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Introduction

Over the past 30 years there has been a surplus of research and scholarly arguments as to the applicability, function, and differential effects of parenting styles across cultures (Sorkhabi, 2005). Most of the debate has been specifically about Diane Baumrind’s theory of socialization (Baumrind, 1971, 1989) and whether the findings that support this theory within the United States can be replicated in cultures that are inherently different. Nowhere has this theory been put to more of a test than in China. Since the advent of the individualism and collectivism dialectic (Hofstede, 1980; Triandis, 1989), China has come to the forefront as a major center of cross-cultural research. Individualism is an emphasis on personal goals, autonomy, self-fulfillment, and one’s needs over the needs of in-groups such as family, friends, community, or work organization. Collectivism is marked by an increased importance of in-group needs over those of the individual. This study will attempt to add to the empirical data on the effects of parenting styles on the subjective well-being of mainland Chinese college students while accounting for confounding variables that have been mainly neglected in the existing literature.

Literature Review

Parenting Styles

In her seminal work, Baumrind (1971, 1989) enunciated the authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive parenting style typologies. Each of these parenting styles comprises a large array of parental behaviors, expectations, and emotional qualities such as maturity demands, communication styles, nurturance, warmth, and involvement (Darling & Steinberg, 1993; Peterson & Hann, 1999). The authoritative style generally refers to a democratic manner of interaction in which the parent maintains a balance between showing love and affection while setting firm boundaries. The end result of this manner of parenting leads to reciprocity, mutual
understanding, and flexibility within the parent-child relationship, enabling the parent to balance the broader goal of socialization with the capabilities, needs, and goals of the individual child (Sorkhabi, 2005). In contrast, an authoritarian parenting style consists of high levels of control and inflexibility maintained through high amounts of directives, verbal hostility and corporal punishment. Authoritarian parents expect their children to acquiesce to their demands without explanation or negotiation while neglecting to account for their children’s developmental needs and capabilities (Sorkhabi, 2005). Permissive parenting is marked by low levels of behavioral control in which children are provided few rules, restrictions, or limits. Considerable research within the United States and other westernized countries has shown that of the three parenting styles, authoritative parenting most often leads to more positive child and adolescent outcomes such as greater academic achievement, self-esteem, psychological competence, adaptive functioning, self-reliance, and adjustment (Carlson, Uppal, & Prosser, 2000; Dornbusch, Ritter, Leiderman, Roberts, & Fraleigh, 1987; Furnham & Cheng, 2000; Lamborn, Mounts, Steinberg, & Dornbusch, 1991; Steinberg, Elmen, & Mounts, 1989; Steinberg, Lamborn, Darling, Mounts, & Dornbusch, 1994). While these concepts appear to have considerable validity and empirical support within the United Stated and other westernized cultures, the picture is less clear when attempting to replicate these findings with children growing up in other cultures, especially those considered more collectivistic.

**Parenting Style Outcomes in Asian Cultures**

Parenting goes beyond simply providing warmth and structure. Inherent in all parenting is a greater context where the specific actions parents take towards their children become the primary agents of socialization, with the implicit goal of transmitting cultural values and norms required for attainment of cultural standards of adult competence (Benedict, 1934; Chao & Tseng,
Therefore, parenting behaviors can have different meanings and lead to different outcomes depending on the surrounding cultural milieu. Because Baumrind’s (1971, 1989) parenting styles have been developed and empirically supported within the individualist context of the United States and other mainly Caucasian, westernized nations, some researchers are doubtful they maintain validity under different circumstances.

One of the most consistent findings in parenting style research across cultures is that Asian-American parents tend to be more authoritarian than European-American parents (Dornbusch et al., 1987; Kawamura, Frost, & Marmatz, 2002; Lin & Fu, 1990; Pong, Hao, & Gardner, 2005; Steinberg, Dornbusch, & Brown, 1992). Asian immigrant parents have also been found to be more reluctant to share decision-making with their children (Kao, 2004), and both foreign-born Chinese adolescents and native-born adolescents with Chinese parents have been found to be significantly more likely to rate their parents as authoritarian when compared to European-American adolescents (Chao, 2001). This finding was also true when only comparing native Chinese adolescents in Hong Kong and European-American adolescents in the United States (Leung, Lau, & Lam, 1998), which rules out the confounding effects of acculturation.

Accompanying these findings is inconsistent evidence that more authoritarian parenting styles lead to expected negative outcomes. Some research has supported the negative relationship between authoritarian parenting and academic success for European-American adolescents, but not among Asian-American adolescents (Dornbusch et al., 1987; Steinberg et al., 1992). Foreign-born Chinese adolescents with authoritative parents were found to perform no better in school than their Chinese peers with authoritarian parents (Chao, 2001). Furthermore, a study conducted in Hong Kong not only found that the authoritative style was unrelated to academic achievement, but that an authoritarian parenting style was positively related to higher grades.
Providing support for this finding, researchers conducting another study in Hong Kong found through the use of parental report measures that both authoritative and authoritarian parenting styles were unrelated to academic performance, and more interestingly, that parents who were more authoritative were less encouraging of their children’s autonomy (McBride-Chang & Chang, 1998). Some researchers have reacted to these findings by broadly claiming that, “the beneficial effects of authoritative parenting do not seem to be found among families of Chinese descent” (Chao & Tseng, 2002, p. 86), and that the parenting styles defined by Baumrind are ethnocentric (Chao, 1994). Chao and Sue (1996) went even further in recommending that these constructs should not be used to predict Chinese students’ achievement.

These assertions, however, appear to be premature as research findings with Chinese participants have been far from conclusive. In a sample of second grade children in Beijing, Chen, Dong, and Zhou (1997) found that authoritarian parenting was associated positively with aggression and negatively with peer acceptance, sociability-competence, distinguished studentship, and school academic achievement. They also found that authoritative parenting was positively associated with social and school adjustment and negatively with general adjustment problems. It is important to note that these findings were obtained when using teacher and peer assessments and official school records of academic and social functioning rather than only parent or student reports. Utilizing official school rankings rather than self-reported grade point averages, McBride-Chang and Chang (1998) found that Baumrind’s parenting styles were predictive of academic achievement in a sample of adolescents (aged 12-20) in Hong Kong. In this same sample they found that Chinese parents with children in more academically competitive schools rated themselves significantly lower on authoritarian and significantly higher on authoritative parenting style than did parents with children in lower quality schools.
Another study conducted in Beijing with adolescents aged 12 to 19 found that the parenting dimensions of support, monitoring, and autonomy granting were positively associated with academic orientation and effort (Supple, Peterson, & Bush, 2004).

There are important differences between these studies in support of Baumrind’s parenting styles relating to academic functioning and those providing disparate evidence. All three of these studies used a sample from either Beijing or Hong Kong, which rules out any of the confounding effects of immigration and acculturation. Secondly, Sorkhabi (2005) proposed that the cultural differences found by researchers who used self-report methods to obtain academic information (as opposed to objective measures such as official school rankings) may be due to a social desirability bias. Children growing up in highly collectivistic cultures may be highly sensitive to external evaluation, especially in the realm of academic achievement. To further illustrate this point, in Chao’s (2001) sample, the range of reported grade point average was truncated for the Chinese adolescents as compared to the European-American adolescents. A final important differentiation is that the studies in support of Baumrind’s parenting styles were obtained using an emic as opposed to an etic approach (Sorkhabi, 2005). Examining the effects of parenting style at the level of individual differences as opposed to cross-cultural, group differences appears to provide clearer proof of the applicability of Baumrind’s parenting styles in Chinese populations.

Increasing amounts of research using Chinese participants has looked past academic achievement and demonstrated that, when using a within-culture design, parenting style does make a significant difference across a number of psychosocial domains. Chinese immigrant mothers of preschoolers were found to strongly endorse the authoritative parenting style, and this style of parenting predicted increased behavioral/attention regulation abilities in the children,
CHINESE PARENTING AND FILIAL PIETY

which then predicted decreased teacher rated child difficulties (Cheah, Leung, Tahseen, & Schultz, 2009). Zhou, Eisenberg, Wang, and Reiser (2004) found that authoritarian parenting and the specific dimensions of verbal hostility and corporal punishment were associated with lowered ability to engage in self-control and increased propensity for anger and frustration in a sample of seven to eight-year-old children in Beijing. In a mixed Chinese and Malay sample in Singapore, adolescents who perceived their parents to be authoritative were more confident in their abilities, better adjusted socially, and more competent (Ang, 2006). A group of studies (Bush, Peterson, Cobas, & Supple, 2002; Kim & Ge, 2000; Lau & Cheung, 1987; Stewart, Bond, Abdullah, & Ma, 2000) conducted in China, Hong Kong, Bangladesh, India, and North America (with Chinese immigrants) supported the notion that adolescents’ reports of restricting and dominating control, harsh discipline, and parental punitiveness were positively related to negative adolescent outcomes including depressive symptoms and lower self-esteem. On the other hand, parental harshness in South Asian Canadian families was negatively related to child aggression when measured by teacher report (Ho, Bluestein, & Jenkins, 2008). These more recent findings echo the same disparate outcomes, which seems to only add to the confusion of how parenting styles affect Chinese children and adolescents. Even in light of conflicting evidence, there is support for the validity of Baumrind’s theory of socialization in the Chinese population. What has yet to be determined is what, besides social desirability bias, is accounting for the inconsistency.

Inconsistent Sample Populations

The dichotomy of individualism and collectivism has often been used as a proxy for examining the cross-cultural validity of parenting styles, with the United States representing an individualistic culture and all other Asian nations representing collectivistic cultures. The
lumping of all Asian (and non-Western) cultures in with each other could be the source of considerable measurement variance. Peterson and colleagues (2005), in reference to inconsistent research findings, suggested that, “general efforts to classify the socialization patterns of particular cultures as either collectivistic or individualistic may be too simplistic for the complex realities of social life” (p. 557). Therefore, aggregating multiple cultures into the same sample pool would inevitably lead to inconsistent findings. Until differences between collectivistic cultures can be identified and accounted for, broad labels such as collectivistic or individualistic may be invalid in reference to specific activities such as parenting behaviors.

Some researchers suggest this may even be true for combining findings from mainland China and Hong Kong, two areas that are very geographically close to each other. Due to Hong Kong being a “westernized” metropolitan area, the Chinese individuals living there may have a greater orientation towards Western values than Chinese living in the mainland (Cheung & Lau, 1985). It has therefore been hypothesized that, when compared to adolescents from mainland China, adolescents from Hong Kong may be more interested in pursuing autonomy and individualistic activities (Cheung & Lau, 1985; Yau & Smetana, 1996). Researchers must be careful about making broad statements about Chinese culture when using Chinese populations in Hong Kong, Singapore, Taiwan, and the United States. The research on the applicability of Baumrind’s parenting styles to Chinese families has provided very mixed findings, and this problem is only compounded by the fact that little data has actually been collected in mainland China (Bush et al., 2002). Definitive statements about Chinese parenting can only be made when there is greater cultural specificity in sample populations. This would rule out the variability in socioeconomic factors, differences in parenting of mothers and fathers, intergenerational
differences in fulfillment of filial obligation, and differential parental expectations for boys and girls that exist when blending all sects of Chinese culture together (Chao & Tseng, 2002).

**Structural Differences in Chinese Parenting**

In reaction to evidence that authoritative and authoritarian parenting styles yielded different outcomes for Asian and Asian-American children, some researchers proposed a completely different, culturally specific conceptualization of parenting. Chao (1994) argued that Baumrind’s parenting styles do not adequately capture Chinese parenting. Instead there are more indigenous concepts such as jiao xun (教训), translated as “to train” or “to lecture,” and guan (管), translated as “to govern” or “to care for” in a positive way. A Chinese parent practicing jiao xun will, “pay special attention to training children to adhere to socially desirable and culturally approved behavior” (Wu & Tseng, 1985, p. 11). Guan is synonymous with firm control and governance of the child, which includes parental care, concern, and involvement (Tobin, Wu, & Davidson, 1989). Both ideas stem from Confucian philosophy, summarized by Bond and Hwang (1986) as having the three essential aspects of personal definition through relationships with others, hierarchically structured relationships, and honoring the requirements and responsibilities of these relationships in order to obtain social order and harmony. Therefore, subordinate members in interpersonal relationships (e.g., children in relation to their parents, a worker to their boss) must show loyalty and respect to senior members. In reciprocity, senior members have the ultimate responsibility of teaching and disciplining subordinate members.

Jiao xun and guan are similar to authoritarian parenting in that they embody a strict standard of conduct enforced by parents. However, the Chinese concepts include explaining, listening, and providing emotional support, facets which are absent from authoritarian parenting (Chao, 1994). Also, the motivation behind jiao xun and guan includes the greater goal of
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assuring the familial and societal goals of harmonious relations with others and the integrity of the family unit (Lau & Cheung, 1987). This differs from the punitive nature of authoritarian parenting.

There has been mixed empirical evidence in support of jiao xun and guan. In a sample of immigrant Chinese mothers from Taiwan and American mothers, Chao (1994) found that after matching the groups on authoritarian scores there were still differences between the groups on Chinese parenting concepts with Chinese mothers demonstrating a higher level of maternal involvement for promoting success, being the sole or central caretaker of the child, and having the child physically close to the mother by sleeping with the mother. In a later study more Chinese than European-American parents endorsed the indigenous Chinese concepts of training (Chao, 2000). However, for both ethnic groups parents that utilized the Chinese concept of training also valued the notion of filial piety, a Chinese cultural tenet that emphasizes respect for authority and hierarchical interpersonal relationships. This unexpected finding was replicated with a group of Hong Kong and English mothers where filial piety and academic achievement was associated with authoritarian parenting (Pearson & Rao, 2003). Implicit in the definition of guan and jiao xun is that higher levels of these parenting practices are associated with positive outcomes for children. However, the Chinese concept of training was unrelated to the official school rankings of children, adolescents, and young adults in Hong Kong (McBride-Chang & Chang, 1998). These findings question that the concept of Chinese training is different from filial piety, and that it is a more valid predictor of outcomes in Chinese populations than Baumrind’s parenting styles.

When defining Baumrind’s parenting styles in terms of warmth, acceptance, and dominating control, Stewart, McBride-Chang, Fielding, Deeds, and Westrick (1998) found that,
in a sample of Hong Kong adolescents, Chinese training items significantly overlapped with warmth and did not have any independent predictive power beyond the dimensions of warmth and control. Another study found that Chinese training only accounted for unique variance in relationship harmony above warmth and dominating control, and not for self-esteem or life-satisfaction (Stewart, Rao, et al., 1998). This is further confounded by the finding that Chinese parenting beliefs were positively related to both authoritative and authoritarian parenting in a sample of Taiwanese mothers (Chen & Luster, 2002). Therefore, the concepts of authoritative and authoritarian parenting styles may be simply aggregated in the concept of Chinese training. Combining positive and negative aspects on the same scale would result in a loss of predictive power, which has been born out in the literature.

The aforementioned findings suggest Baumrind’s parenting styles and Chinese training may not be mutually exclusive. Wu et al. (2002) found commonalities between United States and Chinese samples in the basic structure of authoritative and authoritarian parenting, but also found that the American parents endorsed such Chinese parenting concepts as encouragement of modesty, sharing, maternal involvement, and protection. Furthermore, in a sample of children and mothers in Beijing and Shanghai, data supported the notion that Chinese parents can be characterized along the terms of authoritative and authoritarian (Chen et al., 2000). Throwing out these concepts and replacing them with Chinese training appears to be premature. Although Baumrind’s parenting styles may not map on to Chinese parents the same way they do with European-American parents, that does not mean that they should be precluded from examining child outcomes in Chinese families. Only using Chinese training may provide weaker predictive power than further analyzing the how specific components of Baumrind’s parenting styles function in a Chinese context.
Gender Differences in Parents and Children

Although there has been a considerable amount of research examining the effects of parenting style on a number of outcomes, less attention has been paid to the role gender plays in the paradigm. Crouter and Head (2002) remarked that

it is so unfortunate that so many studies fail to distinguish between maternal and paternal monitoring or knowledge. Much of what we know about parental monitoring blurs the identity of the parents by referring not to mothers and fathers, but to generic ‘parents.’ (p.474)

This same problem exists in the parenting style literature. Williams and Kelly (2005) opined that, “despite the persistent influence of parent-child relational processes on adolescent adjustment and behavioral outcomes, little is known about the differential roles that mothers and fathers play during adolescent development” (p. 171). This glaring omission prevents a true understanding of how parenting practices affect children. The few studies that have explicitly examined gender provide mixed results, with some finding a main effect of adolescent gender, an interaction effect of adolescent and parent gender in the perceptions of parenting characteristics, or no gender differences at all (Shek, 2000). In order to close this gap in the literature researchers have called for the consideration of gender differences in parent-adolescent communication (Youniss & Ketterlinus, 1987) and the parent-adolescent relationship (Youniss & Smollar, 1985). The same considerations should be made in the parenting style research.

With the little that is known about both parental gender differences and adolescent gender differences in the parenting style research, even less is known about how these variables influence functioning within Chinese families (Shek, 2000). The separation of mothers and
fathers in any research examining parental influences on children and adolescents is vitally important because Chinese fathers and mothers differ in terms of their socialization responsibilities (Shek, 2002a). These differences have been exemplified by the common Chinese sayings “yan fu ci mu,” meaning strict father, kind mother (Ho, 1987; Wilson, 1974), and “ci mu duo bai er” (a fond mother spoils the son), which still apply in contemporary Chinese culture (Shek, 2007). The traditional Chinese family unit also includes rigidly defined gender roles within the family (Shek, 2005) and emphasis on the father-son relationship as more important than other relationships (Shek, 2007).

There has been sparse and inconsistent research into the differential roles of Chinese fathers and mothers. Chinese fathers have been described as remote and severe towards their children after the early childhood years (Berndt, Cheung, Lau, Hau, & Lew, 1993; Ho, 1987, 1989). Additional research has found that Chinese fathers are more likely to use severe discipline with their sons, and less likely to do so with their daughters (Wu, 1996). The same research found that Chinese mothers were more likely to use verbal threats with sons than daughters. In a study on research and negotiation about child responsibility with families in Beijing, Bowes, Chen, San, and Yuan (2004) found that fathers were more sympathetic to negotiation from their 10-year-old sons than their 10-year-old daughters in relation to schoolwork that needed to be completed before chores. Fathers were also more likely to say “you should do this because you are a boy,” and displayed a greater willingness to relax rules for boys. Chinese fathers have also generally been found to be both less involved (Shek, 2000) and more influential on family functioning (Shek, 2001). In a sample of Chinese and Malay adolescents in Singapore, Ang (2006) found that adolescents who perceived their father as authoritative scored significantly lower on the sense of inadequacy scale of the Behavior...
Assessment System for Children (BASC; Reynolds & Kamphaus, 1992) than those who viewed their father as authoritarian or permissive. Adolescents’ perspective of their mother’s parenting style was not associated with any outcome variables for the Chinese participants. Across all outcome variables, adolescents’ perception of the parenting styles of fathers influenced outcomes more strongly than did adolescents’ perception of the parenting styles of mothers. Another study separating female and male adolescents found that fathers exerted influence on the existential well-being and delinquency of boys, but not girls, while mothers were influential in the mental health and problem behavior indicators of girls, but not boys (Shek, 2005). These assorted findings support the need to include both parents, and to separate fathers and mothers in any analyses of parenting styles and adolescent outcomes. It is also apparent that the independent parenting processes of Chinese mothers and fathers are far from completely understood.

Male and female adolescents also differ in their role within Chinese families, and therefore their varying perspectives may influence how parenting styles lead to specific outcomes. In traditional Chinese culture sons had to honor the family name, which resulted in a parental focus on achievement (Shek, 2007). Parental expectations for daughters were mainly focused on chastity as virginity was an important value for the family. As China has become increasingly modernized the social fabric has changed. Wu (1996) suggested that the current one-child policy may be increasing the tendency for urban Chinese families to consider males and females in a similar way, especially in regard to education. Studies have found that Chinese parents are more likely to use corporal punishment to discipline males, but use less harsh measures with females (Ho, 1986, 1987). While Chinese parents may act differently towards their children based on their gender, the child’s perception of this behavior may provide the most meaningful information. In a study examining the perceptions of Hong Kong Chinese
adolescents of their parents’ behavior, Shek (2000) found numerous differences across gender. Male adolescents perceived more parental harshness than did female adolescents, with fathers being rated as more harsh overall than mothers by both sexes. Male and female adolescents perceived their mothers to be more responsive than fathers, and viewed their mothers in a more positive light. Both groups of adolescents perceived fathers to be less demanding, and female adolescents perceived mothers to be more demanding than did male adolescents.

In another study of Hong Kong adolescents, Shek (2007) found that Hong Kong Chinese adolescents perceived fathers to have lower parental behavioral control, psychological control, parental control defined by indigenous Chinese concepts, and poorer parent-child relational qualities. Relative to females, Chinese male adolescents perceived higher parental behavioral control, higher psychological control, and lower parent-child relational qualities. Female Chinese adolescents perceived higher parental demandingness. Another study conducted in mainland China with 448 senior high school students examined perceived parenting behaviors and their effects on the subjective well-being of adolescent males and females (Yang, Wang, Li, Teng, & Ren, 2008). Fathers’ positive rearing behaviors were found to be predictive of male adolescents’ subjective well-being, while only maternal punishment could predict the same outcome. Results were less conclusive for female adolescents, as neither paternal nor maternal behaviors were significantly related to subjective well-being. Although these reported findings range across a number of parenting behaviors and adolescent outcomes, they all provide evidence that gender is a substantial factor that needs to be accounted for in any study on parenting styles.
Filial Piety

Parenting styles do not occur within a vacuum, which explains the need to examine these behaviors in different cultural milieus. Within the Chinese family constellation no concept exerts greater influence than the Confucian tenet of filial piety (Ho, 1996; Yeh & Bedford, 2003). Also commonly known as family obligation, filial piety involves the support, assistance, and respect that children are obliged to provide their elder family members, especially parental figures (Bond & Hwang, 1986; Fuligni, 1998; Fuligni, Tseng, & Lam, 1999; Fuligni & Zhang, 2004; Ho, 1994; Uba, 1994). Inherent in filial piety is an emphasis on parental authority, hierarchical relationships, and maintaining connectedness to the family (Bond & Hwang, 1986; Ho, 1994). This cultural value is, “conveyed to children by parents and other socialization agents on a regular and consistent basis” (Juang & Cookston, 2009, p. 396).

Filial piety itself has been correlated to numerous outcome variables. In a study of Chinese adolescents in mainland China, Cheung and Lau (1985) found that self-esteem was positively correlated with clearer organization of family responsibilities and a higher moral and religious emphasis on family values. It is possible that these adolescents experienced higher self-esteem because there was a higher degree of concordance between family characteristics and the greater socio-cultural message of filial piety. Family obligation has also been found to correlate with closer family relationships and greater academic achievement (Fuligni et al., 1999; Fuligni & Zhang, 2004). While filial piety is significantly correlated with many of the same outcome variables as parenting styles, little is known how the two interact in leading to these outcomes.

Filial piety informs parenting goals and values, which are hypothesized to be antecedents of parenting and the child’s willingness to be socialized (Shek, 2002a). With immediate families
taking the role of the main social agent influencing adolescent development (Steinberg, Dornbusch, & Brown, 1992), understanding adolescents’ perceptions of cultural messages may provide insight into how and why adolescents react positively or negatively to specific parenting behaviors. Wong, Leung, and McBride-Chang (2010) found that filial piety was a moderator between perceived maternal control and mother-adolescent relationship quality in a group of Hong Kong adolescents. For adolescents holding stronger beliefs in filial piety, higher maternal control was positively correlated with perceived maternal support. This relationship was not found in adolescents who scored low on a measure of filial piety. The relationship between maternal control and mother-adolescent conflict was also lower in adolescents with higher levels of filial piety. Drawing from these findings, the authors hypothesized that, “some aspects of strictness and control, which may be perceived as domination, hostility, or mistrust in western culture, may then be viewed as concern and caring by the Asian child” (p. 197). There also appears to be significant differences between Chinese adolescents depending on their perceptions of filial piety. A glaring omission in this study is the inclusion of Chinese fathers, which leaves open the possibility that filial piety may function differently in relation to male and female adolescents’ perceptions of their father’s behavior.

The previous study supports the notion that children can interpret a wide array of parenting behaviors as having different affective meanings (Mason, Walker-Barnes, Tu, Simons, & Martinez-Arrue, 2004), leading to different outcomes stemming from the same parenting behaviors. If parenting behaviors originate in cultural values and goals then adolescents’ individual value systems need to be accounted for as a moderating variable between parenting behaviors and psychosocial outcomes. Assessing for Chinese adolescents’ opinions of filial piety could explain how the same parenting behaviors lead to differential outcomes.
Assessing Parenting Behaviors from the Child’s Perspective

There are special considerations that need to be taken into account when using adolescent perspectives on parenting behaviors. Before leaving for college adolescents are still dependent on their parents for support and care, but at the same time they may start to seek autonomy and independence (Wong, Leung, & McBride-Chang, 2010). This may increase the salience of parenting control and possibly lead to more negative perceptions as compared to younger children (Alessandri & Wozniak, 1989; Feldman & Gehring, 1988). However, some studies have shown that age was unrelated to perceived parenting characteristics (Shek, 2002b).

Adolescents’ perspectives of parenting behaviors may be more valid than those of younger children because, “a certain level of emotional and relational maturity is necessary for individuals to reflect on and gain insight toward their family dynamics” (Park, Kim, Chiang, & Ju, 2010, p. 67). This level of maturity may also be needed when examining attitudes towards cultural values. In fact, the many psychosocial changes that occur during adolescence may be the optimal time to study emerging value systems and how they interact with parenting behaviors to affect psychological well-being (Feldman, Mont-Reynaud, & Rosenthal, 1992). Taking these factors into consideration, adolescent perceptions of filial piety and parenting behaviors have the potential to provide valid and meaningful information about how these factors affect overall psychological well-being.

Boundary of Adolescence and College-Age in Chinese Culture

Although the vast majority of research on parenting styles has been focused on children from infancy up until adolescence, it is debatable at which age this research no longer applies, especially when differing cultural milieus are taken into consideration. In the United States there is a marked boundary between the developmental stages of adolescence and college-age, with
several federal laws denoting 18 as the year in which individuals obtain the right to vote and the right to serve in the military, an age that not coincidentally coincides with the age that most Americans begin college. However, this clear demarcation of 18 as the threshold of adulthood is not necessarily true in other cultures, such as in China.

In fact, several studies on Chinese populations conducted by Chinese researchers both in the United States and in Hong Kong have lumped adolescent and college-age participants together when examining adolescent phenomena. In their study on suicidality in Chinese adolescents, Chan et al. (2009) utilized a sample in Hong Kong with participants ranging from ages 15 to 19. The authors explained the selection of this age range as a differentiation between this group of adolescents and a larger group of 20-56 year old individuals who they termed as the working-age subgroup. They did not explain whether college students ages 20 or older were also considered working-age, as they are technically students and not officially in the workforce. Lim, Yeh, Liang, Lau, and McCabe (2009) were more specific in their reasoning for choosing a sample of participants ranging from 12-23 years of age when studying acculturation gaps and parent-adolescent conflict for Chinese-Americans. The authors stated the following:

Adolescence is commonly seen as the transitional period between puberty and adulthood in human development. In Chinese families, it is culturally appropriate for their youth to be dependent on their families while they are still unmarried, especially if they are still in school…Although such an inclusion criteria involves an age range encompassing various developmental issues…all of the youth…may be characterized as being adolescents based on the cultural context of Chinese families. (p. 90)

Finally, as to the applicability of parenting style research and outcomes to college students, this age population has been used in published research examining parenting styles and
family conflict (Park, Kim, Chiang, & Ju, 2010). It is therefore both culturally acceptable and empirically valid to utilize Chinese college-age students when examining the effects on parent behaviors on psychosocial outcomes.

**Hypotheses**

There is little definitive information about how the differential aspects of parenting measured by the Parent Behavior Measure (Bush et al., 2002) will affect psychological outcomes such as psychological well-being. Therefore, all hypotheses about the relationship between the aspects and psychological well-being will follow Baumrind’s (1971, 1989) theory. Parental support, positive induction, involvement, and monitoring will all be positively related to psychological well-being, while parental punitiveness, permissiveness, guilt induction, and love withdrawal will be negatively related to psychological well-being. There is no prior research examining how these variables are different across parent-child dyads. It is hypothesized that in all parent-child dyads filial piety will account for unique variance in all parenting behaviors in relation to psychological well-being. The final hypothesis is that filial piety will be a moderator between all parenting behaviors and psychological well-being for all parent-child dyads.

**Method**

**Participants**

A total of 282 undergraduate college students (115 males and 167 females) from Nanjing University, located in Nanjing, China, participated in the present study. Participants were recruited in English classes, which are mandatory for all students attending this institution, regardless of major. Of these participants, there were 85 (51 male and 34 female) who chose to exit the survey before completing any questions about the dependent variables. Therefore, these participants were subsequently dropped from further data analysis.
Demographic characteristics of the remaining sample of 197 participants (64 males and 133 females) are presented in Table 1. The average age of participants was 20.63 (SD = 1.51) for females and 20.39 (SD = 1.14) for males.

Procedure

Following Institutional Board approval, participants were recruited from a list-serve obtained from the vice-dean of the Department of Applied Foreign Languages, which is responsible for providing English language courses to all the students in Nanjing University. Participants were then sent an e-mail from the primary researcher, in which they were asked to participate in a study examining the interaction of parenting styles and culture (see Appendix A). If they chose to participate in the study, the participants then clicked on a hyperlink included in the e-mail which took them to the actual survey. All surveys were completed online utilizing Survey Monkey.

Measures

Demographic Questionnaire. Participants filled out a brief demographics questionnaire. This included questions about age, mother and father education level, mother and father estimated yearly income, and number of siblings. These are contextual factors found to be significantly predictive of parenting styles in Taiwanese mothers (Chen & Luster, 2002).

Parent Behavior Measure. The Parent Behavior Measure is a 34-item self-report scale that measures adolescents’ perceptions of paternal and maternal support, positive induction, permissiveness, guilt induction, involvement, monitoring, punitiveness, and love withdrawal (Bush et al., 2002). This differentiation of parenting behaviors was based on prior research (Henry & Peterson, 1995; Peterson, Rollins, & Thomas, 1985; Peterson, Bush, & Supple, 1999). All items are rated on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from “strongly agree” to “strongly disagree.”
This scale was used in a recent study of adolescents in Beijing (Bush et al., 2002). The reported alpha coefficients for these scales in the Beijing sample ranged from .71 to .87. The researchers of the present study were unable to find the Chinese version of the Parent Behavior Measure. This scale was therefore forward and backward translated to Chinese by two native Chinese translators independently. Translations were then compared to resolve any disagreements.

Filial Piety Scale. The Filial Piety Scale was a self-report measure originally developed by Yang, Yeh, and Huang (1989) in Chinese. The full version consists of four subscales, named “show respect for your parents,” “self-oppression and complying with parents,” “protection of family honor,” and “ancestral worship and support.” These four subscales total 52 items. For this study the “ancestral worship and support” scale was omitted because its items assess how individuals would repay or worship parents if they pass away, which are less appropriate for late adolescents. One item asking about the relationship with one’s spouse in front of parents was also dropped due to similar concerns. The remaining 41 items were combined for an overall measure of filial piety. Each question was answered on a four-point Likert scale ranging from 0 representing “not important at all” to 3 representing “absolutely important.” A recent study using the same pared-down version of the scale with seventh grade Chinese adolescents obtained an internal consistency value of .93 (Wong, Leung, & McBride-Chang, 2010).

The Mastery Scale. Shek (1999, 2003, 2004, 2005) developed this 7-item scale for use in Chinese speaking populations. It was modeled after the original scale developed by Pearlin and Schooler (1978). It measures a person’s sense of control of his or her life. In a recent study with Chinese adolescents in Hong Kong, Shek (2007) reported adequate internal consistency ($\alpha = .77-.79$). In this same study, the Mastery Scale was completed by the same participants twice.
with a year between administrations. A Pearson correlation analysis yielded a medium effect size \((r = .46, p < .01)\), indicating an acceptable coefficient of stability. Respondents indicated

Table 1

Demographic Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Male (N=64)</th>
<th>Females (N=133)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Father’s Yearly Income(^a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; ¥25000</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¥25001 - ¥50000</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¥50001 - ¥75000</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¥75001 - ¥100000</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; ¥100000</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother’s Yearly Income(^a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; ¥25000</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>45.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¥25001 - ¥50000</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¥50001 - ¥75000</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¥75001 - ¥100000</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; ¥100000</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father’s Education Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade School</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>41.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate School</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother’s Education Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade School</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate School</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Brothers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>87.1</td>
<td>83.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Sisters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td>83.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* \(^a\)Estimated yearly income is reported in Chinese Renminbi (¥)
whether they agreed or disagreed on a 6-point Likert scale, with higher scores indicating higher level of mastery. The researchers of the present study were unable to find the Chinese version of the Mastery Scale. This scale was therefore forward and backward translated to Chinese by two native Chinese translators independently. Translations were then compared to resolve any disagreements. This scale comprised one component of psychological well-being.

**Satisfaction with Life Scale.** The Satisfaction with Life Scale was originally developed by Diener, Emmons, Larsen, and Griffin (1985). The 5-item self-report measure was translated into Chinese and used in multiple studies (Shek, 2004, 2005). In a recent study with Hong Kong adolescents, Shek (2007) reported adequate internal consistency (α = .80-.84). In this same study, the Satisfaction with Life Scale was completed by the same participants twice with a year between administrations. A Pearson correlation analysis yielded a medium effect size (r = .44, p < .01), indicating an acceptable coefficient of stability. The items in the scale were rated on a 6-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly agree) to 6 (strongly disagree). A higher score indicates a higher level of life satisfaction. The Satisfaction with Life Scale was previously translated into Chinese and used in a number of different studies, and was therefore used in that form in this study. This scale comprised the second component of psychological well-being.

Participants completed all questionnaires in Chinese. Scores on the Satisfaction with Life Scale and the Mastery Scale were summed prior to any further statistical analysis.
Results

Statistical Analysis

The first step of the statistical analyses was to run correlations between all demographic variables and all test variables. Any demographic variables that were significantly correlated with psychological variables of interest were controlled for in subsequent analyses.

The next step was to conduct a series of multiple regression analyses within each parent-child dyad (mother-son, mother-daughter, father-son, father-daughter). The following steps were followed for each dyad. Subjective well-being variables were combined and served as the criterion variable. All continuous predictors were centered to reduce mathematically caused multi-collinearity. In step one of the multiple regression analysis the control variables were entered (demographic variables found to be significantly correlated, as stated above). Perceived parenting styles were entered in step two to determine their overall explanatory power. Filial piety was then entered in step three to test whether it explained any unique variance in the dependent variable after controlling for perceived parenting styles. In step four, perceived parenting style x filial piety was entered to determine whether filial piety moderated the association between perceived parenting style and subjective well-being.

If any perceived parenting style x filial piety interactions yielded significant effects, then they were further analyzed using separate regression analyses. The total filial piety score was rescaled into high filial piety and low filial piety, with the zero value for the scale at one standard deviation above and below the mean. Simple slope analysis was then performed to test the significance of the simple slopes of regression lines.

Prior to data analysis all data were screened for incomplete data, outliers, and normality. Several scales were found to be skewed and to have outliers. Square root corrections were made,
Table 2

Demographic Correlations for Male Participants (N=64)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Father’s Income</th>
<th>Mother’s Income</th>
<th>Father’s Education</th>
<th>Mother’s Education</th>
<th>Brothers</th>
<th>Sisters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subjective Well-Being</td>
<td>-112</td>
<td>.178</td>
<td>.288*</td>
<td>.222</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td>-.267*</td>
<td>-.174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filial Piety</td>
<td>-.066</td>
<td>-.190</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>-.015</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>-.127</td>
<td>.187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal Support</td>
<td>.186</td>
<td>-.194</td>
<td>-.266*</td>
<td>-.211</td>
<td>-.271*</td>
<td>.272*</td>
<td>.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternal Support</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>-.017</td>
<td>-.093</td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td>.253*</td>
<td>-.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal Positive Induction</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>-.223</td>
<td>-.240</td>
<td>-.212</td>
<td>-.211</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>-.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternal Positive Induction</td>
<td>-.098</td>
<td>-.121</td>
<td>-.045</td>
<td>-.090</td>
<td>-.065</td>
<td>.303*</td>
<td>-.241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal Permissiveness</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>-.046</td>
<td>-.112</td>
<td>-.028</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternal Permissiveness</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>-.066</td>
<td>-.127</td>
<td>-.132</td>
<td>-.014</td>
<td>-.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal Punitiveness</td>
<td>-.026</td>
<td>-.079</td>
<td>-.098</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>-.000</td>
<td>-.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternal Punitiveness</td>
<td>-.063</td>
<td>-.069</td>
<td>-.041</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>-.005</td>
<td>-.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal Guilt Induction</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>-.232</td>
<td>-.152</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>-.145</td>
<td>-.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternal Guilt Induction</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>-.257</td>
<td>-.155</td>
<td>.165</td>
<td>-.018</td>
<td>-.023</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal Love Withdrawal</td>
<td>-.083</td>
<td>-.172</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>-.153</td>
<td>-.133</td>
<td>-.023</td>
<td>.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternal Love Withdrawal</td>
<td>-.152</td>
<td>-.205</td>
<td>-.014</td>
<td>-.068</td>
<td>-.095</td>
<td>-.065</td>
<td>.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal Involvement</td>
<td>.301*</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>-.398*</td>
<td>-.131</td>
<td>-.164</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>.097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternal Involvement</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>-.188</td>
<td>-.148</td>
<td>-.033</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>-.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternal Monitoring</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>-.075</td>
<td>-.140</td>
<td>-.200</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternal Monitoring</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>-.124</td>
<td>-.158</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>-.056</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *p < .05.
### Table 3

Demographic Correlations for Female Participants (N=133)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Father’s Income</th>
<th>Mother’s Income</th>
<th>Father’s Education</th>
<th>Mother’s Education</th>
<th>Brothers</th>
<th>Sisters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subjective Well-Being</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>.176*</td>
<td>-.047</td>
<td>-.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filial Piety</td>
<td>-.232*</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>.148</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>-.141</td>
<td>-.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal Support</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>-.073</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>-.058</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternal Support</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>-.085</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>-.236*</td>
<td>-.143</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal Positive Induction</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-.166</td>
<td>-.103</td>
<td>-.112</td>
<td>-.092</td>
<td>.203*</td>
<td>-.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternal Positive Induction</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>-.180*</td>
<td>-.207*</td>
<td>-.178*</td>
<td>-.104</td>
<td>-.185*</td>
<td>-.118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal Permissiveness</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>-.052</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>-.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternal Permissiveness</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>-.135</td>
<td>-.025</td>
<td>-.051</td>
<td>-.014</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>-.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal Punitiveness</td>
<td>-.132</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>-.033</td>
<td>-.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternal Punitiveness</td>
<td>-.041</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>-.030</td>
<td>-.019</td>
<td>-.059</td>
<td>-.038</td>
<td>.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal Guilt Induction</td>
<td>-.135</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>.229*</td>
<td>.202*</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>-.198*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternal Guilt Induction</td>
<td>-.044</td>
<td>.149</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>.253*</td>
<td>.200*</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>-.148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal Love Withdrawal</td>
<td>-.058</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>-.089</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>-.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternal Love Withdrawal</td>
<td>-.022</td>
<td>.178*</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>.179*</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>-.107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal Involvement</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>-.149</td>
<td>-.060</td>
<td>-.152</td>
<td>-.158</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternal Involvement</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>-.091</td>
<td>-.063</td>
<td>-.183*</td>
<td>-.197*</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>.114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal Monitoring</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>-.088</td>
<td>-.062</td>
<td>-.173</td>
<td>-.128</td>
<td>.170</td>
<td>.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternal Monitoring</td>
<td>-.042</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>-.046</td>
<td>-.159</td>
<td>-.072</td>
<td>.191*</td>
<td>.069</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. *p < .05.*
and after further analysis these scales no longer had any outliers nor were they positively or negatively skewed. Mahalanobis’ distance was also calculated for both the male and female samples. Three participants in the female sample and one in the male sample were found to be multivariate outliers and were subsequently deleted from further analysis.

Tables 2 and 3 present the correlational matrix between demographic variables and all tested variables for male and female participants, respectively. In the female sample, father’s income, mother’s income, father’s education, mother’s education, number of brothers, and number of sisters were significantly correlated to psychological variables of interest. In the male sample, age, mother’s education, mother’s income, and number of brothers were significantly correlated to psychological variables of interest. In the subsequent regression analyses these variables were entered in the first step in order to control for their effects.

A stepwise multiple regression was conducted to evaluate how well perceived paternal parenting behaviors and filial piety predict subjective well-being for female participants. The results of this regression are presented in Table 4. Assumptions were tested by examining a scatter diagram of residuals versus predicted residuals. No violations of normality, linearity, or homoscedasticity of residuals were detected. The demographic variables were not significant predictors of subjective well-being, $F(5, 114) = 1.00, p = \text{ns.}$ When paternal parenting behaviors were added into the regression, the equation accounted for 8% of variance, but it still did not significantly predict subjective well-being, $F(13, 106) = 1.08, p = \text{ns.}$ Adding filial piety into the regression equation also failed to account for a statistically significant amount of additional variance, $F(14, 105) = 1.00, p = \text{ns.}$ The filial piety x parenting behavior interaction terms were added to the regression in the final step. This final regression equation was not significant, $F(22,$
Table 4

**Multiple Regressions for Paternal Parenting Behaviors and Filial Piety for Female Participants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjective Well-Being</th>
<th>$R^2$ Change</th>
<th>$F$-Value</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$sp^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father’s Education</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father’s Income</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother’s Income</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Sisters</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$ Change</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Induction</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permissiveness</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punitiveness</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guilt Induction</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love Withdrawal</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$ Change</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filial Piety (FP)</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$ Change</td>
<td>&gt;.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support x FP</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Induction x FP</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permissiveness x FP</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punitiveness x FP</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guilt Induction x FP</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love Withdrawal x FP</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement x FP</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring x FP</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$ Change</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. *$p < .05$. 

$R^2$ = 1.07, $p$ = ns. Additionally, none of the t-tests for the individual interaction terms were significant.
Another stepwise multiple regression was conducted to evaluate how well perceived maternal parenting behaviors and filial piety predicted subjective well-being for female participants. The results of this regression are presented in Table 5. Assumptions were tested by examining a scatter diagram of residuals versus predicted residuals. No violations of normality, linearity, or homoscedasticity of residuals were detected. The demographic variables were not significant predictors of subjective well-being, $F(5, 115) = 1.02, p = \text{ns}$. When maternal parenting behaviors were added into the regression, the equation accounted for 14% of variance, but it still did not significantly predict subjective well-being, $F(13, 107) = 1.77, p = \text{ns}$. Upon examination of the t-tests of the individual variables, the t-test for maternal support was significant, $t(120) = -2.06, p < .05$. The t-test for maternal love withdrawal was also significant, $t(120) = -2.15, p < .05$. Adding filial piety into the regression equation also failed to account for a statistically significant amount of additional variance, $F(14, 106) = 1.69, p = \text{ns}$. The filial piety x parenting behavior interaction terms were added to the regression in the final step. This final regression equation was significant, $F(22, 98) = 1.82, p < .05$. Upon further examination, the t-test for the maternal monitoring x filial piety interaction term was significant, $t(120) = 2.59, p < .05$. None of the other t-tests were significant. A simple slope analysis was then conducted to examine the hypothesis that filial piety acts as a moderator between maternal monitoring and subjective well-being. Separate regression analyses were conducted for high filial piety (HFP) and low filial piety (LFP) using rescaled variables for filial piety, with the zero value for the
Table 5

Multiple Regressions for Maternal Parenting Behaviors and Filial Piety for Female Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjective Well-Being</th>
<th>$R^2$ Change</th>
<th>$F$-Value</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$sp^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father’s Education</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father’s Income</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother’s Income</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Sisters</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$ Change</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>-.18*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Induction</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permissiveness</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punitiveness</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guilt Induction</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love Withdrawal</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>-.19*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$ Change</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filial Piety (FP)</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$ Change</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support x FP</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Induction x FP</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permissiveness x FP</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punitiveness x FP</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guilt Induction x FP</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love Withdrawal x FP</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement x FP</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring x FP</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$ Change</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>1.82*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. *$p < .05$.

scale at one standard deviation above and below the mean (following Aiken & West, 1991; Cohen & Cohen, 1983). The simple slopes for the regressions of perceived maternal monitoring
at HFP and LFP were .02 ($p < .025$) and -.02 ($p < .025$), respectively. A graph was created to display this interaction effect. Filial piety and maternal monitoring were split into low and high groups, with the low groups consisting of all cases one standard deviation below the mean and lower, and the high groups consisting of all cases one standard deviation above the mean and higher. See Figure 1 for the pattern of results.
A third stepwise multiple regression was conducted to evaluate how well perceived paternal parenting behaviors and filial piety predicted subjective well-being for male participants. The results of this regression are presented in Table 6. Assumptions were tested by examining a scatter diagram of residuals versus predicted residuals. No violations of normality, linearity, or homoscedasticity of residuals were detected. There were four correlations, involving 5 variables, in the intercorrelation matrix that were above .7 (Guilt Induction, Love Withdrawal, Guilt Induction x Filial Piety, Love Withdrawal x Filial Piety, Punitiveness x Filial Piety). Additionally, 4 of these variables had tolerance coefficients below .2 after the final step of the regression equation (Love Withdrawal, Guilt Induction x Filial Piety, Love Withdrawal x Filial Piety, and Punitiveness x Filial Piety). While high multicollinearity does lead to unstable beta coefficients, it is unlikely that it would significantly affect the analysis of these results as all of the p-values for the aforementioned variables were greater than .2. The demographic variables were not significant predictors of subjective well-being, \( F(5, 51) = 1.54, p = \text{ns} \). When paternal parenting behaviors were entered into the regression the equation significantly predicted subjective well-being, \( F(13, 43) = 2.06, p < .05 \), and accounted for about 25% of variance. However, none of the t-tests for the independent parenting variables were significant. Adding filial piety into the regression equation failed to account for a statistically significant amount of additional variance, \( F(14, 42) = 1.88, p = \text{ns} \). The filial piety x parenting behavior interaction terms were entered into the regression in the final step. This final regression equation was not significant, \( F(22, 34) = 1.48, p = \text{ns} \). Additionally, none of the t-tests for the individual interaction terms were significant.
Table 6

Multiple Regressions for Paternal Parenting Behaviors and Filial Piety for Male Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Subjective Well-Being</th>
<th>$R^2$ Change</th>
<th>F-Value</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$sp^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father’s Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother’s Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother’s Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Brothers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>R^2 Change</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Induction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permissiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punitiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>-.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guilt Induction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love Withdrawal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>-.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>-.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>R^2 Change</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>2.06*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filial Piety (FP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>R^2 Change</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;.00</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support x FP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>&lt;-.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Induction x FP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permissiveness x FP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punitiveness x FP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guilt Induction x FP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love Withdrawal x FP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement x FP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>-.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring x FP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>R^2 Change</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. *p < .05.

The final stepwise multiple regression was conducted to evaluate how well perceived maternal parenting behaviors and filial piety predicted subjective well-being for male participants. The results of this regression are presented in Table 7. Assumptions were tested by examining a scatter diagram of residuals versus predicted residuals. No violations of normality,
### Multiple Regressions for Maternal Parenting Behaviors and Filial Piety for Male Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Subjective Well-Being</th>
<th>$R^2$ Change</th>
<th>$F$-Value</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$sp^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother’s Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother’s Income</td>
<td></td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Brothers</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td></td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Induction</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permissiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punitiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guilt Induction</td>
<td></td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love Withdrawal</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.43</td>
<td>-.28*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>2.56*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filial Piety (FP)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;.00</td>
<td>2.32*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support x FP</td>
<td></td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Induction x FP</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permissiveness x FP</td>
<td></td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punitiveness x FP</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guilt Induction x FP</td>
<td></td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love Withdrawal x FP</td>
<td></td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement x FP</td>
<td></td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring x FP</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. *$p < .05.*

Linearity, or homoscedasticity of residuals were detected. There were four correlations, involving 7 variables, in the intercorrelation matrix that were above .7 (Support, Positive Induction, Guilt Induction, Punitiveness, Guilt Induction x Filial Piety, Punitiveness x Filial Piety, Withdrawal x Filial Piety). Additionally, 3 of these variables had tolerance coefficients.
below .2 after the final step of the regression equation (Guilt Induction x Filial Piety, Support x Filial Piety, and Punitiveness x Filial Piety). While high multicollinearity does lead to unstable beta coefficients, it is unlikely that it would significantly affect the analysis of these results as all of the $p$-values for the aforementioned variables were greater than .6. The demographic variables were not significant predictors of subjective well-being, $F(4, 53) = 2.09, p = ns$. When maternal parenting behaviors were added into the regression the equation significantly predicted subjective well-being, $F(12, 45) = 2.56, p < .05$, and accounted for about 27% of variance. Upon examination of the t-tests of the individual variables, the t-test for maternal monitoring was significant, $t(57) = -2.47, p < .05$. The regression equation with filial piety included was also significant, $F(13, 44) = 2.33, p < .05$, but did not account for significantly more variance. The filial piety x parenting behavior interaction terms were entered into the regression in the final step. This final regression equation was not significant, $F(21, 36) = 1.64, p = ns$. Additionally, none of the t-tests for the individual interaction terms were significant.

**Discussion**

This study was an examination of the effects of perceived parenting styles and filial piety on subjective well-being in mainland Chinese college students. The first hypothesis was that parental support, positive induction, involvement and monitoring would all be positively related to psychological well-being, while parental punitiveness, permissiveness, guilt induction, and love withdrawal would be negatively related to psychological well-being. While several regression equations using these variables were able to significantly predict subjective well-being, very few of the individual variables accounted for a significant amount of variance on their own. For female participants maternal support was positively related to psychological well-being, which was concordant with the hypothesis. For male participants maternal monitoring
was negatively related to subjective well-being, which was not expected. It is interesting that there were no significant findings for paternal parenting behaviors. Possible explanations for this finding will be addressed below. The second hypothesis was that filial piety would account for a significant amount of unique variance beyond that of the perceived parenting behaviors. Filial piety did not account for a significant amount of unique variance when entered into any of the four regression equations calculated in this study. The final hypothesis was that filial piety would be a moderator between all parenting behaviors and psychological well-being for all parent-child dyads. This hypothesis was supported only for maternal monitoring behaviors in female participants. No other parenting behaviors were moderated by filial piety.

Maternal support behaviors were negatively correlated with subjective well-being only for female participants, while paternal support behaviors were unrelated to subjective well-being for both genders. Parental support behaviors, as measured in this study, specifically involved acceptance, warmth, and nurturance. There have been mixed findings about parental support behaviors in previous research, especially among Chinese participants. Part of the reason for this is that parental support is often measured using a variety of scales with slightly different operationalization definitions. In a study using the Parent Behavior Measure with a mainland Chinese population, parental support was not found to be predictive of adolescent self-esteem (Bush et al., 2002). However, there has been a general split in the research, with several studies finding that parental supportive behaviors were a positive predictor of self-esteem among Chinese adolescents (Cheung & Lau, 1985; Lau & Cheung, 1987; Supple et al., 2002). While subjective well-being as opposed to self-esteem was examined in the current study, the findings indicate that the genders of both the adolescent and parent play a significant role in
understanding the effect of parental support behaviors. Perhaps further research examining specific parent-child dyads will help to clear up this muddy picture.

There is also a unique cultural component that contributes to the gender differences, especially in the context of Chinese culture, and therefore significantly adds to the explanation of the current findings. As mentioned previously, there has been sparse and inconsistent research attempting to parse out how gender, parenting behaviors, cultural roles, and societal expectations affect psychological and behavioral outcomes for children. The current findings about parental support behaviors do not reinforce the traditional idea of “kind mother, strict father” in that paternal warmth, acceptance, and nurturance had no effect on the subjective well-being of male and female adolescents in the present study. The finding that females were more responsive to maternal support than males, but in the opposite direction than expected, may be explained by the different gender roles established for sons and daughters in Chinese families and in society. Chinese mothers and fathers both use more harsh verbal and physical discipline towards sons than daughters (Wu, 1996), and therefore the presence of support behaviors may play a less significant role in how adolescent males perceive their upbringing. Additionally, traditional Chinese culture has put an overt focus on achievement as the most important outcome for raising a son (Shek, 2007). If so, then levels of achievement should play a significant role in the life satisfaction and life mastery (the two components used to measure subjective well-being in this study) of male adolescents, as this is a major determinant of whether they are fulfilling their established role within the family. It is possible that warmth and nurturance contribute less to academic success than the more directive and coercive behaviors that hypothetically would ensure the completion of the long hours of studying necessary for entrance into a top tier university. The picture is less clear for females as their role within the family and society
continue to drastically change with the growing economy, modernization, and westernization of mainland China (Shek, 2007; Zhang, 2007; Zhang, Tsang, Chi, Cheung, Zhang, & Yip, 2012). This may be the main reason behind the inconsistent findings in general. Greater specificity of examining perceived maternal support while taking into account the changing cultural milieu and expectations for Chinese women may lead to greater clarity about the Chinese mother-daughter relationship.

A similar pattern was found when examining perceived love withdrawal. Maternal love withdrawal was negatively predictive of subjective well-being for female participants, while results were non-significant for male participants. Paternal love withdrawal had no significant effects in any of the regression analyses. The variance in these results again highlights the need for more research to clarify how culture, parental roles, and gender interact and affects relationships between parents and children. It was found in prior research that both perceived maternal and paternal love withdrawal were not significant predictors of self-esteem for Chinese adolescents (Bush et al., 2002). However, in the aforementioned study male and female adolescents were not studied separately. The current findings provide increased support for examining specific parent-child dyads, as the mother-daughter relationship again appears to have a more significant impact than others for Chinese adolescents.

Perceived maternal monitoring behaviors were negatively predictive of subjective well-being for male participants, while they were moderated by filial piety for female participants. Perceived paternal monitoring behaviors were not predictive of subjective well-being for both male and female participants. The moderating effect of filial piety found for female participants was expected, as previous research has found that filial piety was a moderator between perceived maternal support and maternal control as well as maternal control and conflicts (Wong, Leung, &
McBride-Chang, 2010). In the current study, adolescent females reacted very differently to perceived maternal monitoring depending on how closely they endorsed the principles of filial piety. Those who scored high on the Filial Piety Scale had a similar level of subjective well-being regardless of the level of maternal monitoring. In contrast, the participants who were low in filial piety had higher subjective well-being when maternal monitoring was low, and lower subjective well-being when maternal monitoring was high. In conjunction with prior research, it is plausible that those with low filial piety view monitoring behaviors as a reason for conflict instead of the seeing the same behavior as a form of support. It is possible that this change in perception is due to a number factors, including shifting cultural ideals, westernization, and changing gender roles for women in Chinese society. These are all worth examining in future empirical study. Further research is also necessary to determine why this moderating effect was not found for male participants, as higher maternal monitoring had a negative effect on their subjective well-being.

Filial piety did not account for a significant amount of unique variance beyond that of perceived parenting behaviors for males and females. Previous studies have found that filial piety was able to account for unique variance in perceived maternal support and mother-child conflicts for secondary school students in Hong Kong (Wong, Leung, & McBride-Chang, 2010). While there is evidence that filial piety affects the quality and perception of relationships between mothers and children, the data in the current study show that acceptance of this cultural tenet is not directly related to subjective well-being. The reason for this may be that filial piety taken by itself will not affect outcomes for variables based on individual outcomes such as depression, anxiety, happiness, or academic achievement. It is most likely a contextual factor that affects relationships, the effect on behaviors from one to another, and the perception of
behaviors by others. However, more evidence is needed to determine the validity of these assertions.

It is striking that so few of the parenting behaviors examined in this study had a significant effect on the college students’ subjective well-being. These findings are in opposition to a large array of research proving the importance of parenting, and of specific parenting behaviors, in later-life outcomes for individuals across all cultures. The large sample size for the current study makes it difficult to label the results as a statistical aberration. All reasons should be considered, including study design flaws, sampling problems, and participant response styles. These are addressed in the following section.

**Limitations**

This study had several limitations. Firstly, the participant sample came from Nanjing University, which is one of the top tier universities in China. China has the largest population in the world; and therefore, the competition to gain acceptance into a top tier university is extremely fierce. As stated before, male children in China are often raised with academic achievement as the most important outcome. This has also been increasingly true for female children with the modernization of Chinese society. Therefore, students of Nanjing University represent a very small subsection of Chinese college students, adolescents, and young adults. Accepting this sample as fully representative of a college age population in China would be akin to using a sample from an Ivy League in the United States of America. It is plausible the participants’ relationships with their parents and overall subjective well-being could be very different from the population at large in China.

A second limitation is the high amount of incomplete surveys obtained from participants, especially for male participants in this study. About 30% of participants who began the survey
exited the study before completing any questions about the dependant variables, which were the last two sets of questions. In the male sample alone, 44% who began the study did not complete the survey, as compared to 20% of female participants. This poses another major problem in the generalizability of these results. It is unclear whether the participants who left the study early were significantly different from those who completed the whole study, especially in relation to their level of subjective well-being. One possibility for the high number of incomplete surveys is that Chinese college students are not as accustomed to completing surveys for psychological research as students in the United States. During the initial stages of this study several individuals at Nanjing University voiced concerns over the students being able to complete an online psychological survey due their unfamiliarity with the practice. However, this does not fully explain the higher number of male incomplete surveys. Additional research is needed to determine the nature of differing response patterns between male and female Chinese college students.

Another limitation of this study was the definition of subjective well-being as a composite of life satisfaction and life mastery. Previous research with Chinese populations has defined subjective well-being as a composite of life satisfaction, life mastery, hopelessness, and self-esteem (e.g., Shek, 2004). The researchers attempted to contact the original researchers and obtain the scales utilized in these studies but were unsuccessful. This was especially problematic because the scales for hopelessness and self-esteem were created by one of the researchers and have not yet been published. The current researchers were able to procure the original English language versions of the Satisfaction with Life Scale and the Life Mastery Scale, and then have these surveys translated into Chinese. However, having the aggregate of these two scales represent the entire concept of subjective well-being is problematic as they only truly represent
half of the established operationalized definition established in previous research. This study is therefore incomplete in providing an understanding of how perceived parenting behaviors and filial piety impact a Chinese college student’s complete sense of psychological well-being.

**Future Directions**

Limitations notwithstanding, the present study contributes to a greater understanding of how parenting behaviors affect psychological outcomes when seen through the lens of Chinese cultural values, roles, and expectations. While it certainly does not fully answer the greater question of how authoritarian/authoritative parenting styles influence psychosocial outcomes for Chinese individuals, it does provide insight as to how specific parenting behaviors lead to specific outcomes for Chinese adolescents, and also the importance of including an assessment of cultural values when seeking answers to the effects of parenting behaviors on children in all cultures. The current study also contributes to a greater understanding of how the nature of the parent-child dynamic changes when the genders of both the parent and child are taken into account.

As with any study, the current research answers some questions while creating many others. First and foremost, it is necessary to replicate this study with other populations of Chinese college students in order to determine the generalizability of these findings. Additional research is needed to understand how parenting behaviors influence other outcomes for college students, including depression, anxiety, parent-child conflict, adaptive functioning, and other psychosocial factors. Additional research is also needed to gain a greater understanding of the unique qualities of parent-child dyads when the genders of the parent and child are considered. Finally, human behaviors happen within and are defined by the context of culture. It is necessary to not only gain a deeper understanding of role filial piety plays in parent-child relationships, but
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also how other aspects of Chinese culture contribute to behavioral outcomes for Chinese individuals.
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Appendices

Appendix A: E-mail Recruiting Message

Hello. My name is Blake Kirschner and I am a Doctoral student within the School of Professional Psychology at Pacific University. I am writing to invite you to participate in a research survey. This project is being conducted under the supervision of Catherine Miller, Ph.D., Assistant Professor within the School of Professional Psychology at Pacific University.

This study is an examination of the interaction of parenting styles and culture.

I know that your time is limited and valuable but your input is vital to this study. Your opinions will be useful in compiling data that will help researchers understand the differences in how parenting styles and culture interact.

If you would like a summary of the findings from this study, whether or not you choose to participate, please reply to this email. I will send you the summary once the data has been received and analyzed.

If you would like to participate, click the following link to begin. Your participation will likely require no more than 30 minutes of your time.

http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.asp?u=xxxxxxxxxxxx

Thank you very much for your time!

Blake Kirschner, MS
Doctoral Candidate
School of Professional Psychology
Pacific University
(201) 334-8615
kirs4509@pacificu.edu

Catherine Miller, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
School of Professional Psychology
Pacific University
(503) 352-7324
millerco@pacificu.edu
您好！我叫 Blake Kirschner，是美国太平洋大学心理学院的博士生，非常荣幸地邀请您参加本调查。此调查考察父母育子方式与文化间的相互作用，由太平洋大学心理学院 Catherine Miller, Ph.D. 副教授指导。

非常感谢阁下万忙之中挤出宝贵的时间参加此调查，您的参与对本调查很有意义。您的反馈意见对我们收集数据极其有用，这些数据将非常有助于研究者了解父母育子方式与文化之间的相互作用的区别。

无论您参加此调查与否，如果您想了解本调查的发现结果，请回复此 email，我会在本调查的数据收集齐备并进行分析后将结果发给您。

如果您愿意参与本调查，请点击以下链接开始，此调查最多不会超过 30 分钟。

http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.asp?u=xxxxxxxxxxxx

非常感谢您的宝贵时间。

Blake Kirschner, MS
太平洋大学心理学院在读博士生
电话：(503) 933-9837
Email：kirs4509@pacificu.edu

Catherine Miller, Ph.D.
太平洋大学心理学院副教授
电话：(503) 352-7324
Email：millerco@pacificu.edu
Appendix B: Demographic Questionnaire

Please answer the following questions:

How old are you? ____

What is your father’s highest level of education?
   - Grade School
   - Middle School
   - High School
   - College
   - Graduate School

What is your father’s estimated yearly income? ________

What is your mother’s highest level of education?
   - Grade School
   - Middle School
   - High School
   - College
   - Graduate School

What is your mother’s estimated yearly income? ________

How many brothers do you have? _____

How many sisters do you have? _____
请回答以下问题：

你多大了？ ——

你父亲的最高教育程度是什么？
- 小学
- 初中
- 高中
- 大学
- 研究生

你爸爸的年收入估计是多少？ ——

你母亲的最高教育程度是什么？
- 小学
- 初中
- 高中
- 大学
- 研究生

你妈妈的年收入估计是多少？ ——

你有几个亲兄弟？

你有几个亲姐妹？
Appendix C: Satisfaction With Life Scale

Below are five statements with which you may agree or disagree. Using 1-7 scale below, indicate your agreement with each item by circling the appropriate number. Please be open and honest in your responding.

1. In most ways my life is close to my ideal.
2. The conditions of my life are excellent
3. I am satisfied with my life.
4. So far I have gotten the important things I want in life.
5. If I could live my life over, I would change almost nothing.

请细阅下列五项，并根据在旁一至七的指标，圈上适当的数字，表达你对各项的同意程度。请以开明和诚实的态度作答。

1. 我的生活大致符合我的理想。
2. 我的生活状况非常圆满。
3. 我满意自己的生活。
4. 直至现在为止，我都能够得到我在生活上希望拥有的重要东西。
5. 如果我能重新活过，差不多没有东西我想改变。
Appendix D: The Mastery Scale

How strongly do you agree or disagree that:

1. I have little control over the things that happen to me
2. There is really no way I can solve some of the problems I have.
3. There is little I can do to change many of the important things in my life.
4. I often feel helpless in dealing with the problems of life.
5. Sometimes I feel that I’m being pushed around in life.
6. What happens to me in the future mostly depends on me.
7. I can do just about anything I really set my mind to.

你有多同意或不同意:

1. 对发生在我身上的事我无法左右。
2. 对我的某些问题我真的无法解决。
3. 对我生活中的许多重要事情，我几乎不能做点什么去改变。
4. 面对生活中的问题，我常常觉得很无助。
5. 有时我觉得在生活中很身不由己。
6. 未来发生在我身上的事主要由我决定。
7. 我下决心去做的任何事几乎都能做到。
Appendix E: Parent Behavior Measure

Please provide an answer for the following statements which are about the relationship between you and your parents. Please respond about your mother and father, or the persons who function as your parents on a daily basis.

1. This parent has made me feel that he or she would be there if I needed him or her.
2. This parent seems to approve of me and the things I do.
3. This parent tells me how much he or she loves me.
4. This parent says nice things about me.
5. This parent explained to me how good I should feel when I did something she or he liked.
6. Over the past several years this parent has explained to me how good I should feel when I have shared something with other family members.
7. This parent explains to me how good I should feel with I do what is right.
8. This parent explains to me when I share things with other family members, that I am liked by other family members.
9. This parent tells me how good others feel when I do what is right.
10. This parent usually lets me do anything I want to do.
11. This parent allows me to be out on my own as often as it pleases me.
12. This parent allows me to have any friends I want without questioning me.
13. This parent hits me when he or she thinks I am doing something wrong.
14. This parent does not give me any peace until I do what he or she says.
15. This parent punishes me by not letting me do things that I really enjoy.
16. This parent yells at me a lot without good reason.
17. This parent punishes me by not letting me do things with other teenagers.
18. This parent tells me that I will be sorry that I wasn’t better behaved.

19. This parent tells me that someday I will be punished for my behavior.

20. This parent tells me that if I loved him or her, I would do what he or she wants me to.

21. This parent is always finding fault with me.

22. This parent tells me about all the things that he or she has done for me.

23. This parent punishes me by sending me out of the room.

24. This parent punishes me by hitting me.

25. This parent enjoys doing things with me.

26. This parent shares many activities with me.

27. This parent will not talk to me when I displease him or her.

28. This parent avoids looking at me when I have disappointed him or her.

29. This parent knows where I am after school.

30. I tell this parent who I am going to be with when I go out.

31. When I go out, this parent knows where I am.

32. This parent knows the parents of my friends.

33. This parent knows who my friends are.

34. This parent knows how I spend my money.
以下问题是关于您和您父母的关系的，请从问题后的相关陈述中圈出您的答案。请针对您的母亲和父亲、或相当于父母亲的人的具体情况作选择。

1. 让我觉得我需要时他/她会在我身边。
2. 似乎认可我或是我做的事。
3. 告诉我他/她是多么爱我。
4. 他/她表扬我。
5. 我做他/她喜欢的事时跟我解释我该觉得好的程度。
6. 过去几年我和家里其他人分享某东西时跟我解释我该觉得好的程度。
7. 在我做正确的事时跟我解释我该觉得好的程度。
8. 跟我解释当我和家里其他人分享某东西时其他家庭成员喜欢我。
9. 我做正确的事时告诉我其他人感觉有多好。
10. 通常让我做任何我想做的事。
11. 允许我独自外出，只要我高兴。
12. 允许我交任何想交的朋友而不查问。
13. 他/她认为我做错事时打我。
14. 直到我听从他/她的话做事时才罢休。
15. 用不让我做我真正喜欢的事来惩罚我。
16. 毫无来由的对我大吼大叫。
17. 用不许我和其它十几岁的同龄人在一起来惩罚我。
18. 在我表现不好时告诉我我该感到难为情。
19. 告诉我总有一天我会为我的行为受惩罚。

20. 告诉我如果我爱他/她就该做他/她希望我做的事。

21. 总是挑剔我。

22. 告诉我所有他/她为我做过的事。

23. 用把我赶出房间的方式惩罚我。

24. 用打我的方式惩罚我。

25. 喜欢和我一起做事情。

26. 和我一起分享很多活动。

27. 我惹他/她不高兴时不和我讲话。

28. 我让他/她失望时避而不看我。

29. 知道放学后我在哪里。

30. 我告知他/她外出时我和谁在一起。

31. 我外出时知道我在哪里。

32. 认识我朋友的父母。

33. 认识我朋友。

34. 知道我的钱是怎么花的。
Appendix F: Filial Piety Scale

Everyone has a father. However, in daily life, people’s opinions vary on how one should treat his/her father. The following are over forty different ways to treat one’s father. Please assess how you think you should treat your father according to these ways.

There are totally four types of responses to these questions, which are ‘not at all’, ‘a little bit’, ‘pretty much’, and ‘very much’. The number representing these four responses will be 0 for ‘not at all’, 1 for ‘a little bit’, 2 for ‘pretty much’ and 3 for ‘very much’.

If you think you shouldn’t treat your father a certain way at all, choose ‘not at all’ (0); if you think you should treat your father a certain way a little bit, choose ‘a little bit’ (1); if you think you should treat your father a certain way, choose ‘pretty much’ (2); and if you think you should very much treat your father a certain way, choose ‘very much’ (3). Please cross your choice of answer to each question. This is completely personal opinion so there is no right or wrong answer.

Before you go on with the questions there is something to be clarified: these questions are to assess your attitude towards how to treat your father, rather than your willingness, or your actual behavior. There are many things we should do but we are not necessarily willing to do, nor actually doing. The things we are willing to do and actually doing are not necessarily what we should do.

If you fully understand the directions please go on with the questionnaire.

1. Should you immediately do what your father tells you to do?
2. If your father has a religious belief, should you also hold the same one?
3. Should you be careful of your speeches and behaviors outside family to avoid getting into any troubles, in order not to upset your father?

4. Should you hide your father’s illegal or wrong conduct from getting them found out?

5. In front of your father, should you avoid quarrels and fights with your brothers and sisters?

6. Should you be there for your father to do leisure activities with?

7. To not lose your father’s face should you avoid doing anything immoral?

8. Should you help your father with the housework?

9. To be filial to your father, should you break the promises made to friends?

10. Should you do what will make your father proud of you?

11. Should you work harder and do better at work to get your father relieved?

12. When choosing a career or a job, should you first consider the one which makes it most convenient to take care of your father?

13. Should you give up your own interest to carry on the career left by your father?

14. Should you avoid marrying whom your father dislikes?

15. Should you care about your father’s daily life?

16. When your father is busy, should you offer to help him?

17. Should you keep your father’s birthday deep in mind and give it a celebration?

18. Should you avoid being friends with whom your father dislikes?

19. To save your father’s face, should you speak good of him?

20. Should you take your father’s opinions into consideration upon choosing a profession or a job?

21. Should you live with your father after marriage?
22. Should you have talks with your father so to know his thoughts and feelings?

23. Should you care about your father’s health?

24. Should you tactically reject or postpone doing it if your father asks you to do something bad?

25. Should you squeeze time to keep your father company?

26. Should you have at least one son to carry on your family name?

27. Should you be thankful for your father’s making and raising of you?

28. Before leaving home or after coming back, should you let your father know it so to stop him from worrying about you?

29. Should you listen to your father?

30. Should you study hard to please your father?

31. Should you respect your father’s opinions on choosing whom to marry?

32. Should you let your father know that he is important?

33. Should you avoid living away from your father when he is still alive?

34. In order to take care of your father, should you sacrifice yourself?

35. Should you avoid doing what will upset your father?

36. No matter how bad your father treats you, should you still treat him nicely?

37. Should you care about your father and try to understand him?

38. Should you put all the money you make in your father’s management before your marriage?

39. Should you talk to your father with politeness and softness?

40. When your father gets ill, should you look after him in person?

41. When eating, should you wait till your father begins first?
每个人都有父亲，但在日常生活中，关于子女应该如何对待父亲，各人看法并不相同。下面列举了几十项子女对待父亲的方式，请你自己分别就这些方式，评定一下你认为你应该如何对待你父亲。

分别就每项方式评定应该的程度时，所采用的尺度共有四种程度，即‘不应该’、‘有点应该’、‘相当应该’、‘非常应该’。若以数字代表应该的程度，则‘不应该’是 0 分，‘有点应该’是 1 分，‘相当应该’是 2 分，‘非常应该’是 3 分。

如果你认为不应该那样对待你父亲，就选答‘不应该’（0）；如果你认为有点应该那样对待你父亲，就选答‘有点应该’（1）；如果你认为明显应该那样对待父亲，就选答‘相当应该’（2）；如果你认为非常应该那样对待父亲，就选答‘非常应该’（3）。请在每个题目之后的适当方格中打‘x’，以代表你所选定的结果。这完全是个人意见的表达，答案是没有对错的。

在你填答这份量表以前，有一点必须加以强调：这里请你评定的是应该的程度，而不是愿意的程度，也不是实际作到的程度。你认为应该如何对待你父亲是一回事，你愿意如何对待你父亲是另一回事，你实际如何对待你父亲更是有所不同。很多我们应该做的事情，不一定愿意去做，更不一定实际在做；我们愿意去做或实际在做的事情，也都不一定应该去做。

如果已经充分了解了，就请开始正式作答。
1. 父亲交代的事，你是否应该立即去做？

2. 如果你父亲信教，你是否也应该信同样的教？

3. 为了不增加父亲的困扰，你在外是否应该言行小心，少惹麻烦？

4. 如果父亲有了违法或不当的行为，你是否应该为他隐瞒？

5. 在父亲面前，你是否应该避免和兄弟姊妹吵架？

6. 你是否应该陪父亲做休闲活动？

7. 为了不使父亲丢脸，你是否该避免做不道德的事？

8. 你是否应该帮助父亲做家务？

9. 为了顺从父亲，你是否应该不守对朋友的诺言？

10. 你是否应该去做让父亲引以为荣的事？

11. 你是否应该努力工作，力争上游，以使父亲安心？

12. 选择职业或者工作时，你是否应该以便于照顾父亲者为优先？

13. 你是否应该放弃个人的志趣，继承父亲留下的事业？

14. 你是否应该避免和父亲不喜欢的异性结婚？

15. 你是否应该留心父亲的饮食起居？

16. 父亲忙碌时，是否应该主动帮助他？

17. 你是否应该牢记父亲的生日，并加祝贺？

18. 父亲不喜欢的人，你是否应该避免和他交往？

19. 为了保护父亲的面子，你是否应该为他说话？

20. 选择职业或工作时，你是否应该遵从父亲的意见？

21. 你结婚成家后，是否应该和父亲住在一起？
22. 你是否应该与父亲交谈，以了解他的想法和感受？

23. 你是否应该留心父亲的身体健康？

24. 如果父亲叫你去做坏事，你是否应该委婉拒绝或者推拖？

25. 你是否应该拨时间陪伴父亲？

26. 为了传宗接代，你是否应该至少生一个儿子？

27. 对父亲的养育之恩，你是否应该心存感激？

28. 出门前或返家后，你是否应该向父亲禀报一声，以免挂念？

29. 你是否应该听从父亲的教训？

30. 你是否应该努力读书学习，以使父亲高兴？

31. 选择结婚对象时，你是否应尊重父亲的意见？

32. 你是否应该让父亲感到他很重要？

33. 父亲健在时，你是否应该避免住在外面？

34. 为了照顾父亲，你是否应该有自我牺牲的精神？

35. 你是否应该避免去做对不起父亲的事？

36. 无论父亲对你多么不好，你是否仍然应该善待他？

37. 你是否应该关怀父亲，了解父亲？

38. 在结婚以前，你是否应该将所赚的钱全部交给父亲处理？

39. 你对父亲说话是否应该温和有礼？

40. 父亲生病时，你是否应该亲自照顾？

41. 用餐时，你是否应该请父亲先开始？