Conflict Resolution in the Parent–Child, Marital, and Peer Contexts and Children's Aggression in the Peer Group: A Process-Oriented Cultural Perspective

Ruth Feldman
Bar-Ilan University

Shafiq Masalha
David Yellin Teachers College

Ruth Derdikman-Eiron
Bar-Ilan University

Theories of socialization propose that children's ability to handle conflicts is learned at home through mechanisms of participation and observation—participating in parent–child conflict and observing the conflicts between parents. We assessed modes of conflict resolution in the parent–child, marriage, and peer-group contexts among 141 Israeli and Palestinian families and their 1st-born toddler. We observed the ecology of parent–child conflict during home visits, the couple's discussion of marital conflicts, and children's conflicts with peers as well as aggressive behavior at child care. Israeli families used more open-ended tactics, including negotiation and disregard, and conflict was often resolved by compromise, whereas Palestinian families tended to consent or object. During marital discussions, Israeli couples showed more emotional empathy, whereas Palestinians displayed more instrumental solutions. Modes of conflict resolution across contexts were interrelated in culture-specific ways. Child aggression was predicted by higher marital hostility, more coparental undermining behavior, and ineffective discipline in both cultures. Greater family compromise and marital empathy predicted lower aggression among Israeli toddlers, whereas more resolution by consent predicted lower aggression among Palestinians. Considering the cultural basis of conflict resolution within close relationships may expand understanding on the roots of aggression.

Keywords: toddler aggression, conflict resolution, culture, family interactions, socialization

The ability to resolve conflicts, dialogue disputes, and manage interpersonal disagreements is among the central skills a child must acquire as he or she enters the social world (Baumrind, 1973; Maccoby, 1992). Theories of socialization propose that social competencies in general and the management of conflicts in particular are learned at home through mechanisms of participation and observation—participating in social exchanges within the family and observing the dialogue between parents (Asher & Gottman, 1981; Darling & Steinberg, 1993; Schneider, Attilit, Nadel, & Weissberg, 1989). Such perspectives concur with ecological and family systems' models, which point to the bidirectional influences between the parent–child, spousal, and coparental relationships and between the resolution of conflicts in these relationships and the child's ability to handle conflicts outside the family context (Bronfenbrenner, 1979; Minuchin, 1985). In support, studies have demonstrated the negative effects of marital hostility, inept parental discipline, and coparental undermining behavior on children's maladjustment, aggression, and behavior prob-

lems (Cummings & Davies, 1994; Feinberg, 2002; Katz & Gottman, 1996; Owen & Cox, 1997). Less research, however, has observed the ecology of conflict resolution in the home or provided a process model on how daily conflicts are inflamed, negotiated, resolved, and wrapped up. Particularly lacking are studies that describe parent–child conflict in the toddler years, a period when children begin to engage in conflicted encounters with their parents, and that examine their links with conflict-related behaviors the child observes (e.g., marital conflict) or participates in (e.g., conflict with peers). As to the cultural component, despite the fact that cultural variability in conflict resolution is of much interest in fields such as political science or marketing (Brett et al., 1998; Samovar & Porter, 1994), there are no developmental accounts on the resolution of conflicts between couples, within families, and among children from a cultural perspective.

The present study offers a process-oriented ecological observation of daily conflicts in two cultures guided by different orientations to child rearing and the family. We observed Israeli and Palestinian parents and their firstborn toddler during natural moments of conflict—at dinner time, bath time, and bedtime—and assessed the relations between the ecology of parent–child conflict and the couple's discussion of marital conflict, the parents' disciplinary style, and the child's conflict encounters with peers and aggressive behavior at child care. Three specific goals guided the study: to examine cultural differences in modes of conflict resolution in the parent–child, marital, and peer contexts; to address the associations between the behaviors observed in the three con-

texts in each culture; and to assess conflict-related behaviors children internalize by participation (parent–child, peer) and observation (marital) as predictors of their aggressive behavior toward adults and peers in the child care setting in the two cultures.

Interparental Conflict and Child Social Maladjustment

The negative effects of interparental conflict on children's social–emotional development have been well documented in children ranging in age from toddlers to adolescents (Crockenberg & Langrock, 2001; Jenkins, Simpson, Dunn, Rasbash, & O'Connor, 2005; Webster-Stratton & Hammond, 1999). Negative outcomes of poorly resolved marital conflict include aggressive behavior, externalizing and internalizing symptoms, and low social adjustment (Frosch, & Mangelsdorf, 2001; Loukas, Zucker, Fitzgerald, & Krull, 2003). In particular, couple hostility and undermining behavior have been associated with poor family functioning and child social–emotional difficulties (Gordis, Margolin, & John, 2001; Katz & Woodin, 2002; Sturge-Apple, Davies, & Cummings, 2006). It has been suggested that the effects of marital conflict on children's aggression and vulnerability to psychopathology is moderated by the decrease in the child's sense of emotional security caused by continuous exposure to marital discord (Davies & Cummings, 1994). An additional mechanism implicated in the effects of interparental conflict on child maladjustment is social learning (Bandura, 1977). Children exposed to hostile marital conflict are thought to internalize nonadaptive rather than growth-promoting modes of conflict resolution, which lead to either aggression or victimization in the peer group (Bauer et al., 2006; Schwartz, Dodge, Pettit, & Bates, 1997; Schwartz, Dodge, Pettit, Bates, & the Conduct Problems Prevention Research Group, 2000). These hypotheses are consistent with the ecological and family systems models' propositions on the interdependence between the various relational systems in the family, including the parent–child, marital, and coparental units, and their separate and cumulative effects on child socialization, conduct problems, and proneness to aggression (Belsky, 1981).

The large body of research on marital conflict may generate several specific hypotheses on the interparental correlates of toddlers' aggression. First, children exposed to higher marital hostility are likely to express more aggressive behavior in the peer group. Second, the parents' inability to form a coparental alliance (McHale, 1995), especially their undermining of each other's authority during disciplinary attempts, may have a negative effect on child socialization and may lead to higher levels of aggression at child care. Finally, cultural theories of the family (Kagitcibasi, 1996) propose that the impact of the family atmosphere on child socialization is likely to be universal, and thus the effects of marital hostility and coparental undermining behavior on children's aggression may be observed in both cultures.

Toddler Aggression, Parental Discipline, and Culture

Children's aggressive behavior consolidates at around two years of age and is considered a risk indicator for later development, particularly since toddler aggression tends to persist over time and to escalate during later childhood and adolescence (Del Vecchio & O'Leary, 2006; Keenan & Shaw, 1994). To date, most research on toddlers' aggression has relied on maternal or teachers' reports, and authors have emphasized the need to devise ecologically relevant observational measures of aggressive behavior in young children (Williams, Ontai, & Mastergeorge, 2007). Among the central precursors of toddler aggression are ineffective parental discipline and marital discord, confirming to the mechanisms of participation and observation in the development of aggression in young children. Toddler aggression has been associated with overreactive and punitive parenting on the one hand and with no discipline on the other (O'Leary, Slep, & Reid, 1999). These findings underscore the links between toddler aggression and the three parental disciplinary styles outlined by Baumrind (1973)—the harsh punitive authoritarian style, the warm-control authoritative style that promotes child socialization and self-regulation, and the permissive no-discipline style—and indicate that both authoritarian and permissive parenting may lead to higher aggression in children.

Little cross-cultural data are available on toddlers' aggression in the group setting. Because aggressive behavior is disruptive to any social or learning context, every culture must place constraints on the expression of children's aggression as part of the socialization process. Yet, cultures differ in their reaction to aggressive behavior in young children. Briggs (1972) noted that whereas the central parenting goal for toddlers in Western societies is promoting autonomy by facilitating the expression of the child's emotions and viewpoints, parents in non-Western cultures consider the reduction of aggression and obedience to parental commands as major parenting goals. Assessing the reactions of U.S. and Japanese preschoolers to hypothetical interpersonal dilemmas, Zahn-Waxler, Friedman, Cole, Mizuta, and Hiruma (1996) found that U.S. children expressed more anger and aggression, which were related to the mothers' encouragement of emotional expressiveness. The authors interpreted their findings in terms of the construal of the self in cultures guided by independent and interdependent orientations.

Research on the links between parental discipline, culture, and aggression in young children may lend support to several specific hypotheses. First, consistent with the parenting goals of autonomy and self-expressions, parents in cultures guided by independent viewpoints may promote more negotiation and encourage more compromise between different opinions, whereas children in non-Western societies may consent more readily to parental requests. Second, children in cultures guided by more individualistic orientations may negotiate and compromise conflicts with peers more often, whereas children in non-Western cultures, whose parents emphasize respect for elders and adult control (Darling & Steinberg, 1993; Feldman & Masalha, 2007), may turn to adults to resolve peer conflicts. Finally, the parental discipline style that combines clear boundaries with warmth and affection—the warm-control authoritative style—may facilitate self-regulation and reduce aggression across cultures, regardless of the specific ways parents express warmth or achieve control.

Conflicts Resolution in the Parent–Child, Marital, and Peer Contexts and the Israeli and Palestinian Societies

Although culture is a salient feature of the infant's ecology (Kagan, 2001), cultural variability in the ways couples, families, and children handle conflicts has rarely been studied. Cultures shape the daily living experiences of families, their overarching parenting goals, and the couple's management of gender roles.

Thus, the ecology of conflict resolution in families is likely to be associated with culture-specific components of family life, cultural attitudes on gender roles, and the parent's and child's gender (Hofstede, 2001; Super & Harkness, 1997). The Israeli and Palestinian societies differ on several basic dimensions of family life, including living arrangements, parenting practices, gender roles attitudes, and child-rearing goals (Feldman & Masalha, 2007). According to Abudabbeh's (1998) model on Arab family life, three main features define the Arab family: patriarchal hierarchies of power that stress deference to authority, adherence to traditional gender-role attitudes even among young educated couples, and the superiority of the family goals to those of the self. Research on the Palestinian society has indicated that respect for elders is among the most salient features of family life, and parents emphasize child compliance to parental rules as a central parenting goal (Amara & Schnell, 2004; Dhami & Sheiken, 2000; Dwairy & Van Sickle, 1996; Smooha, 2004). Most Palestinian couples live in extended family dwellings and assume responsibilities for their family of origin and such conditions enable child care by a kin to young working mothers (El-Islam, 1983; Mar'i & Mar'i, 1985; Weisfeld, 1990). Similarly, Palestinian couples tend to express traditional gender-role attitudes with regards to household and child care responsibilities and endorse an instrumental rather than an emotional attitude toward work–family issues (Feldman, Masalha, & Nadam, 2001). In addition, Palestinian fathers tend to have higher expectations of their sons compared to their daughters, which often lead to gender-specific patterns of fathering (Dwairy & Van Sickle, 1996; Smooha, 2004).

Family life among Israeli families is guided by a more individualistic orientation (Feldman, Masalha, & Alony, 2006). Young couples live in nuclear family arrangements and lead an individualistic lifestyle in terms of gender-role attitudes, father involvement, and child care practices (Elizur, Spivak, Ofran, & Jacobs, 2007; Israel Central Bureau of Statistics, 2005), and employment equality is grounded in the law (Israel, 1988). Israeli parents endorse child autonomy and self-expression as central parenting goals, whereas Palestinian parents consider respect for elders and compliance as important child-rearing goals for toddlers (Ben-Arie, Khoury-Kassabri, & Haj-Yahia, 2006; Feldman & Malasha, 2007). Comparing the relationships with family and peers among Israeli and Palestinian adolescents, Seginer, Shoyer, Hossessi, and Tannous (2007) found that Israeli adolescents showed less compliance, tended to negotiate parental rules more often, and were less respectful of parental authority.

The cultural differences in parenting goals, deference to authority, and gender roles attitudes among the Israeli and Palestinian societies may be expressed in different modes of conflict resolution in the parent–child, marital, and peer contexts. Israeli children may be more inclined to negotiate parental rules, whereas Palestinian children may consent more readily to parental commands and defer more to adults to resolve conflicts with peers. In the marital context, whereas Israeli couples may express more emotions, Palestinian couples may focus on instrumental solutions. The greater expectations of Palestinian fathers from their sons (Smooha, 2004) may result in harsher paternal control and stricter parent–child conflict resolution tactics among Palestinian fathers toward sons.

Child gender effects have also been noted in the development of aggression in toddlers. Boys were found to display more aggres-

sive behavior toward peers (Keenan & Shaw, 1994; Rubin, Hastings, Chen, Stewart, & McNichol, 1998), mothers were found to report greater use of harsh discipline in response to aggression in boys, and the socialization of boys and girls was found to take a different form in the toddler years (Hastings & Rubin, 1999). Thus, differences related to child gender in levels of aggression, parental disciplinary style, and parental response to children's requests may be observed. In addition to differences related to cultural membership, modes of conflict resolution are likely to correlate with culture-specific attitudes and practices. Thus, across groups, traditional gender roles attitudes may correlate with less negotiation and compromise, whereas father involvement may be associated with more negotiation and compromise during parent–child conflict and the child's greater use of compromise in the handling of conflict with peers.

The Present Study

In light of the above, in the present study we examined modes of conflict resolution in three contexts that compose the child's social world—parent–child, marital, and peer—as predictors of children's aggressive behavior at child care in two cultures with different orientations to child rearing, parenting practices, and gender-role attitudes. In the parent–child conflict, we were interested in the global ecology of parent–child conflict and addressed behaviors that surround the conflict as well as those related to the parent and child's behavior during conflict. Ecological, family systems', and socialization models informed the study by postulating that processes of conflict resolution are best observed in their natural ecology; that behaviors in the various relational units in the family are interrelated; and that the ability to handle disagreements is learned at home through mechanisms of participation and observation.

Three central goals guided the study: to examine cultural and gender-related differences in conflict resolution behaviors in the parent–child, marital, and peer contexts; to assess the associations between behaviors observed in the three contexts in each culture; and to examine predictors of children's aggression at child care. As to the first study goal, cultural differences were expected in the behaviors that surround parent–child conflict in the home. Based on the emphasis placed in Western societies on promoting children's autonomy and self-expression (Briggs, 1972; Zahn-Waxler et al., 1996), we expected Israeli family members to show more negotiation of conflicted opinions and to resolve conflict more often by compromise, whereas Palestinian families were expected to employ tactics such as parental consent or object, which leave less room for further discussion. In the marital conflict, Israeli couples were expected to show more emotions, whereas Palestinians were expected to employ an instrumental approach. In the peer context, based on the centrality of deference to elders, we expected Palestinian toddlers to turn to adults for resolving peer conflicts, whereas we expected Israeli children to attempt a rudimentary form of independent resolution by compromise.

Differences related to parent and child gender and to Gender × Culture interactions were expected as well. Fathers were expected to serve as a stricter authority figure, to initiate more "don't" commands, to use the demand way of asking, and to respond by object more frequently than mothers. Based on the high emphasis placed on deference to authority in Arab societies (Abudabbeh,

1998), we expected more parental requests and demands from children to be observed in Palestinian families, whereas we expected more child requests and demands from parents would be noted in Israeli families. Based on research showing gender differences in toddler aggression (Keenan & Shaw, 1994), we expected more aggressive behavior at child care among boys in both cultures. Consistent with the findings that harsher parental discipline is directed toward boys (Hastings & Rubin, 1999), more authoritarian discipline and more "don't" comments were expected to be directed toward boys. In addition to global cultural differences, dimensions of family life that differentiate the two societies—traditional gender-role attitudes, father involvement, and child care by a kin—were expected to correlate with the culture-specific behaviors observed in the parent–child, marital, and peer contexts.

The second study goal was to examine the associations between behaviors observed in the three contexts in each culture. Consistent with socialization theories, which suggest that children internalize the typical conflict-related behaviors they experience or observe, we expected that the typical modes of conflict resolution in each culture would be consistent across contexts. Thus, in the Israeli group, more negotiation and compromise in the parent–child context was expected to correlate with more emotional empathy in the marital context and with more child compromise with peers. Similarly, more resolution by consent in the parent–child context among Palestinian families was expected to correlate with more instrumental solutions during marital conflict and with children turning to adults for the resolution of peer conflict.

The third goal was to address the predictors of toddlers' aggression at child care from behaviors observed in the three contexts in each culture. Based on the aforementioned studies, we expected three factors to predict higher toddler aggression in both cultures: marital hostility during the couple's conflict discussion, coparental undermining of each other's authority, and ineffective parental discipline during parent–child conflict as expressed in lower warm-control discipline. We also examined factors that may be associated with lower toddler aggression, but these associations are presented as research questions. It was of interest whether more emotional empathy between couples and children's ability to resolve peer conflict by compromise would correlate with less aggression among Israeli children and whether resolution by consent would be associated with lower aggression among Palestinian children.

Method

Participants

Participants in the present study were 86 Israeli and 55 Palestinian middle-class parents and their firstborn toddler who were part of a longitudinal study and were recruited when the child was 5 months old. At 5 months, 100 Israeli couples (52 boys) and 62 Palestinian couples (33 boys) were recruited. All parents graduated high school, most were holding a vocational or academic degree (83%), and all participating mothers and fathers were employed in skilled or semiskilled professions with no cultural difference in their professional status. At the initiation of the study, Israeli mothers were on average 27.7 years old ($SD = 3.93$), and Palestinian mothers were 25.65 years ($SD = 3.19$), and the difference

was significant, $F(1, 161) = 11.81$, $p < .01$. We thus examined correlations between maternal age and all study variables and no significant relations were found in each group. Israeli mothers completed on average 15.25 years of education ($SD = 1.69$) and Palestinian mothers completed on average 14.68 years of education ($SD = 1.35$). Israeli fathers' age averaged 30.37 years ($SD = 4.99$), and their education averaged 14.54 years ($SD = 1.64$). Palestinian fathers' age averaged 30.35 years, and their education averaged 14.19 years ($SD = 1.85$). No cultural differences emerged in parental education.

Israeli families were recruited by nurses in well-baby stations in their immediate neighborhoods. Nurses introduced the study to those who fit the study criteria, and 100 out of 110 approached agreed to participate. The well-baby clinic records showed no differences in demographic (age, education, employment) or health (pregnancy complications, general health, mode of delivery, infant birth weight and gestational age, mental illness) variables between the participating and declining mothers. Israeli parents were all Jewish, and 95.5% of the parents were Israeli-born and the remaining 4.5% were born in Western countries.

Palestinian families were recruited in the greater area of Nazareth in northern Israel ($n = 28$) and of Ramallah in the West Bank ($n = 34$). Seven families declined participation and these were of similar background as the participating families. Of the Palestinian families, 90% were Muslims and 10% were Christians, with no differences between religions on any study variable. Arabs living within Israel and those in the West Bank consider themselves to be of Palestinian nationality in terms of national identity and cultural heritage (Suleiman & Beit Hallahmi, 1997) and no differences emerged between the two groups, which were combined into a single Palestinian group. Approximately 9% of Arabs in Israel are Christian and the number of Christians in the Rammalla and Bethlehem areas is higher than in other areas of the West Bank, ranging between 7% and 10% (Smooha, 2004), and thus the religious composition of the Palestinian group was similar to the general population in their respective locations.

In terms of religion, 15% of the Israeli families considered themselves to be religious, 20% reported being traditional, and the rest reported being secular. Among Palestinians, 35% considered themselves religious and 42% reported being traditional. Parent religiosity was highly correlated with their traditional gender-role attitudes ($r = .71$, $p < .001$), and the Traditional Attitudes composite (Feldman, Sussman, & Zigler, 2004; see below for details) was used as a proxy for religiosity.

Of the original 100 Israeli families, 86 families (44 boys) were seen again when their babies became toddlers (33.74 months, $SD = 4.43$). Among Palestinian families, 55 families (29 boys) were seen when their babies became toddlers (34.32 months, $SD = 4.18$). No differences were found between families who were revisited and those who were not, and attrition was mainly related to inability to locate the families. All couples were still married, and in 60% of the Israeli families and in 62% of the Palestinian families a second child was born. In infancy, Israeli mothers reported 34.7 hr of employment ($SD = 5.77$), and Palestinian mothers reported 35.6 hr ($SD = 6.11$). In toddlerhood, Israeli mothers were employed 33.4 hr per week ($SD = 6.55$) and Palestinian mothers were employed 32.17 hr per week ($SD = 8.26$), with no cultural differences. All fathers reported full-time employment. The study was conducted between 1996 and 2000, during a

relatively peaceful period in the region. Families received a small gift for their participation.

Procedure

Infancy. Families were visited at home by a culturally matched professional (psychologist in training or social worker) when the infant was 5 months. Parents were interviewed, videotaped in parent–infant interactions, and were asked to complete self-report measures. Three variables related to parenting that showed marked cultural differences were used in the present study.

Traditional attitudes. Parents completed the Parental Leave Inventory (Feldman et al., 2004), a comprehensive questionnaire that includes questions on pregnancy and childbirth, gender-role attitudes, work–family issues, parental attitudes, child care arrangements, and living conditions each rated on a scale from 1 to 5. A factor analysis on selected items identified three factors: Career Centrality, Family Focus, and Traditional Attitudes, and only Traditional Attitudes showed marked cultural difference (Israeli: $M = 3.09$, $SD = 0.76$; Palestinian: $M = 3.98$, $SD = 0.64$, $F[1, 232] = 144.4$, $\eta^2 = .43$; Feldman et al., 2001). This factor included the parents' endorsing statements such as "Mothers should stay home when children are young," and "Raising children is the main purpose of a woman's life," and disagreeing with statements such as "Society should provide equal career opportunities to men and women" and "Parents should share child care responsibilities."

Child care by a kin. One item on the Parental Leave Inventory examined child care arrangements. Sixty-three percent of Palestinian infants were cared for by a kin compared to only 14% of Israeli infants, $\chi^2(162) = 14.89$, $p < .001$.

Father involvement. Parents rated the degree of father involvement on two items addressing housework responsibilities and child care responsibilities. The two items were correlated ($r = .78$, $p < .01$) and averaged into a father involvement composite. Palestinian parents reported significantly lower father involvement, $F(1, 140) = 54.13$, $p < .001$.

Toddler stage. Toddler assessment included two home visits by culturally matched professionals lasting approximately 3 hr in total and including observations of the ecology of parent–child conflict; marital conflict; mother–child, father–child, and triadic interactions; and self-report measures. In addition, children were observed at child care for 1.5 hr.

Home visits. Visits were scheduled for the evening hours, when both parents and children were home. Observations of the ecology of parent–child conflict took place during dinner time, bath time, and up to bedtime, moments of heightened conflict between parents and toddlers.

Observation of family conflict management. Consistent with previous ecological studies on families with toddlers (Belsky, Crnic, & Gable, 1995; Pettit & Bates, 1990) and much cross-cultural research (LeVine, 1973; Tronick, Thomas, & Daltabuit, 1994), we used a narrative approach to assess family behavior, a technique in which behavior is observed in its natural ecology and is narrated in detail along several dimensions of interest. During the entire period of the family's dinner time and the child's bath time and bedtime, a trained assistant provided a written narrative on the family's behavior, marking the time every 5 min. Parents were asked in advance to remain with the target child during the

observation, and moments when one parent left the room were noted ($M = 9.4\%$ of the time). Observers focused on the interactions between parents and the target child. Observations began with simple requests directed from one family member to another that may or may not escalate into a conflict and noted the unfolding of these requests. Following the observation of a request, assistants were instructed to note the reaction of the other party, whether or not a conflict had evolved from the request, how the conflict was resolved, and the reaction of the parent not involved in the conflict. Observations lasted on average 1.68 hr ($SD = 0.62$) with no cultural difference in the length of observation.

Narratives were coded offline into 10 categories. Following the observations, observers completed a coding sheet that included the following codes on the basis of the detailed written narrative. Each category (Categories 3–9) contained a set of mutually exclusive codes. An "other" code was added to each category for behaviors that could not be classified.

1. Length of episode. The exact time in minutes from the beginning of a request to the final resolution of that request.

2. Who is present during the episode? Mother, father, child.

3. Who initiated the request? The assessment of each episode began with a "request" code, defined as any type of demand–call–request directed from one family member to another. Within the context of family life with toddlers, our pilot data showed that family conflicts typically begin with a request directed toward a family member, but not all such requests evolve into a conflict. This category considered the person who initiated the request—mother, father, or child.

4. Who is the target of the request? To whom the initiator directed the initial request—mother, father, or child.

5. Content of the request. Goal of the initial request: (a) simple daily or caregiving requests involving a unitary simple act (e.g., "Pass the milk," "Close the TV"), (b) didactic (e.g., "Tell me a story"), (c) emotional (e.g., seeking closeness or consolation, acknowledging emotions by verbal and nonverbal signals), (d) requests for privacy (e.g., "Leave me alone"), (e) "do" command (other than simple requests and involving more time and effort, e.g., "Pick up the toys," "Set the table"), or (f) "don't" command (e.g., "Don't eat any more cookies"). Children sometimes made requests using gestures and vocalizations, and these were often of the simple caregiving or emotional categories.

6. Way of asking. How was the request formulated: (a) request (directed politely with neutral–positive affect, e.g., "Can you please open the door"?), (b) demand (shorter command, stated as an order, e.g., "Sit up straight, already!"), (c) crying–screaming, or (d) manipulation (e.g., "I'll give you the candy if you come to the table").

7. Reaction of other party. (a) Fulfills the initiator's request (fulfills request immediately without further talk or de-

lay), (b) negotiates (begins a verbal dialogue to delay, alter, or minimize request: e.g., "I can't eat the whole thing" or "I will help you in five minutes,"), (c) disregards (other party makes no indication that he–she heard or intends to fulfills the request), (d) objects (e.g., "I will not give you more chocolate"), (e) gentle use of force (e.g., parent picks child and puts him–her on the chair), or (f) aggressive use of power (e.g., hitting, pulling).

8. Resolution of episode. How was the episode resolved: (a) Initiator does as initially intended (e.g., father takes child's game away), (b) initiator objects verbally to request–demand, (c) compromise between the two parties (e.g., mother calls child to table, child asks to finish the TV program, mother says "You can have five more minutes but not until the end of the program"), (d) initiator consents to other party's demands, and (e) conflict dies out.

9. Reaction of spouse. Reaction of the spouse not involved in the exchange between other parent and child: (a) spouse avoids (spouse makes no indication of noticing or getting involved, e.g., father keeps reading the paper when mother tries to get the child into the bath), (b) spouse supports (e.g., spouse strengthen the request–demand of partner, e.g., father ask child to pick up a toy, child ignores, and mother says "Your father asked you to do that"), or (c) spouse undermines (contradicts verbally or nonverbally the spouse's disciplinary attempts. e.g., father demands that child gets into the bath now and mother says, "Why are you always rushing him–her?").

The instrument was developed by the authors and the research group of Israeli and Palestinian professionals following extensive discussions on the ecology of parent–child conflict in each culture and the specific behaviors (codes) that reflect the typical modes of conflict resolution in each society. Assistants received extensive training on a pilot sample in the two societies ($N = 16$) prior to visiting the target families. Family interactions for the pilot sample were videotaped, and assistants first viewed the tapes and learned to define each category and differentiate its codes. Following, assistants were trained in providing narrative assessments to the videotapes in real time and in translating their narratives offline into the coding scheme. Finally, two assistants trained in providing real-time narratives that would give sufficient information for later coding visited families not from the target sample. Assistants were instructed to provide a very detailed narrative on the behavior of each partner that considered all aspects of the coding scheme and that could be coded offline into the aforementioned codes.

An example of a written narrative and its offline coding is as follows:

> Child asks father politely to tell her a story; father reads paper and ignores the child; mother gets angry at father, "You never pay any attention to her." Father sighs, takes a book, and tells the child, "I will read you this much now and maybe more later." Child says, "No, read me the whole thing." Father replies, "OK, let's do up to here now and the rest before you go to bed." Child takes a doll, cuddles on father, and father reads. Child throws doll on the floor; father says, "Pick it up, please"; child ignores. Father says in a warm but firm voice, "Pick

it up otherwise we won't continue." Child picks up the doll and father continues.

This narrative is coded as follows: *Present in episode*—mother, father, and child; *Initiator of request*—child; *Target of request*—father; *Content of request*—didactic; *Way of asking*—request; *Reaction of other party*—disregard; *Resolution of episode*—compromise, *Reaction of spouse*—undermine; and *Parent disciplinary style*—authoritative.

After reaching 90% reliability in providing narratives to the videotaped sessions and in coding the narratives offline, assistants began to visit the families. Reliability was measured on 28 families (14 in each culture) who were visited by two assistants who provided both narratives and final coding. Interrater reliability averaged κ = .83 (range = .77–.88).

Marital conflict discussion. During a different visit from the visit devoted to the ecology of family conflict, couples were observed alone and were asked to select two central conflicts in their relationship (one related to child-rearing issues, the other to marital issues) and to discuss each conflict for 7–10 min. Conflicts were audiotaped and microcoded using a time-sampling method. For each 30-s epoch, a coder marked the occurrence of 25 preselected codes. Codes considered the affective quality of speech (e.g., speaks in angry voice, talks in steady rhythm) and its verbal content (e.g., criticizes partner, asks for partner's support, cuts partner's speech, speaks about conflict in a "rational" way). The final score for each code was the proportion of time out of the entire session this behavior has occurred, that is, the number of 30-s epochs the behavior appeared out of the entire 10 min. Coding was conducted by two coders who spoke both Hebrew and Arabic and coded sessions from the two cultures. Reliability was computed on 30 couples in the two cultures and averaged κ = .80 (range = .74–.85). Reliability checks were conducted throughout the coding process. A principal component factor analysis with varimax rotation was computed for each conflict and yielded similar factors. The first factor had an eigenvalue of 3.84 and 3.22 in the child-related and couple-related conflict, respectively, explained 15.34% and 12.03% of the variance, and included the following codes (loading > .50): criticizes partner, blames partner, disturbs partner, undermines partner's opinion, answers instead of partner, and attacks partner; it was termed *Marital Hostility*. The second factor had an eigenvalue of 2.92 and 2.67 in the two conflicts, respectively, explained 9.97% and 10.05% of the variance, and included the following codes: interested in partner's opinion, supportive of partner, available to partner, and expresses spontaneous warmth and love; it was termed *Emotional Empathy*. The third factor had an eigenvalue of 2.45 and 2.34 in the two conflicts, respectively, explained 8.32% and 8.14% of the variance, and included the following codes: talks in steady rhythm, keeps calm voice, speaks about conflict in a rational way, and raises instrumental solutions; it was termed the *Instrumental Style*. Medium-to-high correlations were found between each composite in the two conflict discussions ($rs = .41–.72$), and each factor was averaged across the two sessions.

Parent disciplinary style. Following Baumrind (1973), the parent's disciplinary style in each episode narrated in the parent–child home observation was coded offline into one of three styles: (a) authoritarian—parent uses harsh tactics such as scolding, yelling, or physical coercion; (b) authoritarian—parent combines

warmth with clear boundaries; and (c) permissive—parent gives in to child without enforcing any discipline. The final score for each style was the proportion of times it appeared out of all parent–child episodes.

Observations at child care.   Within a period of 1 month from the home visit, the child was observed at child care. Visits lasted approximately 1.5 hr and covered free play, "teaching" time, snack time, and outdoor play. All children attended out-of-home care either at daycare centers, private schools, or family-based care, and no cultural differences were found in the type of care. A trained assistant followed the target child and provided a continuous narrative of the child's activities, entering the actual time every 5 min. Assistants were instructed to pay attention to the child's encounters with peers (e.g., child plays alone, initiates contact, cooperates, engages in verbal or nonverbal dialogue, shows positive emotions, begins a conflict, shows aggressive behavior) and adults (e.g., seeks contact, keeps rules, is cooperative, relies on adults for help, avoids adults, expresses emotions). In addition, any conflict in which the child was involved was described in detail, including information on whether the child was the initiator of the conflict, how long the conflict lasted, and the mode of its resolution.

The ongoing narrative was summarized offline into 28 scales, each coded from 1 (*low*) to 5 (*high*). The instrument was developed on the basis of mutual discussions among the Israeli and Palestinian professionals and the PIs. Discussions considered the dimensions that are central to children's social behavior at the toddler stage and the scales that would best capture social behavior at the child care setting.

Similar to the family observations, assistants completed extensive training before observations at child care by first training on videotapes of a pilot sample and providing narratives to the films and then coding the written narratives into the 28 scales. For instance, when the narrative repeatedly refers to the child's violation of rules, rude behavior, and dysregulated conduct, the offline code for disobedience would be 5. Only after reaching proficiency in providing written narratives and achieving 90% reliability in coding the narratives into scales, assistants began observations at child care. For interrater reliability, 27 observations (20%) were conducted by two assistants who provided separate narratives and scoring of scales and reliability averaged ($r = .93$; range = .88–.98). In additional 15% of the cases, comparisons were made between the visiting assistant and an assistant coding the scales from the narrative and the interrater reliability averaged ($r = .90$; range = .83–.94). Factor analysis conducted on the 28 scales yielded three factors with an eigenvalue of 2.5 and above. The second factor, used as a criterion variable in the present study, had an eigenvalue of 3.06, explained 12.25% of the variance, was termed *Aggression* ($\alpha = .82$), and included high loading for the following scales: Child Disobeys Rules, Child Initiates Conflicts, Child Uses Physical Power (e.g., hits, pushes, punches), and Child Displays Disruptive Behavior (e.g., throws objects, screams).

Conflicts with peers.   For each conflict between the target child and peers, observers selected of the following codes: (a) conflict is resolved by force—target child "won" the conflict through physical force or verbal intimidation (e.g., yelling, threatening, hitting, pulling the toy), (b) conflict is resolved by compromise—child finds verbal or nonverbal means toward a rudimentary form of compromise (e.g., suggests solutions such as "You go

first" when two children are in line for the slide; child says when someone wants a toy he–she is about take, "Can I please have it now?" or hands the toy saying, "I will have it later"), (c) conflict is resolved by giving in (e.g., child goes to the table to use colors, another child takes the colors, child cries and turns away), and (d) conflict is resolved by turning to adults for help. This final code was applied only when the child turned to the adult and not when the adult used proactive intervention to resolve the conflict. Reliability kappa, measured on 27 observations averaged .80 (range = .70–.88).

Results

Data analysis is organized in four sections. The first two sections address the first study goal and examine cultural and gender-related differences in the behaviors observed in the three contexts. Specifically, the first section examines differences related to the ecology of parent–child conflict and assesses differences related to culture, agent (mother, father, child), and child gender. In addition, Pearson product–moment correlations are presented between behaviors observed in the parent–child context and three culture-related factors: traditional attitudes, father involvement, and child care by kin. The second section examines differences related to culture and gender in the marital conflict discussion, the parent's disciplinary style, and the child's conflict with peers. Similarly, Pearson product–moment correlations are presented between the culture-related factors and the behaviors observed in the marital and peer conflicts and the parent's disciplinary style. The third section addresses the second study goal and presents correlations between the behaviors observed in the three contexts: parent–child, marital, and peer. Correlations are presented for each culture separately, and the magnitudes of the differences in the correlations between cultures are compared. The final section considers the third study goal and presents two regression equations predicting toddlers' aggression in each culture from the behaviors observed in the parent–child, marital, and peer contexts.

The Ecology of Parent–Child Conflict in Israeli and Palestinian Families

Of the total time assessed as the ecology of parent–child conflict, only in 15.2% of the time in Israeli families and in 11.8% of the time in Palestinian families did requests made by one family member to another initiate either negotiation or an increase in negative arousal (e.g., raised voice, expressed anger, strictly stated commands, etc.), leading to some form of conflict. This indicates that even at the difficult toddler stage and during the most stressful time of day, most of the evening time in these low-risk families was conflict free. In both societies the initiator of the request was typically the mother (Israeli = 61.3%; Palestinian = 64.2%), and the target of the request was the child (Israeli = 73.5%; Palestinian = 77.2%). Fathers initiated much less requests of any form than mothers, $t(140) = 24.97$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .13$, indicating that fathers tend to leave the handling of daily routines to their wives even when both are present.

A mixed model multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA), with agent (mother, father, child) as the within-subject factor and culture and child gender as the between-subjects factors, was computed for each cluster of variables (e.g., content of request,

way of asking, response of other party). Post hoc comparisons followed main effects for agent and interaction effects. Results are presented in Table 1.

Content of request. As hypothesized, a significant main effect emerged for culture, Wilks's $F(7, 131) = 5.24$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .10$. As seen in Table 1, Israeli families directed more "do" requests to family members, whereas Palestinian families placed more prohibitions ("don't"); and Israeli children directed more "didactic" requests to their parents (e.g., "Tell me a story"). The most common requests in the two societies were simple daily or caregiving requests, and the least common were requests for privacy.

An overall main effect emerged for agent, Wilks's $F(7, 131) = 11.33$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .18$. As seen, mothers directed more caregiving requests than did fathers and children, whereas fathers directed more requests for privacy. Mothers made more "do" and "don't" commands than fathers, who made more such commands than children. As hypothesized, a Culture × Agent interaction was found, Wilks's $F(7, 130) = 3.14$, $p < .01$, related to simple caregiving requests and to "don't" comments. Paired comparisons within agent followed significant interaction effects with alpha set at .01 to correct for multiple comparisons. As for simple–caregiving requests, Palestinian mothers made more such requests than did Israeli mothers, $t(140) = 4.11$, $p < .01$; no differences emerged for fathers; but Israeli children made more simple requests than did Palestinian children, $t(140) = 4.07$, $p < .01$. Similarly, in the "don't" comments, Palestinian mothers and fathers made more "don't" comments than did Israeli mothers and fathers—$t(140) = 4.23$, 6.86, $p < .01$, for mothers and fathers, respectively—whereas Israeli children made significantly more "don't" comments to their parents than did Palestinian children, $t(140) = 9.44$, $p < .01$.

An overall main effect for child gender was also found; Wilks's $F(7, 131) = 2.90$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .06$. Girls directed more caregiving requests to parents ($M = 0.33$, $SD = 0.24$) than did boys ($M = 0.25$, $SD = 0.14$), $F(1, 131) = 3.90$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .04$, and, as hypothesized, more "don't" commands were directed toward boys ($M = 0.10$, $SD = 0.06$) than were directed toward girls ($M = 0.06$, $SD = 0.03$), $F(1, 131) = 3.86$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .04$, pointing to the different socialization of boys and girls in the handling of daily routines. As expected, traditional attitudes correlated with more "don't" comments ($r = .31$, $p < .01$), as did child care by kin ($r = .23$, $p < .05$), but these two factors did not correlate with less didactic requests. Father involvement was associated with more didactic requests ($r = .26$, $p < .05$) and with less requests for privacy ($r = -.21$, $p < .05$).

Way of asking. As hypothesized, a significant main effect was found for culture, Wilks's $F(5, 133) = 10.69$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .16$. Israeli families used the request and manipulation modes more often, whereas Palestinians used the demand mode more frequently (see Table 1). In both cultures, a request was the most frequent way of asking, and screaming rarely occurred. An overall main effect emerged for agent, Wilks's $F(5, 133) = 5.42$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .07$. Mothers used the request mode more often, whereas fathers used the demand mode more frequently. Consistent with our hypothesis, a Culture × Agent interaction was found, Wilks's $F(5, 133) = 6.91$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .08$, related to request and demand. Palestinian fathers (but not mothers) made more requests than did Israeli fathers, $t(140) = 4.74$, $p < .01$, whereas Israeli

children made significantly more requests than did Palestinian children, $t(140) = 5.38$, $p < .01$. In the demand mode, Palestinian mothers and fathers used more demands than did Israeli mothers and fathers—$t(140) = 5.72$, 6.91, $p < .01$, for mothers and fathers, respectively—whereas Israeli children made significantly more "don't" comments to their parents than did Palestinian children, $t(140) = 8.15$, $p < .01$.

An overall child gender effect, Wilks's $F(5, 133) = 2.98$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .03$, was found with parents directing more requests to girls ($M = 0.55$, $SD = 0.26$) than to boys ($M = 0.43$, $SD = 0.18$), $F(1, 133) = 4.41$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .05$. Consistent with our hypothesis, traditional attitudes correlated with more demands ($r = .31$, $p < .01$), as did child care by kin ($r = .22$, $p < .05$) but not with less requests. Father involvement correlated with more requests ($r = .27$, $p < .05$) and less demands ($r = -.21$, $p < .05$) but not with less manipulation.

Reaction of other party. Perhaps the largest cultural difference emerged in the other party's response to the initiator's requests, consistent with our hypothesis, Wilks's $F(4, 134) = 25.42$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .32$. Negotiation and disregard, the more open-ended tactics, were more common among Israeli families, whereas the more clear-cut tactics of consent and object occurred more often in Palestinian families (see Table 1). An overall main effect emerged for agent, Wilks's $F(4, 134) = 6.31$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .06$. Mothers were more likely to consent than fathers, whereas fathers objected more often. As hypothesized, a Culture × Agent interaction was found, Wilks's $F(4, 134) = 13.4$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .21$, related to object and negotiate. Palestinians mothers and fathers used significantly more object tactics than did Israeli mothers and fathers—$t(140) = 5.14$, 10.23, $p < .01$, for mothers and fathers, respectively—whereas no differences were found between Israeli and Palestinian children in object tactics. In negotiation tactics, no differences were found for mothers, but Israeli fathers and children used significantly more negotiation tactics, than did Palestinians—$t(140) = 11.44$, 14.28, $p < .01$, for fathers and children, respectively.

A main effect for child gender was also found, Wilks's $F(4, 134) = 2.26$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .04$. There were more parental objections to the requests of girls ($M = 0.24$, $SD = 0.11$) than of boys ($M = 0.17$, $SD = 0.09$), $F(1, 281) = 4.98$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .04$, while at the same time parents consented more to the requests of girls ($M = 0.43$, $SD = 0.24$) than to those of boys ($M = 0.13$, $SD = 0.10$), $F(1, 281) = 4.95$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .06$, suggesting more ambivalent socialization responses toward girls. Correlations were found between traditional attitudes and lower negotiation ($r = -.31$, $p < .01$) but not with more consent or disregard, and between child care by kin and parental consent ($r = .24$, $p < .05$) but not with lower negotiation or disregard. Higher father involvement correlated with higher negotiation ($r = .26$, $p < .05$) but not with lower consent or disregard.

Resolution of episode. The large cultural differences in ways of asking and in the response of the other party resulted in significant cultural differences in the way conflicts were resolved, Wilks's $F(4, 134) = 5.63$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .10$. As seen in Table 1, the majority of conflicts in Palestinian families were resolved by the initiator's consent. On the other hand, compromise was the most common resolution tactic among Israeli families. An overall effect was found for agent, Wilks's $F(4, 134) = 3.54$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .05$. Fathers resolved conflict more by pursuing their initial

Table 1

Means and Standard Deviations and Culture and Agent Effects in the Context of Parent–Child Conflict Resolution in Israeli and Palestinian Families

Variable	Israeli								Palestinian								Univariate F		
	Overall		Mother (A)		Father (B)		Child (C)		Overall		Mother (A)		Father (B)		Child (C)		Culture	Agent	Culture × Agent
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD			
Content of request																			
Caregiving–daily actions	.41	.21	.20	.09	.09	.04	.12	.05	.46	.22	.28	.12	.10	.04	.08	.03	2.09	17.33*** (A > B, C)	4.45*
Didactic	.13	.06	.05	.03	.03	.01	.06	.02	.07	.03	.04	.02	.01	.01	.02	.01	6.02*	4.26* (A > B)	3.16
Emotional	.08	.04	.02	.01	.01	.01	.05	.03	.07	.04	.02	.02	.00	.00	.05	.03	1.88	7.73*** (C > A, B)	1.28
Requests for privacy	.00	.00	.00	.00	.01	.00	.00	.01	.01	.01	.00	.00	.01	.01	.00	.01	0.32	16.33*** (B > A, C)	0.76
"Do" commands	.13	.06	.07	.04	.04	.02	.01	.01	.07	.03	.05	.02	.02	.01	.00	.00	5.95**	9.68*** (A > B > C)	1.03
"Don't" commands	.21	.11	.11	.07	.07	.03	.03	.01	.31	.14	.18	.08	.13	.05	.00	.00	9.61***	13.74*** (A > B > C)	5.11*
Way of asking																			
Request	.67	.29	.26	.12	.17	.08	.24	.11	.47	.21	.28	.13	.09	.05	.10	.06	16.18***	7.42** (A > B, C)	11.53**
Demand	.25	.12	.08	.05	.10	.06	.07	.04	.39	.16	.15	.07	.21	.11	.03	.01	11.72***	6.53* (B > A, C)	10.22**
Crying–screaming	.01	.01	.00	.01	.00	.01	.01	.01	.02	.01	.00	.01	.01	.01	.01	.01	2.13	2.65	1.97
Manipulation	.07	.03	.04	.02	.03	.01	.00	.00	.04	.02	.02	.01	.01	.01	.00	.01	8.94**	3.98* (A > B > C)	0.44
Reaction of other party																			
Consents	.15	.07	.06	.04	.04	.02	.05	.02	.41	.20	.15	.08	.07	.04	.19	.11	29.71***	6.34* (A > B)	2.88
Objects	.17	.08	.06	.03	.06	.04	.05	.02	.31	.15	.11	.06	.16	.07	.04	.03	11.81***	5.62* (B > C)	15.11**
Negotiates	.43	.21	.17	.08	.12	.06	.14	.07	.20	.09	.13	.06	.04	.02	.03	.02	25.11***	3.96* (A > C)	21.31**
Disregards	.19	.08	.07	.03	.06	.03	.06	.03	.04	.02	.02	.01	.02	.01	.00	.01	31.15***	3.55	1.74
Resolution of episode																			
Initiator does as intended	.15	.08	.04	.02	.06	.03	.04	.02	.26	.12	.09	.04	.12	.06	.05	.03	8.22***	4.61* (B > C)	10.11**
Compromise	.41	.20	.15	.07	.15	.07	.11	.06	.15	.07	.06	.03	.03	.02	.06	.03	17.71***	3.66	3.36
Initiator consents	.30	.15	.11	.06	.08	.04	.11	.06	.48	.22	.24	.13	.06	.04	.18	.07	14.15**	8.92** (B < A, C)	10.42**
Conflict dies out	.13	.06	.05	.02	.02	.01	.06	.03	.11	.06	.04	.02	.01	.01	.06	.03	1.86	5.33* (B < A, C)	2.17
Coparental reaction																			
Avoids	.28	.14	.10	.06	.18	.08			.37	.17	.15	.08	.22	.11			4.50*	7.64** (B > A)	0.86
Supports	.42	.20	.24	.11	.18	.09			.39	.18	.20	.09	.19	.08			1.25	1.63	0.91
Undermines	.29	.13	.18	.09	.11	.07			.17	.09	.11	.06	.06	.03			7.33**	3.96* (A > B)	1.18

Note. Numbers represent proportion of time spent in each behavior pattern.
* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

intent, whereas mothers resolved conflict more by compromise. Consistent with the prediction, an overall Culture × Agent interaction was found, Wilks's $F(4, 134) = 5.12$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .09$, related to compromise and consent. Israeli mothers, fathers, and children tended to resolve conflict by compromise significantly more often than did Palestinian family members, $t(1, 140) = 5.92$, 11.61, 5.17, $p < .01$, for mothers, fathers and children, respectively. On the other hand, Palestinian mothers (but not fathers) and children resolved conflict more by consent than did Israelis, $t(1, 140) = 5.86$, 4.33, $p < .01$, for mothers and children, respectively.

No child gender effects were found, suggesting that the way families resolve daily conflicts may reflect the family style more than gender-related tactics. Traditional attitudes correlated with lower compromise ($r = -.27$, $p < .05$) and higher consent ($r = .25$, $p < .05$) but not with initiator does as intended. Child care by kin was related to whether the initiator does as intended ($r = .23$, $p < .05$) but not with less compromise and higher initiator consent. Father involvement correlated with more compromise ($r = .30$, $p < .01$) but not with less initiator consent.

Reaction of spouse. The spouse's response showed an overall main effect for culture, Wilks's $F(3, 135) = 5.46$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .10$. No cultural differences emerged for the spouse's support of the partner. On the other hand, Israeli spouses showed more undermining behavior and Palestinian spouses showed more avoidance (see Table 1). No parent Gender × Culture effects were found. Child gender effects were also found, Wilks's $F(3, 135) = 4.78$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .07$, related to partner undermining, which was higher in families raising boys ($M = 0.26$, $SD = 0.12$) than in those raising girls ($M = 0.18$, $SD = 0.08$), $F(1, 135) = 5.33$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .06$. As hypothesized, traditional attitudes were related to lower spousal undermining ($r = -.22$, $p < .05$) but not to higher spousal avoidance, and higher father involvement was related to greater spousal support ($r = .33$, $p < .01$) but not to lower avoidance or undermining.

Overall, results of this process analysis are consistent with our hypotheses and provide a detailed account on the child's daily experience in the precipitating conditions and specific behaviors that surround parent–child conflict in the home. The data show that sequences of conflict resolution, in terms of initial request, response, solution, and support of the other parent, are shaped, to a large extent, by the cultural context and the interacting parent. The correlations between these behaviors and culture-specific factors suggest that the findings are not merely related to cultural membership but reflect basic features of family life, attitudes, and practices.

Marital Conflict Resolution, Parent Disciplinary Style, and Child Conflict With Peers

Marital conflict resolution. A mixed model MANOVA, with parent gender as the within-subject factor and culture and child gender as the between-subject factors, assessed the three factors of the marital conflict discussion: marital hostility, emotional empathy, and the instrumental style. As hypothesized, results demonstrated an overall main effect for culture, Wilks's $F(3, 135) = 13.24$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .21$. Table 2 shows that marital hostility was comparable in the two cultures, emotional empathy was higher among Israeli couples, and the instrumental style was more common among Palestinian couples. An overall main effect was also

Table 2
Culture and Gender Differences in Marital Conflict Resolution and Parental Disciplinary Styles

	Israeli										Palestinian										Univariate F				
	Mother						Father				Mother						Father									
	Overall		Boys		Girls		Boys		Girls		Overall		Boys		Girls		Boys		Girls		Culture	Parent gender	Child gender	Culture × Parent	Parent × Child
Variable	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD					
Marital conflict resolution styles																									
Marital hostility	.28	.08	.17	.08	.16	.08	.12	.06	.11	.06	.22	.10	.14	.07	.15	.07	.08	.05	.07	.04	2.12	7.89**	.86	.71	.68
Emotional empathy	.47	.22	.32	.16	.31	.16	.16	.08	.13	.07	.24	.11	.15	.08	.17	.08	.07	.04	.06	.03	17.66**	10.14**	.55	1.03	.29
Instrumental style	.15	.08	.08	.03	.08	.04	.06	.04	.07	.04	.45	.22	.17	.08	.18	.10	.27	.13	.25	.12	15.11**	8.53**	.76	.33	.87
Parent disciplinary style																									
Authoritarian	.10	.06	.03	.02	.02	.01	.07	.04	.04	.02	.34	.14	.11	.06	.07	.03	.30	.13	.14	.06	15.62**	21.44**	7.33**	6.35**	9.24**
Authoritative	.56	.25	.32	.15	.34	.16	.23	.11	.25	.12	.48	.23	.29	.13	.31	.14	.16	.07	.19	.10	1.14	7.17**	1.64	1.86	1.77
Permissive	.28	.13	.19	.10	.13	.06	.05	.02	.12	.06	.11	.06	.08	.04	.05	.02	.02	.01	.06	.04	8.76**	8.33**	6.92**	2.66	6.73**

Note. Numbers represent proportion of time in each behavior pattern.
* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

found for parent gender, Wilks's $F(4, 130) = 3.45$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .06$. Mothers displayed more emotional empathy ($M = 0.22$, $SD = 0.10$) than did fathers ($M = 0.10$, $SD = 0.06$) and showed more hostility ($M = 0.16$, $SD = 0.07$) than did fathers ($M = 0.08$, $SD = 0.05$), whereas fathers used the instrumental style more often ($M = 0.20$, $SD = 0.10$) than did mothers ($M = 0.11$, $SD = 0.06$). Contrary to our prediction, no correlations were found between traditional attitudes, child care by kin, or father involvement and the marital conflict resolution styles.

Parent disciplinary style. A main effect for culture emerged in the parent's overall disciplinary style, Wilks's $F(3, 135) = 6.46$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .12$. No cultural differences were found in the authoritative style (see Table 2), and this was the most common tactic in both societies. Israeli parents were more permissive, whereas and Palestinian parents showed more authoritarian parenting. A main effect for parent was found, Wilks's $F(3, 135) = 9.22$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .11$. Mothers used the authoritative ($M = 0.32$, $SD = 0.19$) and permissive ($M = 0.12$, $SD = 0.07$) styles more often than did fathers (authoritative: $= M = 0.21$, $SD = 0.09$; permissive: $= M = 0.07$, $SD = 0.03$), whereas fathers used the authoritarian style ($M = 0.14$, $SD = 0.07$) more frequently than did mothers ($M = 0.06$, $SD = 0.03$). As predicted, an overall main effect for child gender was found; Wilks's $F(3, 135) = 3.28$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .06$, with parents showing more permissive parenting toward girls ($M = 0.11$, $SD = 0.05$) than boys ($M = 0.07$, $SD = 0.03$) and using the strict authoritarian style more often in handling boys ($M = 0.13$, $SD = 0.06$) than in handling girls ($M = 0.06$, $SD = 0.02$). A Parent Gender $\times$ Child Gender effect, Wilks's $F(3, 135) = 2.92$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .05$, indicated that fathers used more authoritarian parenting toward boys ($M = 0.17$, $SD = 0.06$) than girls ($M = 0.08$, $SD = 0.04$), $F(1, 140) = 5.26$, $p < .01$, whereas differences in mothers' authoritarian parenting toward boys and girls was not significant. In addition, mothers were more permissive with boys ($M = 0.14$, $SD = 0.06$) than with girls ($M = 0.08$, $SD = 0.05$), $F(1, 140) = 5.79$, $p < .01$, whereas fathers were more permissive with girls ($M = 0.30$, $SD = 0.18$) than with boys ($M = 0.09$, $SD = 0.04$), $F(1, 140) = 14.26$, $p < .01$. Consistent with the hypothesis, the parents' traditional attitudes correlated with more authoritarian parenting ($r = .32$, $p < .01$) and less permissive parenting ($r = -.41$, $p < .01$). Child care by kin was related to more authoritative parenting ($r = .27$, $p < .05$) but not with less permissive parenting, and father involvement was related to more authoritative parenting ($r = .33$, $p < .01$) and less authoritarian

parenting ($r = -.38$, $p < .05$) but not with more permissive parenting.

Child conflict with peers. A MANOVA, with culture and child gender as the between-subjects factors for the four modes of peer conflict resolution, yielded a main effect for culture; Wilks's $F(4, 134) = 5.19$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .10$. Univariate tests (see Table 3) showed that Israeli toddlers resolved conflict by compromise more often, whereas Palestinian toddlers tended to turn more to adults or give in during peer conflict. An overall main effect for child gender was found, Wilks's $F(4, 134) = 6.55$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .08$, consistent with the hypothesis. Girls resolved conflict more by giving in or by using some form of compromise, whereas boys used more force and tended to turn to adults more often. No Gender $\times$ Culture interaction was found. The parents' traditional attitudes correlated with resolution by turning to adults ($r = .32$, $p < .01$) but not with lower compromise, and father involvement correlated with more child compromise ($r = .30$, $p < .01$) but not with more turning to adults.

Correlations Between Behaviors in the Parent–Child, Marital, and Peer Contexts

Because different pathways to children's socialization were expected in the two societies, correlations between behaviors in the parent–child, marital, and peer contexts were examined for each group separately, and differences in the magnitudes of the correlations were tested by using r-to-z transformations and Fisher's z tests. The two sets of correlations are presented in Table 4. As seen in Table 4, the culture-specific modes of conflict resolution were consistent across contexts, and these correlations typically showed significant differences in the magnitude of the correlations. Of the 66 comparisons conducted, three would have been expected to be significant by chance at $\alpha = .05$. Thus, the finding that 13 comparisons showed significant differences between cultures underscores the distinct pattern of associations between behaviors observed in the three contexts among cultures. Among Israeli families, more negotiation during parent–child conflict was related to more compromise, greater coparental support, lower marital hostility and higher empathy, more parental authoritative discipline, and greater child compromise with peers. Compromise during parent–child conflict was related to more marital empathy and greater compromise with peers, pointing to the consistency of the negotiating and compromising tactics across conflict contexts.

Table 3

Culture and Gender Differences in Children's Conflict Resolution With Peers

| | Israeli | | | | | | Palestinian | | | | | | Univariate F | |
| | Overall | | Boys | | Girls | | Overall | | Boys | | Girls | | | |
Variable	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	Culture	Child gender
Resolved by force	.25	.12	.30	.14	.19	.10	.23	.11	.32	.15	.11	.06	0.97	13.53**
Resolved by compromise	.37	.16	.28	.15	.46	.21	.20	.11	.16	.09	.25	.14	5.37*	7.93**
Resolved by giving in	.10	.06	.06	.02	.15	.07	.21	.11	.07	.04	.34	.18	7.28**	12.55**
Resolved by turning to adult	.26	.13	.30	.16	.22	.11	.36	.18	.48	.22	.22	.13	4.87*	8.14**

Note. Numbers represent proportion of time in each behavior pattern.
* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 4
Correlations Between Measures of Parent–Child, Marital, and Peer Conflict in Israeli and Palestinian Families

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Parent–child conflict												
1. Reaction—consents	—	−.44**	−.39**	−.42**	**.53****	**.39****	.03	.09	.31*	**.33***	.05	.22
2. Reaction—negotiates	−.46**	—	.36*	−.45**	**−.07**	.07	**.10**	.07	.04	**−.17**	.02	.08
3. Resolution—compromise	−.42**	.49*	—	−.49**	**−.16**	.07	**.18**	.11	.16	**−.35***	−.11	.06
4. Resolution—consent	.43**	−.52**	−.47**	—	**.39****	−.16	−.21	.19	**.39****	**.38****	.09	.17
5. Coparental—support	**−.02**	.38**	**.38****	**.02**	—	−.42**	−.37*	.16	**.35***	.31*	.10	.18
6. Coparental—undermine	**−.03**	−.28*	−.29*	.13	−.45**	—	.36*	−.22	−.14	−.32*	−.18	−.11
Marital conflict												
7. Marital hostility	.10	**−.35***	**−.32***	.05	−.39**	.36**	—	−.34*	−.31*	−.30*	−.24	−.12
8. Emotional empathy	.07	.33*	.34*	−.02	.38**	−.31*	−.42**	—	−.24	.19	.17	.15
9. Instrumental style	.14	−.06	−.09	**−.19**	−.21	.13	.17	−.28*	—	.29*	.16	.11
Parent disciplinary style												
10. Authoritative parenting	**−.27***	**.34***	**.31***	**−.22**	.35*	−.30*	−.32*	.33*	.08	—	.23	.15
Peer conflict												
11. Compromise	−.27*	.34*	.36*	−.29*	.33*	−.32*	−.34*	.37**	.07	.31*	—	.14
12. Turning to adult	.31**	−.27*	−.26*	.20	−.10	.07	.11	−.06	.11	.05	−.07	—

Note. Numbers above the diagonal represent correlations for Palestinian families, and numbers below the diagonal line represent correlations for Israeli families. Boldfaced coefficients show significant differences between the two cultures as indicated by Fisher's *z* test for differences in the magnitudes of correlations.
* *p* < .05. ** *p* < .01.

These correlations were typically not significant in the Palestinian group. For instance, the associations between more negotiation or compromise and coparental support, lower marital hostility, and more authoritative discipline were nonsignificant, and significant differences were found between cultures in the magnitudes of these correlations. Among Palestinian families, correlations emerged between more consent during parent–child conflict with coparental support and more authoritative parenting, and the instrumental marital style was related to more authoritative parenting. These correlations were similarly not significant in the Israeli group. These findings point to the consistency of conflict resolution tactics across the three contexts and highlight their culture specificity.

Predicting Children's Aggression in the Two Societies

The final section presents two hierarchical regressions predicting child aggression at child care from behaviors observed in the parent–child, marital, and peer contexts and the parents' disciplinary style. No differences in the level of child aggression were found between Israeli (*M* = 2.68, *SD* = 0.88) and Palestinian (*M* = 2.86, *SD* = 0.95) toddlers. In both cultures, boys (*M* = 3.22, *SD* = 0.96) showed more aggression than girls (*M* = 2.34, *SD* = 0.87), *F*(1, 140) = 4.26, *p* < .05, with no Culture × Gender interaction. Predictors included the three factors that were hypothesized to contribute to toddler aggression in both cultures in light of their theoretical relevance: high spousal undermining during parent–child conflict, greater marital hostility in the marital conflict, and less authoritative parenting. Culture-specific behaviors were also assessed as research questions: consent and compromise in the parent–child context, emotional empathy in the marital conflict, and compromise in the peer conflict. The two regressions appear in Table 5.

As seen in Table 5, higher spousal undermining behavior, more marital hostility, and less authoritative parenting predicted greater

Table 5
Predicting Toddlers' Aggression at Child Care From Parent–Child, Marital, and Peer Conflicts

Predictor	Israeli[a]				Palestinian[b]			
	β	ΔR²	ΔF	dfs	β	ΔR²	ΔF	dfs
Parent–child conflict								
Resolution—consent	.06	.00	0.33	1, 84	−.29*	.07	4.22*	1, 53
Resolution—compromise	−.30*	.07	4.11*	2, 83	.09	.00	0.31	2, 52
Coparental undermining	.26*	.05	3.99*	3, 82	.32*	.06	4.31*	3, 51
Marital conflict patterns								
Parental hostility	.24*	.07	4.63*	4, 81	.24*	.05	3.88*	4, 50
Emotional empathy	.23*	.05	3.97*	5, 80	−.06	.01	0.87	5, 49
Parent disciplinary style								
Authoritative parenting	−.21	.04	3.86*	6, 79	−.29*	.07	4.83*	6, 48
Peer conflict								
Compromise	−.33*	.06	4.85*	7, 78	−.15	.02	1.36	7, 47

[a] Total *R²* = .34; *F*(8, 78) = 5.24, *p* < .001. [b] Total *R²* = .28; *F*(7, 47) = 3.96, *p* < .05.
* *p* < .05.

child aggression in both cultures. Other predictors were culture specific. Among Israeli children, less compromise in the parent–child context, more marital emotional empathy, and less compromise with peers predicted additional variance in child aggression. Among Palestinian children, lower parent–child consent was related to greater aggression, although the model for Palestinian children should be interpreted with caution in light of the somewhat high number of predictors for the sample size. These findings indicate that the conflict management tactics children experience by participation (parent–child) and observation (marital) predict both independently and cumulatively the degree of aggressive behavior at child care, and that variables related to the development of toddlers' aggression include both shared and culture-specific factors.

Discussion

Children's ability to handle interpersonal conflicts is learned at home through the ongoing participation and observation of conflict encounters within the family. Aggression in young children, on the other hand, often results from the experience of poorly resolved conflict. The present study is among the first to provide ecologically based observations of toddlers' conflict experiences across three relevant contexts—parent–child, marital, and peer—from a cultural perspective and to examine the conflict behaviors children experience in each context as predictors of their aggressive behavior at child care. The findings point to substantial cultural differences in the ways conflict is resolved between parents and children, among couples, and between peers, and these differences correlated in meaningful ways with the culture-specific practices and attitudes that guide family life. Notwithstanding cultural differences, conflict behaviors were consistent across the three contexts in culture-specific ways so that the typical modes of conflict resolution in each culture were individually stable across contexts. Predictors of toddlers' aggression included both shared and culture-specific factors and highlighted three dimensions that may indicate risk for the development of toddler aggression: marital hostility, coparental undermining behavior, and ineffective parental discipline. In general, the results are consistent with ecological, family systems', and socialization models on child adaptation and may add a cultural-developmental layer to these theories in understanding the relational antecedents of aggression in young children.

Overall, the process-oriented observation of parent–child conflict showed that in low-risk families of both cultures, conflicts that involved some negotiation and/or an increase in negative affect occupied only 12%–15% of the observation period that spanned the family's dinner time, bath time, and bedtime—the most conflicted moments for parents and toddlers. These findings are consistent with the affective organization of parenting model (Dix, 1991), which suggests that healthy parent–child relationships are framed by a positive quality and that moments of negative emotions are embedded within the global harmony. Most family transactions occurred between mothers and toddlers, with the mother directing a request to the child and the father in the coparental role, and lasted between 1 and 3 min. Conflicts often involved simple daily or caregiving acts and were grounded in the immediate necessities of daily life. It is important to emphasize that in the parent–child context, we observed the ecology of parent–child

conflict and included requests that did not necessarily lead to actual conflicts, and the data therefore describe the family process during the time of day most prone to conflicts among families with toddlers. In both cultures, spouses tended to support each other during disciplinary encounters, and this coparental alliance has shown to predict social adjustment in the toddler years (Belsky et al., 1995; McHale & Rasmussen, 1998). Parents of both cultures tended to resolve conflicts in an authoritative way, a warm-control style that promotes optimal socialization and reduces aggression (Baumrind, 1973; Feldman & Klein, 2003). These dimensions describe the unfolding of parent–toddler conflict in low-risk, well-functioning families across cultures and underscore factors that support child socialization, enhance self-regulation, and reduce aggression.

The specific tactics mothers, fathers, and children employed during these moments, however, showed marked cultural differences. Among Israeli families, the typical way of asking was by request, the most common reaction was to negotiate, and the most frequent resolution was compromise, and compromise was as frequent a resolution in conflicts initiated by the mother, father, or child. Such patterns reflect the emphasis on autonomy, self-expression, independent problem solving, and the negotiation of differing perspectives endorsed by parents of young children in cultures guided by individualistic orientations (Briggs, 1972; Feldman et al., 2006; Zahn-Waxler et al., 1996). The greater similarity between the behaviors of mothers and fathers and between those of parents and children is consistent with the egalitarian gender-role attitudes, greater father involvement in the more "maternal" roles of household and child care, and the less clear hierarchies between parents and children. The negotiate and disregard behaviors, more common among Israeli families, are open-ended tactics that encourage further discussion, and conflicts indeed lasted longer in this society. On the other hand, among Palestinian families, demand was a more frequent way of asking, consent and object—which provide immediate response and limit further negotiation—occurred nearly three quarters of the time, and consent was the typical resolution. Consistent with the emphasis on child respect for elders (Smooha, 2004), a clearer distinction between parents and children was observed, children directed no "do" or "don't" commands to their parents, and showed no disregard of the parental requests. In line with the patriarchal nature of the Palestinian family, greater differences emerged between mothers and fathers, and fathers used the demand and object tactics significantly more often than did their wives. These differences correlated with culture-specific dimensions of family life—father involvement correlated with negotiation and compromise, traditional attitudes correlated with more demand and object, and child care by kin correlated with higher consent. It thus appears that the ebb and flow of the family's daily routines shape toddlers' behavior in ways that are consistent with the cultural norms, prevalent attitudes, and parenting goals at the period when young children form their first meaningful relationships with adults and peers within the larger social world.

Similar to the parent–child conflict and consistent with the culture-specific norms, beliefs, and attitudes, cultural differences were found in the marital conflict discussion and the child's resolution of conflicts with peers. Although marital hostility was comparable across groups, Israeli couples displayed more emotional empathy, particularly mothers, and Palestinian couples

showed more instrumental solutions, especially fathers. The open expression of emotions is more common and is viewed more favorably in cultures that perceive the self as a separate entity than in cultures that view the self as embedded within close relationships (Mesquita & Fridga, 1992). In Arab societies, where the goals of the group are superior to those of the self, the marital unit faced with a daily conflict may be more inclined to search for instrumental solutions. During conflicts with peers, children adapt the behaviors learned at home. Israeli children, encouraged to seek independent solutions to interpersonal problems, used a rudimentary form of compromise, whereas Palestinian toddlers, educated to defer to authority, turned to adults. These behaviors correlated with the cultural factors—father involvement correlated with marital empathy and child–friend compromise, whereas traditional attitudes correlated with instrumental solutions and turning to adults.

Differences in the socialization of boys and girls were also noted, consistent with previous research in the toddler years (Hastings & Rubin, 1999; Keenan & Shaw, 1994; Rubin et al., 1998). Boys showed more aggression at child care and tended to resolve conflict by force, but at the same time, the socialization of boys in both cultures was harsher and parents used more authoritarian parenting and made more "don't" comments toward boys. Because the data are correlational, it is impossible to know whether boys respond with aggression to harsher parental control or whether the higher aggression observed among boys leads to harsher parenting, and longitudinal research is required to assess this issue. Harsh parenting was especially high in the behavior of Palestinian fathers toward their sons, nearly 3.5 times more than toward their daughters, consistent with descriptions on the high paternal demands in the patriarchal Palestinian society from boys (Dwairy & Van Sickle, 1996; Smooha, 2004).

Our second study goal addressed the interrelationships between conflict behaviors in the three contexts in each culture. The findings indicate that conflict behaviors were consistent across contexts and that this consistency was culture specific. Israeli children who participated in more negotiation and compromise with their parents also received more warm-control discipline, experienced more coparental support, observed more marital empathy, and were more competent at resolving peer conflicts by compromise. Such associations were not significant in the Palestinian group, where more parent–child consent was related to authoritative parenting, coparental support, and the couples' ability to find instrumental solutions to marital issues. The correlations between conflict behaviors in the different family units—the parent–child, marital, and coparental—and their links with children's social adjustment are consistent with the ecological perspective's notions on the bidirectional influences between the various systems in the family (Belsky, 1981). The unique correlational matrix found in each culture and its associations with the cultural codes and customs similarly accords with the significant role ecological theory attributes to culture as the global organizer of the child's microsystem (Bronfenbrenner, 1979). The present findings are the first to show such bidirectional links between conflict behaviors in the various systems that compose the child's social world and are the first to demonstrate how culture provides the overarching envelop for their specific expressions.

The final study goal was to examine predictors of toddler aggression in the two cultures. Results point to three factors that may place children at a higher risk for the development of aggressive behavior: marital hostility, coparental undermining, and ineffective discipline. The effects of marital hostility on children's behavior problems and social maladjustment have been well documented (Katz & Woodin, 2002). To date, no observational study has shown such effects in an Arab society, and the present findings indicate that even under conditions of extended family dwelling, where the impact of the nuclear family may be less central, marital hostility still has a toxic effect on toddlers' proneness to aggression. Similarly, numerous studies point to the impact of the parents' warm-control discipline on child socialization, self-regulation, and adaptation, and the present findings demonstrate such links in the patriarchal Palestinian society that stresses child obedience and places less importance on affective expression. Finally, the parents' support of each other in their parenting role has been shown to promote adjustment, and the findings prove the validity of such effects even in a society guided by traditional gender roles and strong paternal control. These predictors provide support for the hypothesis that the mechanisms of participation and observation each play a role in children's socialization and indicate that in both groups the experiences children observe (marital hostility) and participate (ineffective discipline) contribute both independently and cumulatively to aggressive behavior. The findings also accord with cultural theories of the family (Kagitcibasi, 1996) and suggest that the negative and growth-promoting elements in the family context impact the child's social conduct regardless of the cultural ecology.

In addition to the shared predictors, culture-specific predictors were found that point to the role of conflict resolution tactics in the parent–child, marital, or peer contexts in buffering toddlers' aggression. For instance, parent–child compromise, marital empathy, and peer compromise were each related to lower aggressive behavior in Israeli toddlers. Similarly, the resolution of family conflict by consent predicted less aggression among Palestinian toddlers. These factors may provide "cultural pathways" (Greenfield Keller, Fuligni, & Maynard, 2003) to socialization by using the prevalent modes of behavior in each culture in the service of social growth.

Several limitations of the study are important to consider in the interpretation of the findings. The number of Christian families was very small and although no differences were found between Christians and Muslims, a larger sample of both groups may have revealed some differences. In addition, the issue of religiosity was not highlighted here, yet religion may have played a role in the parents' socialization practices and conflict-resolution tactics. The assessment of the sibling relationship was not within the scope of this article, but such data may have illuminated important aspects of the family ecology. Similarly, we observed only low-risk, educated families in the two cultures, and the study needs replication in other SES groups before its findings can be generalized.

Future research should follow parent–child, marital, and peer conflicts at different ages, cultures, and risk conditions. Much more research is required on the development of parenting behaviors, child socialization practices, marital patterns, and children's social–emotional outcomes in Arab societies in general and in the Palestinian society in particular. The manners in which parental socialization practices are rooted in the culture-specific beliefs and customs and the impact of the family's behavioral patterns, hierarchies, and belief systems on children's behavior within society at

large require much further research across a variety of cultures and family constellations. The development of gender roles and gender-specific behaviors in societies guided by traditional gender-role attitudes has similarly not been examined in detail. Finally, the meaning cultures attribute to the way differences are handled are among the most important topics developmental research should peruse in a world plagued by endless cycles of aggression between couples, within families, and among nations.

References

Abudabbeh, N. (1998). Counseling Arab-American families. In U. P. Gielen & A. L. Laura (Eds.), *The family and family therapy in international perspective* (pp. 115–126). Trieste, Italy: Edizioni Lint Trieste.

Amara, M., & Schnell, I. (2004). Identity repertoire among Arabs in Israel. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 3,* 175–193.

Asher, S. R., & Gottman, J. M. (1981). *The development of children's friendships.* New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Bauer, N. S., Herrenkohl, T. I., Lozano, P., Rivara, F. P., Hill, K. G., & Hawkins, J. D. (2006). Childhood bullying involvement and exposure to intimate partner violence. *Pediatrics, 118,* e235–e242.

Baumrind, D. (1973). The development of instrumental competence through socialization. In A. D. Pick (Ed.), *Minnesota Symposia on Child Psychology* (Vol. 7, pp. 3–46). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Belsky, J. (1981). Early human experience: A family perspective. *Developmental Psychology, 17,* 3–23.

Belsky, J., Crnic, K., & Gable, S. (1995). The determinants of coparenting in families with toddler boys: Spousal differences and daily hassles. *Child Development, 66,* 629–642.

Ben-Arieh, A., Khooury-Kassabri, M., & Haj-Yahia, M. M. (2006). Generational, ethnic, and national differences in attitudes toward the rights of children in Israel and Palestine. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 76,* 381–388.

Brett, J. M., Adair, W., Lempereur, A., Okumura, T., Shikhiru, P., Tinsley, C., & Lytle, A. (1998). Culture and joint gains in negotiation. *Negotiation Journal, 14,* 61–86.

Briggs, J. L. (1972). The issue of autonomy and aggression in the three-year-old: The Utku Eskimo case. *Seminars in Psychiatry, 4,* 317–329.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Crockenberg, S., & Langrock, A. (2001). The role of specific emotions in children's responses to interparental conflict: Test of the model. *Journal of Family Psychology, 15,* 163–182.

Cummings, E. M., & Davies, P. (1994). *Children and marital conflict: The impact of family and dispute resolution.* New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Darling, N., & Steinberg, L. (1993). Parenting style as context: An integrative model. *Psychological Bulletin, 113,* 487–496.

Davies, P. T., & Cummings, E. M. (1994). Marital conflict and child adjustment: An emotional security hypothesis. *Psychological Bulletin, 116,* 387–411.

Del Vecchio, T., & O'Leary, S. G. (2006). Antecedents of toddler aggression: Dysfunctional parenting in mother–toddler dyads. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology, 35,* 194–202.

Dhami, S., & Sheik, A. (2000). The Muslim family: Predicament and promise. *The Western Journal of Medicine, 173,* 352–356.

Dix, T. (1991). The affective organization of parenting: Adaptive and maladaptive processes. *Psychological Bulletin, 110,* 3–25.

Dwairy, M., & Van Sickle, T. D. (1996). Western psychotherapy in traditional Arabic societies. *Clinical Psychology Review, 16,* 231–249.

El-Islam, M. F. (1983). Cultural change and intergenerational relationships in Arabian families. *International Journal of Family Psychiatry, 4,* 321–329.

Elizur, Y., Spivak, A., Ofran, S., & Jacobs, S. (2007). A gender-moderated model of family relationships and adolescent adjustment. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology, 36,* 430–441.

Feinberg, M. E. (2002). Coparenting and prevention at the transition to parenthood. *Clinical Child and Family Psychology Review, 5,* 173–195.

Feldman, R., & Klein, P. S. (2003). Toddlers' self-regulated compliance with mother, caregiver, and father: Implications for theories of socialization. *Developmental Psychology, 39,* 680–692.

Feldman, R., & Masalha, S. (2007). The role of culture in moderating the links between early ecological risk and young children's adaptation. *Development and Psychopathology, 19,* 1–21.

Feldman, R., Masalha, S., & Alony, D. (2006). Micro-regulatory patterns of family interactions: Cultural pathways to toddlers' self-regulation. *Journal of Family Psychology, 20,* 614–623.

Feldman, R., Masalha, S., & Nadam, R. (2001). Cultural perspective on work and family: Dual-earner Israeli–Jewish and Arab families at the transition to parenthood. *Journal of Family Psychology, 15,* 492–509.

Feldman, R., Sussman, A. L., & Zigler, E. (2004). Paternal leave and work adaptation at the transition to parenthood: Individual, marital, and social correlates. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 25,* 459–549.

Frosch, C. A., & Mangelsdorf, S. C. (2001). Marital behavior, parenting behavior, and multiple reports of preschoolers' behavior problems: Mediation or moderation? *Developmental Psychology, 37,* 502–519.

Gordis, E. B., Margolin, G., & John, R. S. (2001). Parents' hostility in dyadic marital and triadic family settings and children's behavior problems. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 4,* 727–734.

Greenfield, P. M., Keller, H., Fuligni, A., & Maynard, A. (2003). Cultural pathways through universal development. *Annual Review of Psychology, 54,* 461–490.

Hastings, P. D., & Rubin, K. H. (1999). Predicting mothers' beliefs about preschool-aged children's social behavior: Evidence for maternal attitudes moderating child effects. *Child Development, 70,* 722–741.

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

Israel Central Bureau of Statistics. (2005). *Statistical abstracts of Israel.* Jerusalem, Israel: Keter Press.

Jenkins, J., Simpson, A., Dunn, J., Rasbash, J., & O'Connor, T. G. (2005). Mutual influence of marital conflict and children's behavior problems: Shared and nonshared family risks. *Child Development, 76,* 24–39.

Kagan, J. (2001). Biological constraint, cultural variety, and psychological structures. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, 935,* 177–190.

Kagitcibasi, C. (1996). *Family and human development across cultures: A view from the other side.* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Katz, L. F., & Gottman, J. M. (1996). Spillover effects of marital conflict: In search of parenting and coparenting mechanisms. *New Directions for Child Development, 74,* 57–76.

Katz, L. F., & Woodin, E. M. (2002). Hostility, hostile detachment, and conflict engagement in marriages: Effects on child and family functioning. *Child Development, 73,* 636–651.

Keenan, K., & Shaw, D. S. (1994). The development of aggression in toddlers: A study of low-income families. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 22,* 53–77.

LeVine, R. A. (1973). *Culture, behavior, and personality.* Chicago, IL: Aldine.

Loukas, A., Zucker, R. A., Fitzgerald, H. E., & Krull, J. L. (2003). Developmental trajectories of disruptive behavior problems among sons of alcoholics: Effects of parent psychopathology, family conflict, and child undercontrol. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 112,* 119–131.

Maccoby, E. E. (1992). The role of parents in the socialization of children: An historical perspective. *Developmental Psychology, 28,* 1006–1017.

Mar'i, S. K., & Mar'i, M. M. (1985). The role of women as change agents

in Arab society in Israel. In M. Shafir, M. S. Mednick, D. Izraeli, & J. Bernard (Eds.), *Women's worlds: From the new scholarship* (pp. 122–153). New York, NY: Praeger.

McHale, J. P. (1995). Coparenting and triadic interactions during infancy: The roles of marital distress and child gender. *Developmental Psychology, 31,* 985–996.

McHale, J. P., & Rasmussen, J. L. (1998). Coparental and family group-level dynamics during infancy: Early family precursors of child and family functioning during preschool. *Development and Psychopathology, 10,* 39–58.

Mesquita, B., & Fridga, N. (1992). Cultural variation in emotions: A review. *Psychological Bulleting, 112,* 179–204.

Minuchin, P. (1985). Families and individual development: Provocations from the field of family therapy. *Child Development, 56,* 289–302.

O'Leary, S. G., Slep, A. M., & Reid, M. J. (1999). A longitudinal study of mothers' overreactive discipline and toddlers' externalizing behavior. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 27,* 331–341.

Owen, M. T., & Cox, M. J. (1997). Marital conflict and the development of infant–parent attachment relationships. *Journal of Family Psychology, 11,* 152–164.

Pettit, G. S., & Bates, J. E. (1990). Describing family interaction patterns in early childhood: A "social events" perspective. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 11,* 395–418.

Rubin, K. H., Hastings, P., Chen, X., Stewart, S., & McNichol, K. (1998). Intrapersonal and maternal correlates of aggression, conflict, and externalizing problems in toddlers. *Child Development, 69,* 1614–1629.

Samovar, L., & Porter, R. (1994). *Intercultural communication: A reader.* Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Schneider, B. H., Attili, G., Nadel, J., & Weissberg, R. P. (Eds.). (1989). *Social competence in developmental perspective.* Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Kluwer.

Schwartz, D., Dodge, K. A., Pettit, G. S., & Bates, J. E. (1997). The early socialization of aggressive victims of bullying. *Child Development, 68,* 665–675.

Schwartz, D., Dodge, K. A., Pettit, G. S., Bates, J. E., & the Conduct Problems Prevention Research Group. (2000). Friendship as a moderating factor in the pathway between early harsh home environment and later victimization in the peer group. *Developmental Psychology, 36,* 646–662.

Seginer, R., Shoyer, S., Hossessi, R., & Tannous, H. (2007). Adolescent family and peer relationships: Does culture matter? *New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development, 116,* 83–99.

Smooha, S. (2004). Arab–Jewish relations in Israel as a deeply divided society. In A. Shapira (Ed.), *Israeli identity in transition* (pp. 31–67). New York, NY: Praeger.

Sturge-Apple, M. L., Davies, P. T., & Cummings, E. M. (2006). Hostility and withdrawal in marital conflict: Effects on parental emotional unavailability and inconsistent discipline. *Journal of Family Psychology, 2,* 227–238.

Suleiman, R., & Beit-Hallahmi, B. (1997). The structure of national and civic identities of Palestinians in Israel. *Journal of Social Psychology, 137,* 219–228.

Super, C. M., & Harkness, S. (1997). The cultural structuring of child development. In J. Berry, P. Dasen, & T. S. Saraswathi (Eds.), *Handbook of cross-cultural psychology: Vol. 2. Basic processes and developmental psychology* (2nd ed., pp. 1–39). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Tronick, E. Z., Thomas, R. B., & Daltabuit, M. (1994). The Quechua manta pouch: A caretaking practice for buffering the Peruvian infant against the multiple stressors of high altitude. *Child Development, 65,* 1005–1013.

Webster-Stratton, C., & Hammond, M. (1999). Marital conflict management skills, parenting style, and early-onset conduct problems: Processes and pathways. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 40,* 917–927.

Weisfeld, G. E. (1990). Sociobiological patterns of Arab culture. *Ethnology & Sociobiology, 11,* 23–49.

Williams, S. T., Ontai, L. L., & Mastergeorge, A. M. (2007). Reformulating infant and toddler social competence with peers. *Infant Behavior & Development, 30,* 353–365.

Zahn-Waxler, C., Friedman, R. J., Cole, P. M., Mizuta, I., & Hiruma, N. (1996). Japanese and United States preschool children's responses to conflict and distress. *Child Development, 67,* 2462–2477.