due to perceived threats in a given situation where the mother was uncomfortable with certain U.S. norms. One participant related an incident that was salient to her in her life and her 20-year-old daughter's life. The incident involved the participant's daughter's American friend in elementary school, after the friend's parents got divorced suddenly. Until then, the girls had been close, spending a great deal of time in one another's house. After the divorce the participant did not wish to send her daughter to the friend's house, for the reasons stated below:

> After the divorce the mother started dating and she would go out with different men. She would leave her daughter with baby-sitters, sometimes a 15-year old boy. We weren't comfortable with that. So we stopped sending S__ [daughter] over. We would try to say it in so many ways subtly. But it was so difficult because for some many years we had sent her. See in their culture it was OK [dating; leaving child with sitter]. This type of thing is common. But for us, especially leaving a 10-year-old girl with the 15-year-old boy. I don't know. At that time we were really in a dilemma. We tried telling the mother that maybe she could send S___ [the friend] to our house and she came a few times, but they would keep calling my daughter to come there, but we didn't send her. That had a very bad effect on that kid …but we couldn't do much. We had to look out for our child. But even now we feel bad and S___ [her daughter] thinks about that friend a lot. (P7)

In the above example the mother faced the tension due to the novelty of the situation which she perceived as a threat to her daughter's well-being.

The tension between predictability-novelty was experienced by some women in the context of finding a mate for their children. As mentioned before, mothers wished to have their children marry within the AI community; they thus sought the predictability of an arranged marriage, even in terms of a modified one where they introduced the man and woman. Some children on the other hand were reluctant to accept an arranged marriage, even a facilitated one. Yet as one mother reported, these AI children were reluctant to find their own mate through dating. Reportedly AI children felt discouraged due to the high rate of divorce among Americans, in spite of choosing their own partners. This created a dilemma for AI second-generation children with the result that many "27 and 28-year-olds are not married because they don't want to experiment" (P7) in terms of trying to find their own partner.

The other context unrelated to cultural differences, which most parents with teenagers encountered related to letting them stay out late. While children sought the novelty of going out with friends and enjoying themselves, parents sought the predictability of curfew times, and parental authority to exercise such curfew; this led to a predictability-novelty contradiction between parents and children.

Although not directly related to value contradictions, the predictability-novelty still manifested some of the cultural differences, mainly because not understanding the U.S. culture or its norms, or seeing it as a threat to their children posed novel situations for AI mothers. The tension as it related to children's marriages, as reported by the mothers, was experienced by both mothers and children. Unrelated to cultural expectations were issues of children seeking enjoyment with friends and parents.

Judgment-Acceptance

As was the case with the other dialectics the tension between judgment-acceptance also occurred in some situations due to differences in AI and U.S. values. This took the form of participants being judgmental of certain aspects of U.S. culture while their children embraced aspects of the U.S. culture not approved of by participants. A few participants described experiences that pointed to this dialectic in the context of clothing, and social events, both of which seemed to be more salient to women with daughters. Women spoke of these tensions in the context of making an effort to be more accepting. A variation of the judgment-acceptance tension emerged as being central to the mother-child relationship, in the form of an *expectation-acceptance* dialectic, in which mothers experienced a tension between parental expectations versus acceptance of their children.

Once again there was an awareness and conscious effort made by most mothers to be more accepting for the sake of their children. As one participant said, "from the beginning I knew that we are raising the kids here in this country and I can't raise them like in India." (P2), yet it was difficult not to see the U.S. culture from one's own limited perspective. In some situations mothers tried to find a compromise between judgment and acceptance of the desires of their children. One participant who was in her mid-forties with an 18-year-old daughter described her dilemma regarding clothes that her daughter picked, which the mother found inappropriate or immodest.

> It's not fair on the kids if we impose our values on them, because they are
>
> growing up in this society. For example, N__ (daughter) came home with a dress
>
> one time that I thought was too revealing and I made her return it. But girls here
>
> wear those types of clothes. For her graduation, I went shopping with her. I

realized then why she had made the choice she did, because we couldn't find much that was not revealing. Finally we compromised and found something that was not so bad. It was still not what I would have chosen but it was not as bad as some of the others. So a lot of times we just have to find middle ground. (P9)

Others mentioned that they tended to be judgmental in some situations but were able to quickly change their thinking to being more accepting or at least trying to learn more about the situation before reacting. This mother who was a vice-president in a local bank, talked about having made a conscious effort over the 33 years she had been in the U.S., to learn about the culture. At the same time she described her tendency to be judgmental in certain situations with her children even before she had a chance to understand things.

I think not understanding the various things in this society, like for example if she [daughter] wanted to go to the dance in high school or in middle school, or go to the prom or things like that, my first answer is NO and then I would ask the question, "What does that mean, how does it work, what it is, who is she going with and where is she going?" I mean I don't even think that I said no, but it automatically comes.... my biggest thing was that I needed to learn how the system works. (P2)

A secondary tension related to judgment-acceptance was evident in *expectations* mothers had of their children versus *acceptance* of their children as they were. This tension is likely to occur in any parent-child relationship where parents have certain expectations of children; however, in this study, some of the ways in which it occurred was reported as being culturally oriented. The following excerpt demonstrates this tension:

Because kids grow up so different here. I mean they are doing good, but your expectations, like you want them to grow up as Indian and stay within the culture, but that doesn't really happen because they are not Indian. They did not breathe the Indian air and they are not like that. Really different. In that respect I feel maybe I should never have come here [the U.S]. (P16)

In the following example, the participant talks about her expectation from her daughter. This might be an expectation that any mother might have regardless of cultural background; the participant however framed it as a contradiction between daughters in India and daughters raised in U.S. society. This mother spoke of having certain expectations from her daughter; she also realizes that her expectations were perhaps misplaced. Her response revealed a tension as she tried to accept that her daughter had been raised differently, without the responsibilities the mother had growing up.

When I was growing up in India, my heart was with my mother. When I went home [from college] I would take over so she could get some rest. Sometimes your heart wants your kids to do that for you. On Mother's day, they do that, go do groceries, make a nice meal, set the table, write a nice card and all that, but only on that day. In India we do that everyday. Now I had backache, and they will ask how are you mom, but it won't occur to them to ask, "Mom do you want us to come home and stay with you? We'll do something". … I guess it's not their fault, it just doesn't occur to them because they are raised here like that. (P5)

Thus the mother experienced the tension between her expectations of her daughter and the acceptance that it was probably unrealistic of her to have such expectations due to living in the U.S.

The expectation-acceptance tension also surfaced in discussions about marriage. One thing that most women had accepted was that ultimately their children would make their own choices in marriage, but for most accepting that their child might marry a U.S. American was difficult. A few women reported having mixed feelings about the issue because as one mother put it "living 33 years here I have realized that I cannot take them back in my religion and culture completely" (P14). Another participant said, "you have to let go of some of the things if you want better relations with your children" (P12).

The following excerpt describes a mother's struggle where she feels she is wrong to judge but cannot help it because of her own expectations:

Well, we want our kids to marry an Indian, naturally. I mean I'm wrong in feeling that way. But I'm Indian so culturally I feel that way. But our kids are not. We think they are Indian but they are really not. They need to marry an American born Indian. Culturally I think they will have more in common. I don't think they should marry an Indian born Indian. That will be a cultural shock for them…. So it is their selection basically whether they marry Indian or American. It's OK. If they marry an American not much we can do. (P16)

Sometimes the contradiction occurred in career choices. This mother recalled when her daughter, who was studying physical therapy, called her after finishing a year of college, and said she wanted to study social work instead. She and her husband did not like the idea, but they supported their daughter.

We struggled a little bit in terms of whether she was making the right choice or not, but we supported her feeling what she wants to do. While she finished her

degree every year whatever work she was doing more and more seemed like her.

Now we can see that it is good. (P14)

The interviewee further explained that her initial reaction to her daughter's choice of social work was related to lack of employment, and mental health situations that the daughter might encounter. But the daughter being able to prove that she had made the right choice for herself helped the mother be more accepting.

The judgment-acceptance contradiction was also evident in how parents felt their children judged them. The participants spoke about how their children found it hard to accept them and their traditions and way of life. Participants thought their children perceived AI parents to be "over-protective, pushy, and over-bearing" (P7), and how their children found it hard sometimes to accept their traditions and way of life. One participant said that her daughter thought Indians were "prejudiced" (P20). Another participant felt that she always fell short of her children's expectations. She was a physician in nuclear medicine with three children, two sons in their twenties, and a daughter who was nineteen. In spite of the mother's educational background, and her accomplishments as a physician, she spoke of not measuring up to her children's expectations because she had not grown up in the U.S.

No matter what you tell them you are always below their expectations. You as a parent are always below their expectations. I can feel that every minute. Culturally we are different. We don't have the same background; we have not studied the same books they read. They talk about their books, they ask you questions, I mean they just want a conversation. We have never read those so we don't know. So it's

like, they shut off, because parents don't know. It happens all the time. All

through their middle school and high school this happens. We don't meet their

expectations. (P16)

Once again this tension may not be related to U.S.-AI contradiction as much as

differences in perceptions of children about their parents. But to this participant the

cultural aspect was salient.

The picture that emerges from the findings is one in which AI mothers

experienced tensions between judgment and acceptance of their children's preferences.

The root of the tension in many situations appeared to be cultural in nature. Underlying

the tension was also a general awareness that because the children were being raised in

the U.S., the participants could not always impose their judgment or expectations on the

children. As a result most of the participants consciously tried to be more accepting of

their children in order to maintain a harmonious relationship with them.

Other Contradictions

Research question 5 explored the possibility of other contradictions. While

variations on existing dialectics were found as discussed in the previous sections, no new

contradictions emerged from the data.

Communication

The final research question addressed whether the dialectical tensions were

negotiated internally, externally, or intrapersonally. Internal meant internal to the

relationship (between mother and child); external referred to communication outside the

mother-child relationship; and intrapersonal referred to the mother coping with the

contradictions within her self. When they talked of communication, participants spoke in general terms. Occasionally the communication was related directly to the negotiation of a contradiction, particularly when it came to internal communication. In terms of external communication, participants spoke more about sources than communication tactics they used. Intrapersonal communication did not emerge as an important way of dealing with contradictions.

Internal Communication

Participants talked about a number of mechanisms for resolving tensions that occurred internal to the mother-child relationship. The majority of participants mentioned the need for open communication with their children and hoped that the children would reciprocate. One mother said it was important to maintain friendly relationships with children in order ensure that children would confide in her. Many participants mentioned spending time with children and being involved in their activities ensured open communication.

Although parents were willing to be open in communicating with their children, children did not always open up. In such situations mothers found it necessary to encourage the children to open up. This interviewee spoke of her communication strategy with her two young daughters:

I bring up stuff, and ask them questions, start up a conversation later at night. And they talk to each other, but they don't always tell me everything because they want to keep it as sisters talk. So when I have one child or the other I strike up a

conversation. My younger daughter, if you give her a little lead she will reveal everything. (P10)

The closedness on the part of the children sometimes occurred due to reticence on the part of the child. Speaking of her reticent son, this participant said:

The best time I have with him is when we are driving somewhere for his school events and that's when we talk. Then he will start talking himself. He opens up. If I ask him something he won't. If I give him a little thing he will open (P19)

One mother mentioned the importance of listening without saying anything that might seem judgmental to the children.

The kids openly talk how the society is and you just listen. You never say you don't like it, otherwise they think you are prejudiced. For example my daughter will be talking about some girls this and that. She will separate herself out that she doesn't think they are right, why are they doing that. But you just listen. You give a very benign answer. If you talk too much, they will think you are cocky, you are too proud of yourself. Or that we are biased and we already have built in ideas about everything. You have to be very careful. You have to answer very non-commitally. Otherwise they don't like that, I have realized. (P16)

Explaining was employed as a tool particularly when it related to restrictions that were placed on the children. For example this mother reported that she would explain to her children why the father placed certain restrictions on the children:

I sit down and explain to the kids how I want them to do things and why we are doing it.… He [dad] sets certain rules without giving an explanation. Then I take

time and explain to them why he said no, and what he is thinking. And they say

"why didn't dad explain that" and I say, "I am explaining it. So now you know."

(P10)

Another mother explained to her son why he was not allowed to date:

I told him that it is just not part of our value system. I also, explained to him that

if he started dating there is lot of emotional baggage that goes with dating which

they don't realize. There is a good chance that he will get hurt because of that. He

also does not realize the things could come out of it. I explain to him the extreme

things that could happen. And he goes, "Oh mom, you are so extreme." But you

never know anything can happen. (P18)

Thus, explaining and reasoning with children was a frequently used communication

strategy by the participants.

At other times mothers relied on parental authority to lay down rules. This type of

communication was particularly evident in the freedom-restriction context particularly

when reasoning or explaining did not work: As one participant stated:

Sometimes we simply put our foot down, because there is no reasoning at that

age. Sometimes we try to reason, when they are calmer we try to explain why we

did what we did. But like at certain point we just tell them, "no you are not doing

it, and we can't give you a reason." (P13)

Or as another participant stated it, "I tell them eventually your parent's word is final. It is

not a democracy in this house." (P17), or, "I tell them that as long as they live in my

house they have to follow my rules" (P15). In all the cases the mothers felt it necessary to

place restrictions as a means of addressing the tension.

Arguments were common, particularly with teenagers, however, not all children argued. Many of the mothers mentioned that they did not encounter any particular challenges with their children, while others felt that their children argued about everything. Some mothers saw such arguing as questioning parental authority that they would never have done. Others like this mother saw argument as natural, "They are basically not kids who argue unnecessarily. They will argue when they have a point and we let them argue too. It's not like 'I'm the mom you have to listen to me'" (P7).

All the participants tried to foster open communication. In some instances children were equally open; in other cases mothers had to resort to other tactics to maintain such communication with their children.

External Communication

In terms of communication outside the mother-child relationship, participants mainly mentioned sources of support rather than strategies of communication. Source mentioned were, spouses, extended family, older children, and friends. Most women mentioned talking with their husbands when they experienced a struggle. There were only a few cases in which the women felt that the husband was not a source of support, either because the husband was too busy or because he left the bulk of the parenting decisions to his wife. Most participants mentioned open communication with their husbands as central to helping them manage the dialectical tensions in their relationships with their children. One woman illustrated this quite clearly:

> I pick up the phone and talk to R__ [husband]. Lot of times we come to a consensus. Because R__ is less impulsive so he will give me the right advice. That way I trust him a lot. (P17)

Among family members, mothers, and mothers-in-law were mentioned as a source of support for negotiation of tensions. Other family members included sisters, sisters-in-law, aunts, cousins and on occasion even older children who had exposure to the U.S. society and could give appropriate advice. Most women mentioned family in the U.S. as the greatest source of support, particularly if they were older and had already been through the parenting experience. These family members were not only able to offer advice to the participants but also talked directly to the children in cases where the children were not willing to listen to their mothers. Open discussion among the immediate family was sometimes used as a strategy for managing dialectical tensions:

We had and we still have over the dining table we have a lot of discussions. A lot of them come up at the dining table but not all of them get resolved there. Everybody talks and yells until one or two in the morning, whenever, and eventually your parents' word is final. (P17).

Older children helped mothers in resolving issues. Participants reported that they constantly learned from their children and this helped them become less judgmental of certain things, as shown in this example:

The kids too always argued that Americans aren't all bad. When you generalize things the children would argue. So we learned from them. They are the only ones that will tell you about the society what is happening. Otherwise we don't know much. And we are not right all the time either. We didn't grow up here (P12)

Differences were noted between how mothers dealt with issues while they were raising their older children versus younger children in the family. But the time it came to the younger children, the older ones were able to provide guidance on what was out there,

which helped by bringing some predictability in novel situations. For example, one mother described such guidance as follows:

> When I was bringing up K__, she being the oldest, we didn't know. With A__
> [younger daughter] K__ [older daughter] was guiding us, "Mom it is OK let her
> go". So A__ did get a lot more freedom. (P13)

One mother recalled an incident in which she was explaining to her son who was in high school at the time why she did not let him date. He in turn gave her some advice about his younger sister:

> My son said, "Mom, when S___ [daughter] turns 16 I think you should let her
> date mom." I said, "why?" He said, "you want her to learn how to deal with boys
> in front of you with your guidance rather than go crazy when she goes to college."
> Which made a lot of sense to me. So I let her date when she turned 16. (P2)

Most women did not feel they could confide in friends. They felt that most people in the AI community were not open about the problems they faced, particularly in the mother-child relationship. One participant found it easier to talk to colleagues at work to understand some of the American norms in order to help her manage her relationship with her children.

> I had American friends that I used to talk to, my previous boss, he had kids the
> same age as mine and I would talk about this is what is happening and he would
> say, oh my god you are going through that. That kind of a thing. So that you know
> it is normal. Or he would say, gosh S___ (daughter) that's really good, S___
> dropped the guy, and is going on. That makes her realize what's good, what's not

good. Otherwise I would have thought, oh my, she dropped this guy and is seeing another guy. I would have, but he could tell me that that it was OK. (P2)

External communication thus mainly involved supportive communication from various sources outside the primary mother-child relationship.

Intrapersonal Communication

Intrapersonal communication as a strategy for managing dialectical tensions was mentioned least often by participants. Self-talk, one form of intrapersonal communication, was only mentioned by one participant as follows:

I analyze and teach and talk to myself. I try to put myself in the other person's shoes and try to understand, why they are behaving the way they do. I have to find out what the issue is because sometimes I may not be the issue. They may be the issue themselves so they are dumping. So if I know that I know how to keep away. I teach myself. I do that a lot. (P4)

Worrying was a frequent response to tensions in relation to issues such as dating or staying out late.

If at the time I told S__ [daughter] not to go out S_ used to argue, don't you trust me? Those kinds of things come you have to pretend you trust them. But inside I was worried. I was putting up a front like, "Oh S_ I trust you so much." That was just a front. But inside I used to worry especially if she was late coming back when she went out. (P11)

Trying to remain calm was mentioned as a coping mechanism particularly when the tension had escalated as mentioned by this mother, " When I am very upset I can't talk.

So that time I did not talk. My language is not good. I will keep quiet and try to calm myself." (P11)

Praying was mentioned as another way of coping, particularly when the mother felt she did not have control over a situation, "They have a lot of freedom in many ways. You don't have any control over your kids. So many times I have felt very uncomfortable but there is nothing I can do. I just pray." (P16)

The participants referred to all three types of communication under examination in this study, however, internal communication was most frequently mentioned. Internal communication ranged from simply talking to arguing. External communication took the form of seeking advice from other sources such as spouse, family, friends and older children. Intrapersonal communication seemed to be the least used means of coping with tensions.

Chapter Summary

In this chapter each of the research questions posed in this study was addressed and the related findings presented including excerpts from the interviews. Asian Indian values and U.S. American values salient to the participants were discussed; contradictions posed by the opposition of the two sets of values were explored, followed by a discussion of the common dialectical tensions in the mother-child relationship and the ways in which AI communicated in addressing the tensions. The next chapter includes a discussion of findings followed by the implications of the study and directions for future research in the area.

CHAPTER FIVE

Discussion

This thesis examined contradictions posed by the interplay of Asian Indian (AI) and U.S. American values in the lives of AI immigrant women living and raising children in the U.S. This chapter will summarize the key findings, discuss the limitations of the study, and offer suggestions for future research.

The first research question of the study sought to understand what AI values were identified as being salient to the AI women in this study. The responses of participants concurred with what has been reported in literature about the values that AI immigrants hold as part of their culture and tradition. Among these, Schwartz's (1992) value of *conformity*, in the form of respect for elders was named by every participant, as was the importance the value of *security;* of close ties with the family, the priority given to raising children, and the importance of marriage. The importance of *tradition* was mentioned frequently by participants as a value central to their lives. The importance of retaining one's cultural heritage and traditions in the face of U.S. mainstream cultural influence was evident from many of the participant's responses. The AI values thus, for the most part, fell into the areas of conformity, tradition and security, which are consistent with literature highlighting an emphasis by AIs on retaining their culture.

Interestingly enough *benevolence* and *universalism* were not mentioned by participants in this study in relation to AI values. This reflects Bond's (1988) findings of cultural inwardness of the AI culture as well as Hofstede's (1980) findings that members of collectivistic cultures have primary loyalty to family. In fact, a few participants mentioned close-mindedness, conservativeness and discrimination toward those outside

their cultural groups as a negative aspect of AI culture. The participants also indicated that their children had expressed their beliefs that AI parents were prejudiced and biased against Americans. This was perhaps why the value-types of *benevolence* and *universalism*, did not surface with regard to AI values. *Achievement* came up in the context of the AI focus on education; but this was the only value that fell under achievement. *Power* also did not show up in the results, however, as Schwartz (1992) points out, there is overlap between contiguous sections of his model. Achievement and power are contiguous in Schwartz's model; thus based on AI women's description of reasons they wanted their children to do well academically (e.g. "only way to survive", "because we are a minority"), it is possible that academic excellence is motivated by control over people and resources denoting power.

The second research question explored U.S. cultural values salient to AI women in the study. Freedom, independence, and openness were consistently mentioned by participants as typical U.S. values; these are classified as *self-direction* according to Schwartz (1992). The participants indicated, however, that too much independence was also not healthy. Liberal attitudes about sex, and promiscuity, that are related to sensual gratification and enjoyment represented the *hedonism* value type. Thus, the values participants identified as being American fell mainly under self-direction, and hedonism. The value type of *stimulation* did not surface at all. There were some U.S. values that represented *benevolence*, *universalism*, *power* and *achievement* value types indicating that participants did not see U.S. culture as being only hedonistic or individualistic. The value-types of benevolence and universalism in particular revealed participants' perceptions of Americans as friendly, helpful, broad-minded, and honest.

The third research question addressed contradictions between AI cultural values and U.S. cultural values as perceived by the participants. These contradictions were reported by AI women in the context of raising children. The AI emphasis on security, tradition, and conformity came into opposition with the U.S. value-type of self direction and hedonism in the context of child-rearing. The value-types of self-direction versus conformity arose frequently because the participants perceived the outspokenness and independence of U.S. culture as opposing the conformity of AI culture in the form of unquestioning obedience to parental authority. The U.S. practice of dating and finding one's own mate, and the freedom of choice it entailed, opposed the AI tradition of the arranged marriage. Although AI mothers expected their children to have an arranged marriage, they spoke about a modified version where the parents introduced the prospective partner. In some cases the participants believed that children were agreeable to this arrangement, in which case there was no contradiction; in other cases this arrangement was not acceptable to the children who could not accept the idea of marrying someone they did not know well enough. Although the participants felt the contradiction themselves, they also recognized the difficult situation of their children were caught between the two systems. Most of the participants expressed that they were worried about the marital situation of their children in the context of conflicting value systems.

Not all participants reported feeling a contradiction between the AI and U.S. values. The absence of contradictions seemed to occur for three reasons. First, contradictions were not felt keenly if the mothers or children aligned themselves with the AI culture primarily. Second, if the participant had adapted to the U.S. culture to the extent that she did not see AI values and U.S. values as distinct, or as differing from one

another. Third, when there was a realization on the part of the participant that her children were growing up in the U.S. and so traditional expectations would not hold. Another factor that influenced whether contradictions were experienced or not depended on how Westernized the participant was while growing up in India before coming to the U.S.

The first three research questions of the study were analyzed using Schwartz's (1992) model of universal values. This model was chosen because it offered specific categories to classify values described by first-generation immigrant AI women as being salient to them. Further, instead of merely providing a means of classification of values, the model also provided a way to examine the relationship between values as being compatible or as opposing each other. Thus, the model provided an effective means of viewing the interplay of the U.S. culture and AI culture in the lives of AI women.

The fourth research question explored the dialectical tensions of autonomy-connection, openness-closedness, predictability-novelty and judgment-acceptance within the mother-child relationship. Cultural aspects such as AI emphasis on tradition and conformity influenced these dialectics of mother-child relationship in some situations; however, it is important to recognize that many of the situations in which the tension between the poles were experienced could occur in any parent-child relationship, regardless of culture. It appears that dialectics that are influenced by value differences could occur within the same culture as well; for example generational differences between parent and child might cause similar tensions as found in this study. It was difficult in this study to distinguish between those dialectical tensions that existed due to culture based value contradictions as opposed to other sources of relational tension. In

this case, we relied on the participants' *perceptions* of the source of the contradictions; the accuracy of which is unknown.

The autonomy-connection dialectic emerged as an important contradiction Women experienced the tension as it related to their own need for autonomy versus connectedness to family. The tension was also evident in the mother-child relationship with the mother seeking connection, while the child sought autonomy. A secondary tension also emerged in the form of autonomy-protection where connection took the form of being protective. A number of participants reported that children often complained that they were being "over-protective". Mothers also recognized such protectiveness as being detrimental to the children but reported not being to help themselves. Protectiveness led to mothers restricting their children in certain things. They reported using parental authority when they felt children needed to be controlled. Other mothers alternated between giving their children autonomy versus restricting them, depending on the situation. Underlying such decisions was always the question mothers asked themselves, if they were in fact being too restrictive. The emergence of these secondary tensions highlight the idea of *totality* in the Dialectical Perspective in terms of a knot of related contradicitons. Further context was found to have a bearing on what contradictions occured, how they occured and in what ways they were experienced. The secondary tensions of autonomy-protection and related restrictions imposed by parents on children might be unique to the context of parent-child relationships, due to the presence of parental authority which makes control and placing restrictions a legitimate part of the relationship. Other relationships such as romantic relationships may also have a power differential, however, it is generally assumed that those are relationships between equals.

In the parent-child relationship on the other hand, such power is both overt and accepted as being a part of the relationship.

The openness-closedness contradiction mainly occurred in the context of the participants' repeated struggle to keep an open mind when it came to their children. For example they expressed the hope that their children would marry an Indian and not an American, yet they had to keep themselves open to the possibility that the latter could happen. Therefore, they tried not to be close-minded yet could not prevent themselves from hoping. Some women on the other hand were confident that their children would marry only Indians. Other women favored the openness completely. The other area in which this contradiction was evident was in the way AI mothers wished to communicate with their children. Most mothers mentioned that they tried to be open with their children; their openness was sometimes met by the children being closed. The mothers would then attempt to find ways in which to get their children to communicate.

The predictability-novelty dialectic occurred mainly in situations that involved dating, liberal attitudes about sex, and situations where participants perceived threats in society. In the face of these novel situations, the women favored the predictability of their own traditions. As hard as they tried to be open to their children's needs to be engaged in novel situations, some women still fell back on their traditions in new situations. Most women, however, seemed to be aware that their lack of knowledge about the U.S. culture created the novelty aspect of the dialectic.

The judgment-acceptance dialectic occurred in part as a result of cultural differences. The AI mothers in this study worked to accept that their children were growing up in the U.S. and therefore were in reality Americans. They believed that they

as mothers could not impose their traditions on them. Yet it was difficult not to be judgmental of certain aspects of U.S. culture that AI mothers felt were unacceptable to them but were embraced by their children. Their judgments became more acute once again due to their lack of knowledge of U.S. culture, which fostered fear. A secondary tension of judgment-acceptance dialectic was evidenced as an expectation-acceptance tension in which the expectation mothers had of their children opposed their unconditional acceptance of the children. In the marital context, although AI mothers attempted to accept that their children might marry an American, deep down their expectation was that the children marry an AI. Such expectations produced a tension where the women tried to come to terms with the fact that their expectations may not be met. In fact most of the participants tried to accept that it was likely that their expectations would not be met.

It is important to acknowledge that the contradictions discussed above are not necessarily discrete entities; there is considerable overlap among them. For example the protectiveness of AI mothers, and their judgment of U.S. society were at least partly related to the predictability-novelty contradiction. For example, the fear of the unknown (novelty) led to increased protectiveness and judgment. Similarly those who favored the openness pole of the openness-closedness contradiction also tried to be more accepting when experiencing the tension between judgment-acceptance. The concept of *totality* in the dialectical perspective lends support to this overlap in terms of the interwoven nature of contradictions, as previewed in Chapter 2.

The final research question examined the communication aspects of dealing with dialectical tensions. There was considerable amount of communication that took place

internally between the participants and their children. In almost every case, the mothers tried to foster open communication. Some of the forms that internal communication took were, simply talking, encouraging children to talk, and listening. While descriptions of internal communication included tactics used to foster communication, external communication was related to sources of support such as husband, extended family, and older children; there was little communication reported with friends. For the most part the participants chose to discuss issues with their husbands. Intrapersonal communication sometimes took the form of self-talk, internal analysis, and rationalizing; but most often it took the form of worrying, being calm, or praying as opposed to active coping strategies for resolution of a tension. The reasons behind the use of these particular coping strategies presents an important area for additional research because it is likely that external forms of negotiation are only one aspect of the parent-child relationship. In fact, it is likely that the intrapersonal aspects precede both internal and external ways of negotiating tensions.

Of the three types of communication for resolving the dialectical tensions, the participants in this study used internal communication the most. They were almost unanimous in saying that maintaining open communication with the children was the best means to resolving contradictions. Establishing internal communication with the children was particularly easy for mothers whose children did not argue or challenge parental authority. Others whose children did challenge parental authority had to sometimes resort to other intervention from external means such as the spouse, or other family members. The intrapersonal coping was the least used means of resolving tensions. One study (Segal, 1992) that looked at conflict between first and second generation AIs mentioned

poor communication as a reason for conflict. However, the present study did not support this idea. All participants without exception said they fostered an environment of open communication with their children and that this decreased conflict in their relationships.

The findings of this study lend support to Schwartz's (1992) value structure in which value-types placed directly opposite others in the model oppose one another. For example, self-direction/stimulation opposed tradition/conformity, the simultaneous pursuit of which results in conflict. The dialectical perspective, also deals with the idea of opposing forces leading to dialectical tensions in relationships. The tensions are created due to the opposing poles of a given contradiction in a relationship, such as autonomy versus connection. These tensions in the dialectical view are situated within a relationship as opposed to the macro level of Schwartz's model. Whereas Schwartz speaks of conflicting values, the dialectical perspective states that opposing poles do not necessarily create conflict; instead contradictions are inherent in a relationship, are ongoing, and are negotiated. This study borrowed this concept to view Schwartz's value-types and their opposition as value-contradictions rather than conflicting values. The pull between differing sets of values created a pull in the lives of AI mothers raising children in the U.S., typically when mothers adhered to AI values of tradition and conformity, while children showed a preference for the U.S. values of self-direction and hedonism. The idea of differing values leading to contradictions offers an area for future research.

<center>Directions for Future Research</center>

This thesis examined the interplay of two cultures in the lives of AI immigrant women raising children in the U.S. and how communication is used to cope with these

contradictions. Although this study provides insight into these issues, there are a number of other findings from the study that warrant exploration in future research.

Classifying the AI and U.S. values (as perceived by AI women) in this study enables us to view intercultural encounters in terms of value contradictions. Schwartz (1992) suggested that an individual trying to follow values from two opposing value sets would experience a contradiction. Viewing cross-cultural encounters from a dialectical perspective can provide further insight into the complexities of such relationships.

Additional research should examine dialectics in the parent-child relationship. This relationship is unique from other relationships explored in previous dialectical research such as friendships and romantic relationships. One reason is that these other relationships often involve greater equality in terms of power than the parent-child relationship; thus the form that the dialectics take, the ways in which the tension is experienced, and ways in which the tensions are negotiated, may be different in parent-child relationships than in other relationships. An example from this study was that of autonomy-connection which took the form of autonomy-protectiveness, and the placement of restrictions on children.

Another important area for future research might be to examine the communication strategies used by parents and children in negotiation of the dialectical tensions. This study used a simplistic approach in looking at communication occurring internally, externally, or intrapersonally in coping with dialectical contradictions. However, the responses of AI women in reference to resolving the contradictions suggested that they used specific communication strategies as proposed by Baxter (1990, 1998). Thus, future research on parent-child dialectics should attempt to explore these

strategies. Extending the study to a larger sample would also provide more generalizability.

The next step would be to extend this study into other cultural groups. Differences in child-rearing experiences among different cultural groups would provide cross-cultural perspectives on raising children. For example, it would be interesting to compare AI child-rearing experiences with Euro-American experiences to see what similarities and differences exist. The relational dialectics of parent-child relationships among various groups would add to our understanding of cultural variables that impact such dialectics among various groups. The heuristic value of such research would be the valuable insight it could provide parents in relationships with their children.

Finally, another area of research might involve examining relational dialectics in arranged marriages. To date the contradictions have been examined mainly in romantic relationships among couples who are dating. The few studies on long-term marital relationships are based on Western perspectives of marriage. One study reviewed for this thesis (Singh & Kanjirathinkal, 1999) revealed high levels of commitment and stability in arranged marriages. Studying arranged marriages form a dialectical perspective might yield valuable information on (a) whether the basic contradictions said to occur in every relationship occur in the arranged marriage situation, and (b) what communication strategies contribute to the stability of the arranged marriage.

Limitations

There are a few limitations of this project that should be addressed. The first limitation of the study is that it was confined to the Kalamazoo-Battle Creek community. The size of the community may have an impact on the findings, one, because some

participants specifically mentioned living in a small town made it easier for them to raise children, because of greater opportunity to interact socially with American. In larger cities AI communities tend to be more segregated into their own ethnic groups. This prevents assimilation. Thus, there could be differences between AI populations in small towns versus larger cities in the U.S. in terms of child-rearing experiences.

The researcher being known to some of the participants could be viewed both as a limitation and an advantage. The participants' knowledge of the interviewer may have caused them to be less disclosive than they would have been with a stranger, particularly around issues of conflicts or tensions. On the other hand, the interviewer being an Asian Indian herself may have facilitated the interview process in some respects. For example, the participants often used terminology to describe traditional rituals that would have taken some explaining for a non-Indian to understand. The researcher was also familiar with some of the Indian languages the participants spoke, therefore when the dialogue switched from one language to the other, the researcher was able to understand them. It should be mentioned that because the researcher was AI, this also likely influenced her interpretation of the data, yet her knowledge of the culture also aided in having a deeper understanding of the culture. These potential limitations were acknowledged by the researcher at the outset, but were deemed unavoidable, in part because of the fairly small size of the local AI community and other constraints of the study.

A third limitation was that because the present study was framed in a cultural context from the outset, it might have prevented the exploration of the mother-child relational dialectics more fully. Because the first two research questions dealt with cultural aspects, participants might have been prone to frame their answers to subsequent

questions in terms of cultural differences. It is possible that cultural differences would have come up frequently regardless of earlier questions because it was salient to the participants in terms of relational dialectics with children, but we cannot be sure. In order to determine which tensions occur due to cultural differences and which ones occur in any parent-child relationship, one would have to formulate questions in a general way, and see if contradictions posed by cultural differences emerge naturally from participant responses.

The final limitation was that the question on exploring the dialectics, which asked if participants experienced a pull between two cultures, yielded answers only some cases. The rest of the participants said they did not really experience any pulls when responding to this question, yet as they answered the question about challenges they faced in raising children, contradictions were described by participants. Thus, using the word 'pull' or 'caught' may not be the best way to try and get at contradictions. The use of the term 'pull' was modeled after previous research on dialectics (Baxter, 1990). However, Bridge and Baxter (1992) acknowledge that "probing the presence of dialectical tensions is a complicated task…" (p. 221). There were occasions where a few participants clearly stated that they experienced a pull; in general, only a few participants were able to answer the question about the pull directly.

Conclusion

This thesis explored dialectical tensions among first-generation Asian Indian (AI) immigrant women raising children in the U.S. Because of the salience of cultural traditions in the lives of AIs in the U.S., participants' perceptions of U.S. values and AI values were examined. A model proposed by Schwartz (1992) on the structure and

content of values was used as a means of understanding and classifying the values of U.S. and AI cultures salient to first-generation AI women. The perceived value differences between the cultures were also explored in relation to the contradictions they posed. The dialectical perspective (Baxter, 1988) provided the lens for viewing relational-level dialectics in AI mother-child relationships. The value-contradictions thus provided a macro perspective on how values oppose one another while the dialectical perspective provided a micro perspective on how the interplay of two cultures posed relational level dialectics. It was noted that not all relational dialectics that emerged from the study were necessarily value-related.

Chapter 1 of the thesis provided an introduction; Chapter 2 provided a review of literature related defining cultural values, norms, and practices, and a review of values research in multiple countries. This was followed by a discussion of AI and U.S. values, norms, and practices. The next section provided a historical perspective of AI cultural values, norms and practices, the continuity of such practices in present-day India, and their prevalence in the familial lives of first-generation immigrant AI women in the U.S. The third part of the chapter proposed the dialectical perspective (Baxter, 1988) as the theoretical framework for this study with an explanation of the key assumptions and concepts of the theory. Finally, the rationale for the study was proposed, together with research questions to address the issues being explored by this study. Chapter 3 described the methodology used to conduct the study including a description of the sample and the procedures used for conducting the study. Results of the study were presented in Chapter 4; these were organized by research questions posed and included excerpts from the

interviews. Finally Chapter 5 provided a discussion of the findings, limitations of the study and directions for future research.

The present study opens up many possibilities for intercultural research in interpersonal relationships as value contradictions. The dialectics of relationships between parents and children offers another promising area for future research both in mono-cultural as well as intercultural arenas. Dialectical research has yet to make any serious inroads into studying cultural groups offering new possibilities for dialectical research.

REFERENCES

Ahluwalia, M. K. (2002). *The selfways of Indian-American women.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, New York University.

Altekar, A. S. (1962). *The position of women in Hindu civilization: From prehistoric times to the present day.* New Delhi, India: Motilal Banarsidas.

Altman, I., Vinsel, A. & Brown, B. B. (1981). Dialectic conceptions in social psychology: An application to social penetration and privacy regulation. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental psychology.* New York: Academic Press.

Ashcraft, N. (1986). The clash of traditions: Asian Indian immigrants in crisis. In R.H. Brown & G. W. Coelho (Ed.), *Tradition and transformation: Asian Indians in America* (pp. 53-70).

Bacon, J. (1996). *Life lines: Community, family, and assimilation among Asian Indian immigrants.* New York NY: Oxford University Press.

Balgopal, S. S. (1999). The case of the brown memsahib: Issues that confront working South Asian wives and mothers. In S. R. Gupta's (Ed.), *Emerging voices: South Asian women redefine self, family, and community* (pp. 146-168). Walnut, CA: Altamira Press.

Baxter, L.A. (1988). A dialectical perspective on communication strategies in relationship development. In S. Duck (Ed.), *Handbook of personal relationships* (pp. 257-273). New York: Wiley.

Baxter, L. A. (1990). Dialectical contradictions in relationship development. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 7,* 69-88.

Baxter, L. A. (1994). A dialogic approach to relationship maintenance. In D. J. Canary & L. Stafford (Eds.), *Communication and relational maintenance* (pp. 233-251). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Baxter, L. A., & Erbert, L. A. (1999). Perceptions of dialectical contradictions in turning points of development in heterosexual romantic relationships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 16,* 547-569.

Baxter, L.A., Mazanac, M, Nicholson, J., Pittman, G., Smith, K., & West, L. (1997). Everyday loyalties and betrayals in personal relationships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 14,* 655-678.

Baxter, L. A., & Montgomery, B. M. (1996). *Relating: Dialogues and dialectics*. New York: Guilford Press.

Baxter, L. A., & Montgomery, B. M. (1998). A guide to dialectical approaches to studying personal relationships. In B. M. Montgomery & L. A. Baxter (Eds.), *Dialectical approaches to studying personal relationships* (pp. 1-15). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Baxter, L. A., & Montgomery, B. M. (2000). Rethinking communication in personal relationships from a dialectical perspective. In K. Dindia & S. Duck (Eds.), *Communication and personal relationships* (pp. 31-53). New York: Wiley.

Baxter, L. A., & Simon, E. (1993). Relationship maintenance strategies and dialectical contradiction in personal relationships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 10,* 225-242.

Bhutani, S. D. (1994). *A study of Asian Indian women in the U.S.: The re-conceptualization of self.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.

Bumiller, E. (1990). *May you be the mother of a hundred sons: A journey among the women of India.* New York: Fawcett Columbine.

Bochner, A. P. (1984). The functions of human communication in interpersonal bonding. In C. Arnold & J. Bowers (Eds.), *Handbook of rhetorical and communication theory* (pp. 21-41). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Bond, M. H. (1988). Finding universal dimensions of individual variation in multicultural studies of values: The Rokeach and Chinese value surveys. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 55,* 1009 – 1015.

Boyle, C. (1999). *Daughters, brides, and devoted wives: Changing perspectives of Hindu women.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California.

Bridge, K. & Baxter, L. A. (1992). Blended relationships: Friends as work associates, *Western Journal of Communication, 56*, 200-225.

Cheek, J., O'Brien, B., Ballantyne, A., & Pincombe, J. (1997). Using critical incident technique to inform aged and extended care nursing. *Western Journal of Nursing Research, 19,* 667-682.

Chinese Cultural Connection (1987). Chinese values and the search for culture-free dimensions of culture. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 18,* 143-164.

Cornforth, M. (1968). *Materialism and dialectical method.* New York: International Publishers.

DasGupta, K. (1997). Raising bicultural children. In B. Khare (Ed.), *Asian*

Indian immigrants (pp. 1-24). Dubuque: Kendall Hunt Publishing.

Dindia, K. (1998). "Going into and coming out of the closet": The dialectics of stigma disclosure. In B.M. Montgomery, & L. A. Baxter (Eds.), *Dialectical approaches to studying personal relationships.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Diwakar, I. (1992). Family, society, and women. In L. Mishra (Ed.). *Women's issues: An Indian perspective.* New Delhi: Northern Book Centre.

Dube, S. C. (1976). Glimpses through the corridors of history. In B. K. Vashishta (Ed.), *Encyclopaedia of women in India.* New Delhi: Praveen Publications.

Fisher, W. R. (1984). Narration as a human communication paradigm: The case of public moral agreement. *Communication Monographs, 51,* 1-22.

Flanagan, J. C. (1954). The critical incident technique. *Psychological Bulletin, 51,* 327-357.

Fong, T. P. (2002). *The contemporary Asian American experience: Beyond the model minority.* NJ: Prentice Hall.

Gupta, S. R. (1999). Walking on the edge: Indian-American women speak out on dating and marriage. In S. R. Gupta's (Ed.), *Emerging voices: South Asian women redefine self, family, and community* (pp. 120-145). Walnut, CA: Altamira Press.

Gupta, A. R. & Prakashan, J. (1982). *Women in Hindu society.* New Delhi: Prakashan.

Hegde, R. S. (2002). Translated enactments: The relational configurations of the Asian Indian immigrant experience. In J. N. Martin, T. K. Nakayama, & L. A. Flores (Eds.), *Readings in intercultural communication: Experiences and contexts* (pp. 95-101). Boston: McGraw Hill.

Helweg, A. W. & Helweg, U. M. (1991). *An immigrant success story: East Indians in America.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage

Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions, and organizations across nations (2nd ed.).* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

Hsu, F. L. K. (1963). *Clan, caste, and club.* Princeton, NJ: Nostrand.

Inglehart, R., Basanez, M, & Moreno, A. (1998). *Human values and beliefs: A cross-cultural sourcebook: Political, religious, sexual, and economic norms in 43 societies.* Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Inman, A. G., Constantine, M. G. & Ladany, N (1999). In D. S. Sandhu (Ed.), *Asian and Pacific Islander Americans: Issues and concerns for counseling and psychotherapy* (pp. 31-41). New York: Nova Science Publishers.

Jayakar, K. (1994). Women of the Indian subcontinent In L. Comas-Diaz & B. Greene (Eds.), *Women of color: Integrating ethnic and gender identities in psychotherapy.* (pp. 161-181). New York: Guilford Press.

Kakaiya, D. (2000). Identity development and conflicts among Indian immigrant women. In Chin, J. L. (Ed.), *Relationships among Asian Indian women* (pp. 133-149). Washington D.C.: American Psychological Association.

Khandelwal, M. S. (2002). *Becoming American, being Indian: An immigrant community in New York City.* Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.

Kluckhohn, C. (1951). Values and value orientations in the theory of action: An exploration in definition and classification. In T. Parsons & E. Shilis (Eds.),

Toward a general theory of *action.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Lindlof, T. R. (1995). Qualitative communication research methods. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Lombard, M., Snyder-Duch, J., Bracken, C. C. (2002). Content analysis in mass communication: Assessment and reporting of intercoder reliability. *Human Communication Research, 28*, 587-604.

Lustig, M. W. & Koester, J. (1996). *Intercultural competence: Interpersonal communication across cultures.* New York: HarperCollins

Matai, P. R. (1997). Cultural constraints and the psychological changes. In B. Khare (Ed.), *Asian Indian immigrants* (pp. 1-24). Dubuque: Kendall Hunt Publishing.

Mitter, S. S. (1991). *Dharma's daughters: Contemporary Indian women and Hindu culture.* NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Montgomery, B. M., & Baxter, L. A. (1998). Dialogism and relational dialectics. In B. M. Montgomery & L. A. Baxter (eds.), *Dialectical approaches to studying personal relationships,* (pp. 155-183). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Mukherjee, P. (1978). *Hindu women: Normative models.* Hyderabad, India: Orient Longman. Nandi, P. K., & Fernandez, M. (1994). Liberation of Asian American women: An uncertain quest. *International Journal of Sociology of the Family, 24,* 1-22.

Neuliep, J. W. (2000). *Intercultural communication: A contextual approach.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin Norman, I. J., Redfern, S. J., Tomalin, D. A., & Oliver, S.

(1992). Developing Flanagan's critical incident technique to elicit indicators of high and low quality nursing from patients and their nurses. *Journal of Advanced Nursing, 17,* 590-600.

Pearson, A. K. (1996). *"Because it gives me peace of mind".* NY: State University of New York Press.

Prathikanti, S. (1997). East Indian American families. In E. Lee (Ed.), *Working with Asian American: A guide for clinicians* (pp. 79-100). New York: Guilford Press.

Query, J. L., Kreps, G. L., Arneson, P., & Caso, N.S. (2001). Toward helping organizations manage interaction: The theoretical and pragmatic merits of the critical incident technique. In S. L. Herndon, & G. L. Kreps (eds.). *Qualitative research: Applications in organizational life* (pp. 91-119). Creskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Rangaswamy, P. (2000). *Namaste American: Indian immigrants in an American metropolis.* University Park: Pennsylvania University Press.

Rawlins, W. K. (1989). A dialectical analysis of the tensions, functions and strategic challenges of communication in young adult friendships. In J. A. Anderson (Ed.), *Communication Yearbook, 12,* (pp. 157-189). Newbury, CA: Sage.

Rawlins, W. K. (1992). *Friendship matters: Communication, dialectics, and the life course.* Hawthorne, NY: de Gruyter.

Riegel, K. F. (1979). *Foundations of dialectical psychology.* New York: Academic Press.

Reynolds, H. H. (1978). "To keep the Tali strong": Women's rituals in Tamilnadu, India. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin, Madison.

Rokeach, M. (1973). *The nature of human values.* New York: Free Press.

Roland. A. (1987). *In search of self in India and Japan.* NJ: Princeton University Press

Roy, M. (1985). Mothers and daughters in Indian American families. In S. D. Dasgupta

(Ed.). *A patchwork shawl: Chronicles of South Asian women in America* (pp. 97-110).

New Jersey: Rutgers University Press.

Samovar, L. A., & Porter, R. E. (1995). *Communication between cultures (2nd edition).*

New York: Wadsworth.

Samovar, L. A., Porter, R. E., & Stefani, L. A. (1998). *Communication between cultures*

(3rd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Saran, P. (1985). *The Asian Indian experience.* Cambridge, MA: Schenkman.

Schwartz, S. H. (1992). Universals in the content and structure of values: Theoretical

advances and empirical tests in 20 countries. *Advances in Experimental Social*

Psychology, 25, 1-71.

Sharma, R. P. (1995). *Woman in Hindu literature.* New Delhi: Gyan Publishing.

Sheth, M. (1997). The immigrants from India: Who are they? In B. Khare (Ed.), *Asian*

Indian immigrants (pp. 1-24). Dubuque: Kendall Hunt Publishing.

Singh. R. N., & Kanjirathinkal, M. (1999). Levels and styles of commitment in marriage:

The case of Asian Indian immigrants. In J. M. Adams & W. H. Jones, (eds.),

Handbook of interpersonal commitment and relationship stability (pp.307-322).

New York: Plenum.

Singhal, S. (1997). Psycho-social and historical profiles. In B. Khare (Ed.), *Asian*

Indian immigrants (pp. 1-24). Dubuque: Kendall Hunt Publishing.

Subbama, M. (1992). *Hinduism and women.* New Delhi: Ajanta.

Ting-Toomey, S. (2002). Intercultural conflict competence. In J. N. Marin, T. K.

Nakayama, & L. A. Flores (Eds.), *Readings in intercultural communication:*

Experiences and contexts (2nd ed., pp. 323-336). Boston: McGraw Hill.

U.S. Census Bureau, (2002). Retrieved on April 16, 2004, from website:

www.census.gov.

Wadley, S. S. (1977). Women and the Hindu tradition. *Signs, 3(1),* pp. 113-125.

Werner, C. M. & Baxter, L. A. (1994). Temporal qualities of relationships: Organismic,

transactional, and dialectical views. In M. L. Knapp & G. R. Miller (Eds.),

Handbook of interpersonal communication (2nd ed., pp. 323-379). Thousand Oaks,

CA: Sage.

Wong, K. (2002). Migration across generations: Whose identity is authentic. In J. N.

Martin, T. K. Nakayama, & L. A. Flores (Eds.), *Readings in intercultural*

communication: Experiences and contexts (pp. 95-101). Boston: McGraw Hill.

Young, K. (2002). Women in Hinduism. In A. Sharma (Ed.), *Women in Indian religions*

(pp. 3-37). New York: Oxford University Press.

APPENDIX A

Value Types for Coding AI and U.S. Values

Value Type	Value items	Description
Self-direction (SD)	Curious	Interested in everything, exploring
	Creativity	Uniqueness, imagination
	Freedom	freedom of action and thought
	Choosing own goals	selecting own purpose
	Independent	self-reliant, self-sufficient
	Self-respect	belief in one's own worth
Stimulation (ST)	Daring	seeking adventure, risk
	A varied life	filled with challenge, novelty, change
	An exciting life	stimulating experiences
Hedonism (HE)	Pleasure	gratification of desires
	Enjoying life	enjoying food, sex, leisure etc.
Achievement (AC)	Successful	achieving goals
	Capable	competent, effective, efficient
	Ambitious	hardworking, aspiring
	Influential	having an impact on people and events
	Intelligent	logical, thinking
Power (PO)	Social power	control over others, dominance
	Authority	the right to lead or command
	Wealth	material possessions, money
	Preserving my public image	protecting my "face"
	Social recognition	respect, approval by others
Security (SE)	Clean	neat, tidy
	National security	protection of my nation from enemies
	Reciprocation of favors	avoidance of indebtedness
	Social order	stability of society
	Family security	safety for loved ones
	Sense of belonging	feeling that others care about me
	Healthy	not being sick physically or mentally
Conformity (CO)	Obedient	dutiful, meeting obligations
	Honoring parents and elders	showing respect
	Politeness	courtesy, good manners
	Self-discipline	self-restraint, resistance to temptation

Tradition (TR)	Accepting portion in life	submitting to life's circumstances
	Devout	holding to religious faith and belief
	Humble	modest, self-effacing
	Respect for tradition	preservation of time-honored customs
	Moderate	avoiding extremes of feeling and action
	Detachment	from worldly concerns
Benevolence (BE)	Helpful	working for the welfare of others
	Honest	genuine, sincere
	Forgiving	willing to pardon others
	Loyal	faithful to friends and group
	Responsible	dependable, reliable
	Spiritual life	emphasis on spiritual no material matters
	True friendship	close, supportive friends
	Mature love	deep emotional and spiritual intimacy
	Meaning in life	a purpose in life
Universalism (UN)	Protecting the environment	preserving nature
	Unity with nature	fitting into nature
	A world of beauty	beauty of nature and the arts
	Broad-minded	tolerant of different ideas and beliefs
	Social justice	correcting injustice, care for the weak
	Wisdom	a mature understanding of life
	Equality	equal opportunity for all
	A world at peace	free of war and conflict
	Inner harmony	at peace with myself

APPENDIX B

Interview Protocol

Thank you for agreeing to be interviewed for this study. This study is about first-generation Indian immigrant women like us, living in the U.S. looking specifically at married women with children. The purpose of the study is to look at the differences and similarities in cultural values between Indian culture and American culture, and the challenges that Indian women face in terms of living between two sets of values. I will be asking you questions about one, your views on Indian culture and its impact on your marriage, and raising children; two, your views on American culture and the impact it has on your marriage, and raising children; three, the challenges of living between two cultures, and four, how you handle some of these issues.

I will begin with some general questions and then ask more specific questions on each topic. If at any time you feel that the question is too general, and you are unable to answer it, please let me know and I will try to be more specific. At times you may wonder why I am asking you some of these questions when I am an Indian myself and know the culture; but as a researcher, I am here to understand your point of view. So for this interview, I would like you to see me as the researcher, rather than a member of the Indian community, or as someone you know.

Do you have any questions so far….. anything that is not clear? In that case, can you please read this consent form and sign it if you agree to be interviewed for this study?

Thank you.

To begin with, I would like to ask you some questions about the Indian culture as **you** see it, its importance in your life, and how you think it influences your relationships in terms of your marriage, and raising children. I would also like to understand your views on U.S. American culture, and how that influences your relationships in the family.

1.   How long have you been in the U.S?

2.   What brought you to the U.S.?

3.   What were your experiences like moving to the U.S. from India?

4.   How would you compare India and U.S. in terms of the culture?

5.   What are some aspects of Indian culture that you find are important to you in your life in the U.S?

6. What influence does the Indian culture have on your family, particularly as related to your children?

    a. Probe: Would you say that it plays an important role in your family life? Can you give me examples of how it is important?

    b. Probe: What are some positive and negative aspects of Indian culture in your life as it relates to raising children?

    c. Probe: Are there specific Indian values that you try to teach your children?

    d. How do you try to teach them those values? Can you give me an example or examples?

7. What are some aspects of U.S culture that you find are important to you in your life here?

8. What influence does the U.S. culture have on your family, particularly as it relates to your children?

    a. Probe: Would you say that it plays an important role in your family life? Can you give examples of that?

    e. Probe: What are some positive and negative aspects of U.S culture in your life as it relates to raising children?

    f. Probe: Are there specific U.S values that you try to teach your children?

    g. Probe: How do you try to teach them those values (how do they learn those values)? Can you give me an example?

9. Do you ever experience challenges living with two cultures, the Indian culture and U.S. culture? (in general)

10. Do you ever feel caught between the two cultures in raising children, like you are being pulled in different directions or that you have to balance the two?

    a. Probe: Can you describe these experiences for me?

    b. Probe: Can you think of particular times when you felt these pulls?

    c. Probe: What were **your** feelings at that time?

    d. Probe: Did you experience these pulls when the children were young, or in their teens, or older?

11. How do you cope with some of the challenges and pulls you have described?

    a. Probe: Do you talk about them with your spouse? Can you remember particular situations when you did that?

    b. Probe: Do you talk to others? If so, who? Can you remember particular situations when you talked to ___?

    c. Probe: Do you think about it and try to solve them yourself? If yes, how?

APPENDIX C

Phone Recruitment Script

Hi, is this (name of potential participant) or, may I speak to (potential participant)? This is Chitra Akkoor. How are you? …Good. I am working on my Master's thesis at Western Michigan University in the Department of Communication. As part of the thesis I'm studying the challenges that first-generation immigrant women face in raising children here in the U.S. in terms of cultural differences between the Asian Indian culture and U.S. culture. Your name was picked randomly from the Asian Indian community's directory as a possible participant in my study. Would you be interested in learning more about the study?

(If respondent says "no"): Ok –well thanks for your time and consideration.

(If respondent asks to call back later, ask for a more convenient time).

(If respondent says "yes"): If you choose to participate in the study it will involve a face-to-face interview lasting about an hour and a half. The interview will be held at a time and place that is convenient to you. The questions will address your views on the Asian Indian culture, and the U.S. American culture, how these cultures influence your daily family life, the challenges you experience in raising children in the U.S. and how you cope with those challenges. With your permission I would like to audiotape the interview. Please know that the taping is only for transcription purposes. Your name will not be associated with the tape. When the audiotapes have been transcribed, they will be destroyed. Also no identifying information will be included in the transcripts of you or other people you mention by name in the interview. You can also refuse to be audiotaped or request that certain portions of the interview not be audiotaped. I will be conducting the interviews myself. If you feel that my being part of the Indian community will make you uncomfortable or raise privacy issues for you, you can refuse to participate. Do you think you might be interested in participating in this study?

(If respondent says "no", she is not interested): Thanks for your time.

(If respondent says "I have to think about it"): When would you like me to call you back?

(If respondent says "yes", she is interested):
Great –would it be Ok if we meet at the temple community meeting room? (If no then what other place would be convenient to you? Will we be able to meet there without any interruption from people or the phone and such?) What day and time would work for you?

Thank you and I will see you on (date/time) at (place). My number is (phone) if you need to change the date or time of the interview. Once again thanks for agreeing to participate.

APPENDIX D

Questionnaire

1. Your age in years? _____

2. What is your level of education? (please pick highest level).

   High School ____   Bachelors _____   Masters ____   Ph.D. ____

   Other _____

3. Which state do you come from in India? _____

4. What year did you come to the U.S.? _____

5. Please indicate the reason you came to the U.S

   Marriage _____   Education _____

   Other _____

6. Did you have an arranged marriage?

   Yes _____   No _____

7. Did you know your husband before marriage?

   Yes _____   No _____

8. Please indicate the number of children, male and female?

   Male _____   Female _____

9. Were your children born in the U.S.?

   Yes _____   No _____

10. How old are your children? ____   _____

11. Which of the following family members do you have in the U.S.?

   None ____

   Father ____

Mother _____

Brothers _____

Sisters _____

Grandparents _____

Husband's family _____

Other extended family _____

12. On a scale of 1-5 how would you rate your connection with the above family members in the U.S.?

Very Connected …………………………………….. Not at all Connected

   5   4   3   2   1

13. Do you have family in India?

Yes _____   No _____

14. On a scale of 1-5, how would you rate your connection with family in India?

Very Connected …………………………………….. Not at all Connected

   5   4   3   2   1

15. How likely is it that you will go back to India permanently?

Very Likely …………………………………….. Not at all Likely

   5   4   3   2   1

WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY

Centennial
1903·2003 Celebration

APPENDIX E

HSIRB Approval Form

Date: May 17, 2004

To: Maria Lapinski, Principal Investigator
        Chitra Akkoor, Student Investigator for thesis

From: Mary Lagerwey, Ph.D., Chair   *Mary Lagy*

Re: HSIRB Project Number: 04-05-13

This letter will serve as confirmation that your research project entitled "Contradictions between US Culture and Asian Indian Culture Among First-Generation Asian Indian Immigrant Women" has been **approved** under the **expedited** category of review by the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board. The conditions and duration of this approval are specified in the Policies of Western Michigan University. You may now begin to implement the research as described in the application.

Please note that you may **only** conduct this research exactly in the form it was approved. You must seek specific board approval for any changes in this project. You must also seek reapproval if the project extends beyond the termination date noted below. In addition if there are any unanticipated adverse reactions or unanticipated events associated with the conduct of this research, you should immediately suspend the project and contact the Chair of the HSIRB for consultation.

The Board wishes you success in the pursuit of your research goals.

Approval Termination: May 17, 2005