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This article reviews studies that have examined whether Baumrind’s parenting styles are related to child outcomes similarly in cultures where independence is said to be emphasized versus cultures where interdependence is said to be emphasized. I present evidence showing that Baumrind’s parenting styles have similar function in both collectivist and individualist cultures. Based on these studies, I argue against the claim of some researchers that authoritarian parenting is not detrimental or authoritative parenting beneficial to the development of young people in cultures that are said to emphasize interdependence. However, more research is needed before conclusions can be reached about the extent to which the culture construct explains child-rearing effects on child development. Future directions for research, which include the importance of identifying diverse forms of parenting within interdependent cultures so as to distinguish the influence of functional and dysfunctional forms of parenting on child outcomes, are suggested.

Contemporary and classic works maintain that parents in all cultures are the primary agents of socialization responsible for the transmission of cultural standards of adult competence (Benedict, 1934; Chao & Tseng, 2002; Markus, Mullally, & Kitayama, 1997). There is considerable agreement in the literature that Baumrind’s parenting styles, first identified in 1967, describe the range of parent child-rearing that is associated with differences in developmental competence in countries, like the US, that are described as individualist in orientation. In individualist contexts, authoritative parenting relative to authoritarian, permissive, or neglecting-rejecting parenting throughout development has been found to provide children with the experiential basis for optimally balancing agency (characterized by self-assertion, self-reliance, and prudential self-interest) with communion (characterized by prosocial engagement, cooperation, and moral concern for others’ interests) (Baumrind, 1971, 1989, 1991a, 1991b, 1991c; Steinberg, Dornbusch, & Brown, 1992; Stewart et al., 2000b).

There is disagreement, however, with respect to the applicability of Baumrind’s authoritative model to cultures that are described as collectivist (e.g., China). Some cross-cultural researchers (Chao, 2000, 2001) suggest that Baumrind’s authoritative model may not be relevant to cultures like China because: “The beneficial effects of authoritative parenting do not seem to be found among families of Chinese descent, but they are found among families of European descent” (Chao & Tseng, 2002, p. 86). However, Chen and his colleagues pioneered the argument, presented herein, that the pattern of findings for authoritative, authoritarian, permissive, and indulgent parenting styles in an individualist culture like the US or Canada has functional relevance for child outcomes in a collective culture like China (Chen, Dong, & Zhou, 1997a; Chen, Liu, & Li, 2000a; Chen, Liu, Li, Cen, Chen, & Wang, 2000b). Steinberg (2001) also suggested that: “As a general rule adolescents fare better when their parents are authoritative, regardless of their racial or social background... This finding has been confirmed in samples from countries around the world that have extreme diversity in their value systems, such as China, Pakistan, Hong Kong, Scotland, Australia, and Argentina” (p. 12). More recently, Chang and his colleagues suggest that the social context of Chinese living is Westernized (Chang, 2003, 2004; Chang, Liu, Wen, Fung, Wang, & Xu, 2004b), such that the function of care-giving dimensions of warmth, empathy, and support for Chinese children and adolescents is similar to that found among European American children and adolescents (Chang, Lansford, Schwartz, & Farvar, 2004a; Chang, McBride-Chang, Stewart, & Au, 2003a).

I now examine the empirical evidence for and against the similarity in the link between Baumrind’s parenting styles and child outcomes in cultures that have been described (e.g., by Chao, 2001; Markus et al., 1997) as collectivist and individualist. At the outset I would like to indicate that my use of the terms individualism and collectivism is intended for congruence and clarity in reference to the extant literature. As Smith and Bond (1999) have indicated, the categorization of entire countries as individualist or collectivist may inappropriately homogenize countries without sufficient evidence. Furthermore, while the prevalence or importance of certain cultural values or parenting is emphasized within the theoretical framework of individualism and collectivism, variability of values, goals, and parenting within cultural groups is also acknowledged. For example, Chao and Tseng (2002) discuss variability within cultures involving socioeconomic factors.
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differences in parenting of mothers and fathers, intergenerational differences in fulfillment of filial obligation, differential parental expectations for boys and girls, and differences among countries like Taiwan, China, Hong Kong, and the Philippines.

Also, I would like to indicate that in presenting the evidence and theoretical arguments for the applicability of Baumrind’s parenting styles to cultures that have been described as collectivist I am not championing the approach of between-culture exploration (referred to as etic) over the approach of within-culture exploration (referred to as emic). I present empirical studies and theoretical arguments, both for and against the applicability of Baumrind’s parenting styles, to cultures that have been described as collectivist (e.g., Chao, 2001; Dornbusch, Ritter, Leiderman, Roberts, & Fraleigh, 1987; Leung, Lau, & Lam, 1998; Markus et al., 1997; Rudy & Grusec, 2001). The emic and etic approaches both represent different and equally important research perspectives (Berry, 1989). I also discuss the theoretical and empirical work of researchers who sometimes combine etic and emic approaches. For example, with respect to the link between parenting and child outcomes, Chao (1994) has theoretically proposed that there is a culture-specific form of Chinese parenting that she has termed training (and has defined according to the Chinese concepts of chia-shun, entailing organizational control, and guan, entailing parental involvement and investment). Chao (1994) has hypothesized that training explains the high academic achievement of Chinese children and adolescents. However, she has not empirically verified the culture-specific question of whether training is or is not linked to the achievement of Chinese children. Furthermore, Chao (1994, 1995, 1996) has also hypothesized that training is distinct from both authoritarian and authoritative parenting styles and dimensions of warmth and control. While Chao’s theoretical proposals (to be discussed in more detail later) suggest a culture-specific (emic) approach (i.e., the link between training and achievement of Chinese youth, in addition to the distinctness of training and Baumrind’s parenting styles), her empirical research has taken a between-culture (etic) approach by examining whether the link between Baumrind’s parenting styles and academic achievement observed among Anglo Americans is also present among Chinese Americans. Despite some differences between Chao’s theoretical proposals and empirical research, her theoretical proposals have advanced the field of parent socialization research by spawning much research where scholars (e.g., McBride-Chang & Chang, 1998; Stewart et al., 1998b, 1999a) have sought to empirically verify Chao’s important propositions about culture-specific ways of parenting. Therefore, this review considers studies seen as providing evidence for and against the applicability of Baumrind’s parenting styles in addition to hypotheses and propositions that may or may not have been empirically verified by the originator of the proposition.

How divergent are the links between Baumrind’s parenting styles and child development in cultures described as collectivist and individualist?

Several cross-cultural studies show that Baumrind’s parenting styles and parenting dimensions (e.g., warmth, control) are similarly differentiated in cultures that are said to emphasize interdependence and independence (Chao, 1994, 2001; Chen et al., 2000a, 2000b; Dornbusch et al., 1987; Greenberger & Chen, 1996; Greenberger, Chen, Tally, & Dong, 2000; Leung et al., 1998; Rosenthal & Feldman, 1991; Stewart et al., 1998a; Stewart, Bond, Deeds, & Chung, 1999a; Zhou, Eisenberg, Wang, & Reiser, 2004). Furthermore, Wu et al. (2002), in addition to finding commonalities between US and Chinese samples in the basic structure of authoritarian and authoritative parenting, also found that parenting constructs thought to be emphasized in Chinese culture—such as encouragement of modesty, sharing, maternal involvement, and protection—were also applicable to parenting in the US. However, similarities between cultures in the differentiation of different parenting styles or “normative” differences between cultures in the prevalence of any one parenting style (which has been found by some studies, Dornbusch et al., 1987) does not answer the more important cross-cultural question of whether or not parenting styles and dimensions are similarly associated with functional or relatively dysfunctional child outcomes across cultures. The links between parenting styles and adolescent outcome factors have been found by some studies to be different in different types of cultures. Dornbusch et al. found that for Caucasian adolescents, authoritative parenting style was associated with higher grades and authoritarian and permissive styles were associated with lower grades. However, for Asian adolescents, only authoritarian and not authoritative or permissive parenting style had any association to grades. (See Leung et al., 1998, for similar findings with Hong Kong adolescents.) Similarly, Chao (2001) found that adolescents’ reports of authoritative rather than authoritarian parenting (measured by Steinberg et al., 1992, 1994 questionnaire) were related to greater effort and higher grade point average (GPA) for European Americans, but not for Chinese Americans. Chinese American adolescents’ reports of their parents as authoritative or authoritarian did not differentiate their self-report of effort levels or GPA.

These cultural differences in the links between Baumrind’s parenting styles and child outcomes have been explained in three different ways. Currently, a consensus as to which one of the three explanations or combination of explanations best elucidates the nature of between-culture differences is not apparent. The lack of consensus is due to mixed empirical support for each explanation and to studies that find similarity in the link between Baumrind’s parenting styles and child outcomes in collectivist and individualist cultures (e.g., Chen et al., 1997a). The findings of similarity between cultures in the link between parenting styles and child outcomes calls into question the claim that the same parenting style operates differently as a function of culture. I will now present the evidence for and against each of the three explanations.

Explanation one: Authoritarian parenting style is associated with positive parental characteristics in collectivist cultures and with negative parental characteristics in individualist cultures

Given the presence of a negative relationship between authoritarian parenting and academic competence found by studies in cultures described as individualist (e.g., US, Canada), Rudy and Grusec (2001) endeavoured to explain the absence of a negative relationship found by some studies (they cite Dornbusch et al., 1987) between authoritarian parenting and academic achievement of adolescents belonging
to cultures that have been described as collectivist (e.g., China). Rudy and Grusec offer the explanation that in cultures described as collectivist in orientation, authoritarian parental factors who may be restrictive or demand obedience without question or democratic give and take may not be rejecting and lacking in warmth and unlikely to attribute negative disposition to children for their misbehaviour. However, in individualist cultures these negative parental characteristics (e.g., rejection, lack of warmth, and attribution of negative disposition to children) are often associated with authoritarian parents who are restrictive and demand obedience without give and take (Rudy and Grusec cite the following studies: Baumrind, 1967; Dix, Ruble, & Zambarano, 1989).

Rudy and Grusec (2001) examined whether negative parental characteristics such as low levels of parental warmth, parental attribution of negative disposition to child for misbehaviour, and high levels of anger associated with individualist authoritarian parenting are less likely to be associated with authoritarian parenting in collectivist cultures. To study the hypothesized differences in parental characteristics that accompany authoritarian parenting in collectivist and individualist cultures, Rudy and Grusec examined differences between Egyptian and Anglo Canadians (two groups they categorized as collectivist and individualist, respectively). They also examined parental psychological factors (i.e., warmth, anger, and negative dispositional attribution to child misbehaviour) that are associated with authoritarian parenting without examining whether these factors are linked to different child outcomes.

As Rudy and Grusec predicted, a significant negative association between authoritarianism (measured by Kochanska, Kuczynski, & Radke-Yarrow, 1989, based on Block’s CRPR, 1981) and warmth was found for Anglo Canadians. Also, in support of their hypothesis, the association between authoritarianism and warmth was positive for Egyptian Canadians. However, this association was not significant. Contrary results were that: “There were no significant correlations between authoritarianism and negative attributions within either cultural group. Also unexpected, parental anger was positively associated with authoritarianism in the Egyptian Canadian but not the Anglo Canadian group” (p. 208).

Therefore, within this particular comparative sample the hypothesized positive attributes of warmth and nonhostility that were proposed to be associated with authoritarian parenting in collective cultures was not found. Rather, it appears that both groups of authoritarian parents are unsupportive in different ways. The authoritarian Egyptian Canadians tend to be angry, and the authoritarian Anglo Canadians tend to be cold. Therefore, from this study the deemed positive link between authoritarian parenting and child outcomes in collective cultures could not be attributed to the positive and negative factors that covary with authoritarian parenting in collectivist and individualist cultures, respectively.

In fact, a study by Chang et al. (2004a) examined family dynamics associated with harsh parenting among Hong Kong primary school children. They found that Chinese mothers who were (nonclinically) depressed (measured by Chinese Personality Assessment Inventory-2, Cheung, Leung, Song, & Zhang, 2001) or experienced frequent marital discord (measured by Dyadic Adjustment Scale; Spainer, 1976; Shek, 1985) were in both cases more likely to engage in harsh parenting (measured by Parental Acceptance Rejection Questionnaire; Rohner, 1986) than mothers who were not depressed or who did not experience frequent marital discord.

Therefore, based on these studies, it appears that in cultures that are said to emphasize interdependence, authoritarian parenting is associated with negative affect, parental psychological distress, and negative family dynamics.

**Explanation two: Training is a culture-specific form of parenting that is distinct from Baumrind’s parenting styles and parenting dimensions of warmth and control**

Chao (1994) put forth the valuable proposition that the differences observed in studies reported earlier between Chinese and European American adolescents in the links between Baumrind’s parenting styles and academic achievement should be understood from a culture-specific (emic) perspective. Chao reasons that Baumrind’s parenting styles address the cultural concerns and practices of US parents and capture child outcomes associated with such practices. Therefore (according to Chao) Baumrind’s parenting styles may not transfer to China to capture the cultural concerns and practices of Chinese parents and to capture child outcomes that are associated with Chinese parenting practices. Chao (1994) provided a culture-specific (emic) model of parenting by proposing training as a form of Chinese parenting, defined by the concept of chia-shun, which entails organizational control, and the concept of guan, which entails parental investment and involvement. For Chao, the factors of chia-shun and guan render training distinct from both authoritarian and authoritative parenting styles. According to Chao (1994, 1995, 1996, 2001), the organizational control of training emphasizes hard work, self-discipline, achievement, family honour, and obedience. Furthermore, the responsiveness of authoritative parents or the parenting dimension of warmth is implicitly expressed by Chinese parents’ support of child achievement and is distinct from the demonstrative expressions of affect and noncontingent praise of US parents. (Incidentally, it is important to note that Baumrind’s 1989 definition of responsiveness is multifaceted and includes the extent of parental investment and involvement, which may or may not be accompanied by noncontingent praise or demonstrative expressions of affect, depending on parenting style).

While Chao (1994) proposed the training model as a means to a culture-specific (emic) approach of study, her research goals also included cross-cultural approaches. Chao’s multiple goals included: (a) whether or not training is associated with the same parenting goals for Chinese and European Americans (Chao, 2000); (b) whether or not training is related positively to the academic achievement of Chinese children and adolescents (hypothesized by Chao, 1994, 2001); (c) whether or not training is distinct from authoritarian parenting and parenting dimensions of restrictive control and from authoritative parenting and parenting dimensions of warmth in terms of associations with child outcomes (hypothesized by Chao, 1994, 1995, 1996); (d) whether Baumrind’s parenting styles are related to achievement of Chinese American adolescents in ways different from achievement of European American adolescents (Chao, 2001); and (e) whether authoritarian parenting style is interpreted more positively by Chinese than by European American adolescents (Chao, 2001; to be discussed in Explanation three). Each of these points, with
supporting empirical evidence, will be discussed. Some of the empirical evidence has been provided by Chao and some by other researchers.

With respect to the first cross-cultural question, involving the relationship between training and parenting goals of Chinese and European American parents, Chao (2000) did find that more Chinese than European American parents endorsed training. However, Chao also found that: “Training was related to the goals emphasizing filial piety for Chinese- and Euro-Americans. Thus, for both ethnic groups, those parents that endorsed training also valued the cultural notions of filial piety. This unexpected finding requires further examination” (p. 356). Chao’s unexpected finding is similar to that of Rudy and Grusec (2001), where authoritarian parenting for both Anglo and Egyptian Canadians was associated with emphasis on child success. Furthermore, a study by Pearson and Rao (2003) also found that both Hong Kong and English mothers who valued the socialization goals of filial piety and academic achievement endorsed authoritarian parenting. However, both Hong Kong and English mothers who valued the socialization goals of socio-emotional development endorsed authoritative parenting. Therefore, Chao’s own findings, in addition to the findings of Rudy and Grusec and Pearson and Rao, appear to indicate that training and socialization goals of academic achievement and filial piety are endorsed by individualist as well as collectivist parents (though a greater number of collectivists endorse training). The findings also show that the socialization goals of child success, academic achievement, and filial piety are similarly associated in cultures that are said to emphasize independence and interdependence with either training or authoritative parenting.

McBride-Chang and Chang (1998) examined Chao’s second hypothesis involving the positive link between training and academic achievement of Chinese children, adolescents, and young adults. Using Chao’s (1994) measure, McBride and Chang examined whether training is related to the academic achievement of young people in Hong Kong (age 12–20). They found that training is unrelated to the academic achievement (measured by official school ranks) of children, adolescents, and young adults in Hong Kong.

Stewart et al. (1998b, 1999b) examined Chao’s third hypothesis that training (using Chao’s 1994 measure) is distinct from both authoritarian and authoritative parenting styles in predicting psychosocial outcomes among adolescents in Hong Kong and Pakistan. Stewart et al. (1998b) defined authoritarian and authoritative parenting styles in terms of the dimensions of warmth, acceptance, and dominating control involving restriction or high demand without democratic exchange. Their findings show that for Hong Kong adolescents, the guan items overlap significantly with warmth and do not have independent predictive power beyond that provided by the dimensions of warmth and control. The authors also indicate that the guan items are consistent with the authoritative construct, where high expectation for age-appropriate behaviours, close involvement, and supportive supervision are found to be developmentally beneficial for children of European descent. The conclusions by Stewart and her colleagues were based on the fact that, “once the relationship between mother’s warmth and control and the well-being measures were accounted for [by way of partial correlations] the correlation between guan on the one hand and perceived health and life satisfaction are not significant” (p. 353). The same results were obtained for fathers. In another study, Stewart et al. (1999b) examined whether training explains parenting in Pakistan above and beyond parenting dimensions of warmth and dominating control. They found that the training items, with the exception of physical punishment and shaming strategies, loaded with warmth, not with dominating control items. Baumrind (personal communication, December, 2003) also commented that the guan items are more consistent with the authoritative than the authoritarian parenting style. However, Stewart et al. (1999b) did find that “the training items contributed to prediction over and above the warmth and dominating control items on only one variable [the variable being relationship harmony but not self-esteem or life-satisfaction]” (p. 766).

Furthermore, a comparative study (Stewart, Bond, Kendall, Ho, & Zaman, 2002) of adolescents and young adults in the United States, Hong Kong, and Pakistan revealed that measures of guan have adequate internal consistency in all three cultures, and that guan is positively associated with parental warmth in all three cultures. Guan items were also positively related to optimal outcomes of relationship harmony and life satisfaction in the US, Hong Kong, and Pakistan. However, the association of Guan to optimal outcomes was weaker in the US than in Hong Kong and Pakistan (Stewart et al., 2002).

In sum: The existing studies that tested whether training does or does not predict the effort and academic achievement of Chinese adolescents, whether training is or is not related to similar parenting goals in different cultures, and whether training is or is not distinct from authoritarian and authoritative parenting provide the following results. With respect to the link between training and academic achievement, McBride-Chang and Chang (1998) did not find an association among Hong Kong adolescents. Furthermore, Chao’s (2000) findings surprisingly show that training is related to the same parenting goal when endorsed by European and Chinese Americans. Several studies (Stewart et al., 1998b, 1999b, 2002) show that training is consistent with the parenting dimension of warmth and more akin to authoritative than authoritarian parenting in collective cultures. However, Stewart et al. (1999b) did find that training explained significant variance on one factor—relationship harmony—beyond warmth and dominating control items for young Pakistani women. Therefore, future studies could take a plural approach (as opposed to the singular approach of training) and delineate the different forms of control in which parents in collective cultures engage, and identify the various goals these different forms of control are intended to attain (i.e., test of parenting beliefs) and actually succeed in attaining.

With respect to the fourth question (posed by Chao and others) involving differences between individualist and collectivist cultures in the link between Baumrind’s parenting styles and academic achievement, Chao (2001) questions the beneficial effects of the authoritative style for ethnic minorities in the United States. Chao proposes that: “Authoritative parenting should not be treated as the prototype for some Asian-American groups. Whether these findings [that authoritarian parenting is linked to poor achievement for Anglo but not Chinese Americans] extend to other areas of development remains to be tested” (p. 1841). Chao’s recommendation is based on group differences found by some cross-cultural studies (including her own study discussed earlier) in the link between parenting styles and...
academic achievement (e.g., Chao, 2001; Dornbusch et al., 1987; Leung et al., 1998).

However, Chao’s (2000, 2001) reservations regarding authoritarian parenting for Chinese Americans may still be open to debate for several reasons. First, in Chao’s (2001) own study, Chinese American adolescents’ perceptions of their parents as authoritative is not linked to lower grades (albeit not higher) than those who view their parents as authoritarian. Second, as Chao also acknowledges, the effects of authoritarian parenting on Chinese children’s psychosocial adjustment is relatively unknown and remains to be tested. However, several studies (which will be discussed shortly) have examined the link between authoritarian parenting and psychosocial adjustment of young people in several countries that are described as collectivist in cultural orientation.

Third, Chao’s reservations regarding authoritative parenting may be open to debate because of findings by McBride-Chang and Chang (1998), Chen et al. (1997a), and Supple, Peterson, and Bush (2004). McBride-Chang and Chang, with a sample of children, adolescents, and young adults in Hong Kong (ages 12 to 20), found that Baumrind’s parenting styles as reported by parents (using Buri’s, 1991, Parental Authority Questionnaire) do predict adolescents’ academic achievement (i.e., based on school ranks 1, highest achieving, through 5, lowest achieving). Chinese parents with children in Rank 1 schools rated themselves significantly lower on authoritarian parenting style than did parents with children in Rank 5 schools. Conversely, parents with children in Rank 1 schools rated themselves as significantly higher on authoritative parenting style than parents with children in Rank 5 schools. Similarly, Chen et al. (1997a) found that reports of authoritarian parenting style (measured by Block’s, 1981, CRPR) by both Chinese mothers and fathers in Beijing were positively associated with child (age 8) aggression-disruption (based on teacher assessments) and negatively associated with distinguished studentship and academic achievement (based on official school records). Authoritative parenting was positively associated with Chinese children’s peer acceptance, social competence, school achievement, and distinguished studentship, and was negatively related to social difficulties. Also Supple et al. (2004) found that in Beijing, China—for both younger and older adolescents (ages 12 to 15 and 16 to 19)—such parenting dimensions as support, monitoring, and autonomy granting were positively associated with academic orientation and effort.

It appears that when objective measures (i.e., official school rank or grades, teacher assessments instead of self-report of grades) are used to ascertain levels of academic achievement, distinctions between Baumrind’s authoritative and authoritarian parenting are linked to youth achievement in China and Hong Kong just as they are in the United States. However, when academic achievement is based on self-report of adolescents (Chao, 2001; Dornbusch et al., 1987; Leung et al., 1998), a negative link between authoritarian parenting style and achievement is not found in collective cultures. The apparent cultural difference proposed by these authors (e.g., Chao, Dornbusch, and colleagues) may reflect a methodological artifact; social desirability bias may have inordinately skewed self-reports of collectivist children, who are highly conscious of the value of education and external evaluation.

For example, Chao (2001) found that the range of scores on GPA was skewed (truncated range) more for Chinese adolescents than for Anglo American adolescents. For Chao, the truncated range of scores on GPA is evidence of superior academic achievement of the Chinese as a group. However, it might be argued that if Chao had obtained official school grades, instead of obtaining the adolescents’ self-report of grades, a less skewed or truncated range of grades may have been found, as was the case in other studies in Hong Kong and China (Chen et al., 1997a; McBride-Chang & Chang, 1998).

An alternative explanation for divergence between the findings of McBride-Chang and Chang (1998) and Chao (2001) could be that associations found at the group level (school) are not replicated at the individual level. But the individual-level analysis by Chen et al. (1997a) and Supple et al. (2004) also diverges from similar analysis by Chao. McBride-Chang and Chang’s findings are important per se, because they show that in a collective culture (Hong Kong) parenting styles do in fact predict actual differences in academic performance—outcome differences that Chao (2000, 2001) has hypothesized would not be explained by differences between authoritative and authoritarian parenting styles in countries like China and Hong Kong.

Furthermore, Chao (2001) indicates that the influence of authoritarian parenting on psychosocial adjustment of Chinese children or adolescents “remains to be tested” (p. 1841). Several studies (e.g., Chang et al., 2003a; Chen, Rubin, & Li, 1995, 1997b; Chen, Wu, Chen, Wang, & Cen, 2001; Crystal et al., 1994; Sheldon et al., 2004) have in fact tested this relationship. These studies have found that the use of such authoritarian methods as public humiliation, shaming, and rejection of Chinese children and adolescents whose achievement levels fall below the threshold necessary for maintenance of family honour may undermine children’s achievement, carry psychological costs, and negate the cultural goal of scholastic achievement to promote family honour. Researchers (e.g., Chang et al., 2003a; Chen, Rubin, Li, & Li, 1999) agree with Chao (1994, 2001) that maintenance of family honour by way of a child’s academic achievement is valued by Chinese parents. For example, Chang et al. (2003a) indicate that the value of learning and academic engagement constitute an important aspect of Chinese socialization, which creates a social context, “where a child’s happiness hinges on his/her perceived ability to do well in school” (p. 187). However, these researchers (e.g., Chang et al., 2003a; Chen et al., 1999) contend that the means used by authoritarian parents—shaming, rejection, and unilateral obedience—are less likely to produce culturally valued ends than acceptance, warmth, and use of reason. They suggest that the links found between parenting and child outcomes in cultures that are said to emphasize interdependence are similar to those found in cultures that emphasize independence.

Several studies indicate that Chinese mothers who choose to employ warmth and acceptance instead of authoritarian or harsh parenting strategies of shaming, rejection, and physical punishment appear to be more successful in helping their children achieve the goals of academic and social competence. According to Chen et al. (1995), “maternal acceptance serves as a protective factor that buffers children who have academic difficulties from developing depressive symptoms” (p. 945). With respect to social competence of aggressive children Chen et al. (1997b, see p. 676) found that aggression and peer rejection were highly stable over the years for Chinese children whose mothers were rejecting, but not for children who had sensitive and warm mothers. Chang et al. (2004a) found that for primary-school-age children in Hong Kong, maternal harsh
perceptions of authoritarian parenting styles and specific

dimensions of shaming, family honour, obedience demands,
and emphasis on achievement, as opposed to adolescents’
perceptions of training. This is due to the fact that researchers,
including those (e.g., Chao, 1994) who have proposed a
culture-specific (emic) form of parenting (training), have also
been seeking empirical answers to the separate question of
whether Baumrind’s parenting styles and parenting dimen-
sions, similarly identified in both individualist and collectivist
cultures, are in fact similarly interpreted by adolescents in the
two contexts. The hypothesized difference concerning adoles-
cents’ interpretation of parenting in different cultures is
proposed to explain group differences found by some studies
in the outcomes associated with authoritarian parenting style
(Chao, 1994; Markus et al., 1997).

Chao (1994), Fung (1999), and Markus et al. (1997)
suggested that children and adolescents in collectivist cultures
are likely to attribute positive meaning to the authoritarian
parenting style and perceive practices of shaming, obedience
demands, and emphasis on family honour and achievement as
desirable, organizational, and necessary for hierarchical order
and harmony. On the other hand adolescents in cultures that
are described as individualist are likely to attribute negative
meaning to the authoritarian parenting style, perceiving such
parental control as domineering and reflective of arbitrary
power-assertion. For example, Fung (1999) contends that the
use of shame is a socialization strategy that is highly
emphasized and valued in Confucian philosophy. According
to Fung, the use of shame, which includes a range of
behaviours such as name-calling, derogatory attributions,
threats of abandonment, social comparisons, and physical
punishment (e.g., spanking to a point where a parent tells the
child that the spanking deserved now will be deferred, until the
child’s skin is no longer itchy), are intended by parents to teach
the child to “fit in” and be a part of society. Therefore,
shaming is intended to have constructive socialization effects
and to transmit Chinese cultural values. Similarly, Chao
(1994) indicates that, “strictness is sometimes equated with
manifestations of parental hostility, aggression, mistrust, and
dominance [for European Americans]. For Asians, parental
obedience and some aspects of strictness may be equated with
parental concern, caring, and involvement” (p. 1112).

Chao (2001) provides empirical support for her position.
She found that authoritative parenting was positively related to
relationship closeness with parents for first- and second-
generation Chinese and European American adolescents. Howev-
er, authoritarian parenting was negatively related to
relationship closeness with parents only among European
American adolescents. In turn, differences were found (Chao,
2001, discussed earlier) between European and Chinese
Americans in the links between authoritative and authoritarian
parenting and outcomes of academic effort and GPA. More
recently, Supple et al. (2004) also found that in Beijing, China
younger adolescents’ (ages 12 to 15) reports of parental
punitiveness were not significantly related to their reports of
conformity with parental expectations or their reports of their
level of self-esteem. (These findings did not hold true for an
older group of adolescents aged 16 to 19—to be discussed
shortly).

In contrast to findings by Chao (2001) and Supple et al.
(2004), other studies based on adolescents’ perspectives (e.g.,
Lau & Cheung, 1987; Rohner & Pettengill, 1985; Rosenthal,
Ranieri, & Klimidis, 1996; Yau & Smetana, 1996) show that in
societies described as collectivist, authoritarian, or restrictive,
parental control is interpreted as a sign of parental hostility and rejection, negatively associated with harmony and cohesion, and positively associated with conflict. Consistent with these negative adolescent evaluations, studies (e.g., Barber, 2002; Bush, Peterson, Cobas, & Supple, 2002; Kim & Ge, 2000; Lau & Cheung, 1987; Stewart et al., 1999b, 2000b; Supple et al., 2004) have shown that in numerous cultures adolescents’ perceptions of authoritarian parenting style, psychological control, the use of shame, emphasis on family honour, and high demands for achievement are in turn related to negative child outcomes such as low self-esteem and lower levels of psychosocial adjustment.

Rohner and Pettengill (1985) examined Korean adolescents’ perceptions of level of parental control and its relation to adolescents’ evaluation of parental warmth and found that, ‘‘even though mothers high in reported control are perceived as being high in warmth and low in neglect, strict maternal control is also seen by Korean youths as being slightly aggressively hostile and rejecting’’ (p. 527). Lau and Cheung’s (1987) findings indicate that adolescents’ perceptions of restrictive parental control that curtailed independence (where control was not organizational) was positively related to conflict and negatively related to cohesion and harmony for high school students in Hong Kong. Yau and Smetana (1996) found that adolescents in Hong Kong report conflicts with their parents about a range of issues (such as homework, academic achievement, choice of friends, doing chores, and curfew) that their parents regulate, but which adolescents regard as matters of personal choice and beyond parental jurisdiction and control. Similarly, Rosenthal et al. (1996) found that both Vietnamese adolescent girls and boys reported conflict with their parents about traditional family values in different ways. Therefore, these studies suggest that arbitrarily strict control that curtails any legitimate expression of autonomy is perceived as hostile by adolescents, is associated with conflict, and subverts the cultural goals of harmony and cohesion in cultures that are described as emphasizing collective concerns.

Studies conducted in China, Hong Kong, Bangladesh, Pakistan, and among Chinese Americans further support the proposition that adolescents in collective cultures equate authoritarian control with hostility and rejection rather than with warmth and concern. These studies (e.g., Bush et al., 2002; Kim & Ge, 2000; Lau & Cheung, 1987; Stewart, Bond, Abdullah, & Ma, 2000a; Supple et al., 2004) found that adolescents’ reports of restrictive and dominating control, harsh discipline, and parental punitiveness are linked to negative adolescent outcomes. Lau and Cheung (1987) applied Baumrind’s parental control distinctions (measured by the Family Environment Scale) and found that the self-esteem of high school students in Hong Kong was negatively related to their perception of parental restrictive control (defined as arbitrary, lacking in use of reason, domineering) and positively related to their perceptions of parental functional control (defined as rational, constructive, organizational, and autonomy supporting). More recently, Supple et al. (2004) found that in Beijing, China older adolescents’ (ages 16 to 19) perception of parental punitiveness (measured by Parent Behavior Measure; Henry et al., 1989) was negatively related to adolescents’ self-esteem and conformity to parental expectations. Additionally, older adolescents’ perceptions of parental support, autonomy granting, and monitoring were positively related to their self-esteem and conformity to maternal expectations. Similarly, Bush et al. (2002) found that in Beijing, China maternal and paternal autonomy granting, reasoning, and monitoring (measured by Parent Behavior Measure; Henry & Peterson, 1995) were related positively to adolescents’ reports of their self-esteem, whereas parental punitiveness was a negative predictor of Chinese adolescents’ self-esteem (measured by Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale, 1979). According to Kim and Ge (2000), Chinese American adolescents’ (ages 13 to 15) perceptions of high parental monitoring and inductive reasoning were negatively related to their depressive symptoms, whereas adolescents’ perceptions of parental harsh discipline were positively associated with their depressive symptoms. These findings held true after income, parental education, and length of stay in the US were controlled.

In Bangladesh, both boys and girls who reported self-dograting cognition also perceived their parents as exerting dominating control (Stewart et al., 2000a). Pakistani women (nursing students in their 20s) who perceived greater use of shame and familial emphasis on honour also reported lower self-esteem than their counterparts who did not perceive emphasis on honour and greater use of shame (Stewart et al., 1999b). In another study with a sample of Pakistani male and female adolescents, Stewart et al. (2000b) found that for both adolescent males and females, perceptions of parental autonomy granting were negatively related to self-denigration. In turn, self-denigration was related to lower perceived health and life-satisfaction.

In cultures described as individualist and collectivist, comparative studies of adolescents’ perceptions of authoritarian parental demands and adolescents’ self-appraisal and psychological distress have found similarity across the cultures of the US, India, Gaza, Turkey, Russia, Japan, and China. In a comparison of Chinese, Japanese, and Anglo American adolescents (age 17), Crystal et al. (1994) found that adolescents within all groups who perceived their parents as having high expectations and being dissatisfied with their academic performance reported greater psychological distress, which included depression, academic anxiety, somatic complaints, feelings of aggression, and stress. Taylor and Oskay’s (1995) comparison of Turkish and Anglo American adolescents revealed that both groups who perceived their parents as authoritarian and reported the prevalence of conflict also reported lower self-esteem. However, both Turkish and Anglo American adolescents who perceived their parents as granting autonomy also reported higher self-esteem than adolescents who did not perceive their parents as granting autonomy. Barber and Harmon (2002) found that adolescents’ perception of parental psychological (or intrusive) control related positively to internalizing and externalizing problem behaviours in nine cultures, including what they describe as the collective cultures of Gaza and India. Olsen et al. (2002) also found that in China, Russia, and the US, maternal reports of psychological control were positively related to teacher reports of child internalizing and externalizing problems.

Furthermore, a meta-analysis conducted by Khaleque and Rohner (2002) transculturally attributes 26% of the variance explained in children’s and 21% of the variance explained in adults’ self-reports of psychological adjustment to maternal and paternal acceptance or rejection (based on 43 studies with samples from five continents—Asia, Europe, North America, Central America, and Africa; the North American sample included the range of ethnic groups).
In sum: There is some evidence to suggest that when adolescents from several collectivist as well as individualist cultures perceive lack of warmth, use of shame, psychological intrusion, or authoritarian parental control that arbitrarily curtails legitimate autonomy, they are likely to perceive such a hierarchy as undesirable and hostile, rather than view it as an intrinsic order that is desirable and necessary for the preservation of harmony. Indeed, such perceptions are linked to conflict and absence of harmony or cohesion (e.g., Lau & Cheung, 1987; Rosenthal et al., 1996), and related to negative psychosocial outcomes and feelings of isolation and depression (e.g., Barber & Harmon, 2002; Crystal et al., 1994; Stewart et al., 2000a). Studies that further examine the way that adolescents in cultures said to emphasize interdependence interpret different forms of parenting within their cultures are needed in the literature.

Reasons for treating Baumrind’s parenting styles as an etic

What are some of the reasons or plausible explanations for the findings of studies reported herein, that authoritative parenting, in contrast to authoritarian and permissive parenting, is similarly related to academic and psychosocial adjustment in certain cultures that have been described as collectivist and individualist? One possible reason is that authoritative parents are more effectively able to coordinate and integrate multiple and (at times) competing goals, which include social requirements or group goals and individual needs or goals, present across cultures. However, coordination and integration of goals, which might determine the optimal sequence and timing of goal achievement, does not necessarily determine the way in which any one goal will be achieved. Therefore, another possible reason for the success of authoritative parenting found in some cross-cultural studies might be that authoritative parents employ more effective ways or means of obtaining goals by balancing responsive and demanding practices, being more flexible and reasoned, and by being able to appropriately select among different parenting practices (Baumrind, 1989).

It is important to note that the content of goals vary across cultures. For example, Chang et al. (2003a) indicate that the goal of happiness for Chinese children is significantly determined by their academic competence. In contrast, the happiness of some European American adolescents may not be so significantly influenced by academic competence and may be influenced by other factors such as athletic competence. However, despite differences in the content of goals that exist between cultures (which can potentially exist within cultures as well), the joint ability of the authoritative parent to coordinate different or competing goals and to select effective means for attaining goals may explain the similarity of findings in child outcomes shown by some studies (e.g., Chen et al., 1997a; McBride-Chang & Chang, 1998) in cultures that have been described as collectivist and individualist.

Authoritative parenting is distinguished by reciprocity, mutual understanding, and flexibility, which enable the parent to effectively account for, coordinate, and balance communal needs or collective goals of society and family with the capabilities, needs, and goals of the child. Authoritative parenting is in contrast to the inflexible, nonmutual, and unilateral emphasis of authoritarian parenting on parental requirements and social expectations that fail to accommodate the reality of the child’s needs, weaknesses, and strengths. The reality of the child’s state of being may in some cases require parents to shift their expectations and goals in attaining “culturally” valued goals. Authoritative parenting also contrasts with permissive parenting, which focuses on the pursuit of child-determined goals without sufficient coordination of parental, social, or communal needs and requirements that may require the child to accommodate to the other. Given the multifaceted nature of socialization, I suggest that when the child’s state of being and social requirements are properly acknowledged, coordinated, and balanced by parents (as is not the case with both authoritarian and permissive parenting styles), parents may experience relative success in attaining multiple goals or any one end of socialization (be these sociocultural or individual goals). However, when social concerns and goals are ignored or subordinated to individual goals (permissive parenting), or when individual concerns and goals are ignored or subordinated to social goals and requirements (authoritarian parenting), such parents may experience less success in the attainment of any given goal.

With respect to the way goals are achieved, socialization research shows that even when parents pursue the same goal (e.g., good grades), they employ different ways or practices to attain that goal; these differences in practice are differentially associated with goal attainment. For example, Rosenthal and Feldman (1991) found that two immigrant Chinese groups residing in Australia and the US employed different practices with respect to academic grades. The Chinese immigrants living in Australia were more likely to punish poor grades, and those living in the US were more likely to remain neutral or ignore poor grades. Interestingly, for both groups high grades were associated with a neutral approach rather than with either negative or positive reactions. Similarly, Baumrind (1991b) found that when European American parents pursue the same goal (e.g., academic excellence, deterring drug use), all do not employ the same practice, and that authoritative parenting practices are qualitatively different and more successful at meeting any given goal than authoritarian or permissive practices.

Throughout development, the way that authoritative parents pursue goals in any area (e.g., social, academic) is by balancing different forms of control with different ways to support autonomy (defined as opportunities that facilitate or support children’s ability to meet their obligations without external control or parental assistance). Authoritative parents understand that when they require or demand anything from the child, they are reciprocally required to help and provide the means necessary to meet parental demands. They provide organizational structure and supportive control (e.g., factual knowledge) in order for the child to competently achieve goals by sustaining the effort needed to overcome frustration, setbacks, and even failure (Baumrind, 1989). They grant autonomy and support the child’s plan when welfare concerns are not compromised, when the child demonstrates competence, or when the child makes a reasonable request to act autonomously. Authoritative parents apply firm control and insist on compliance to redirect and alter any child behaviour or goal that is self-defeating or insensitive to communal needs (e.g., family). However, they insist on compliance by applying firm control in a just and fair way without coercion and are able to justify their directives by reason, because their demands are reasonable. As Baumrind (1967) indicates, the use of reason by authoritative parents, “permits the child to grasp the rationale
behind parental directives and thus to view them as an expression of a larger necessity, . . . rather than an arbitrary imposition of parental will” (p. 61). It may be because of the consistent, balanced, and differentiated use of autonomy granting, supportive control, firm control, and nurturance that children of authoritative parents have been found, in cultures like China as well as the US, to be socially and instrumentally competent (e.g., positively regarded by peers and have good grades), self-reliant and autonomous (e.g., resilient, non-regressive), as well as communally minded or respectful of others’ needs and claims (lack of externalizing problem behaviour) (e.g., Chen et al., 1997a, 1997b).

In contrast, permissive parents do not consistently provide the organizational structure and supportive control necessary for achievement of goals that may in fact be chosen by the child. They are likely either to ignore problematic child behaviours or to apply inconsistent lax control when the child’s behaviour is imprudent or inconsistent of the other and communal needs. Also, their acceptance of the child at any given point in time does not clearly point out the child’s reciprocal social responsibilities or properly differentiate in the child’s mind mature and praiseworthy behaviour from regressive and inconsiderate behaviour (Baumrind, 1971, 1989).

Authoritarian parents unilaterally demand that the child meet socially desirable and family-centred goals without understanding that as parents they are reciprocally responsible for helping the child obtain these socially valued goals. In fact, authoritarian parents are more likely to blame the child for setbacks and berate the child for failure than to provide organizational or supportive control by engaging in specific problem solving and ascertaining potential reasons external to the child that may have contributed to the setback or failure. They also apply restrictive or intrusive control that fails to differentiate areas where the child has attained competence or can legitimately exercise autonomy (Baumrind, 1989). Authoritarian parents make inflexible demands for obedience that coerce the child into complying with a directive that may be logically and pragmatically unjustifyable. The arbitrary and unreasonable nature of demands issued by the authoritarian parent may be the reason why authoritarian parents are unlikely to engage in verbal give and take, to use reason to legitimate their directives, or to make an effort to understand the child’s point of view.

Therefore, the way in which parents obtain goals is of paramount importance to the attainment of their own and their child’s goals. Obedience requirements that systematically entail failure or self-defeat for the child by coercing the child to undertake what is beyond his or her capacity, that curtail legitimate autonomy, and that largely benefit the parent at the expense of the child will meet with rebellion (i.e., externalizing behaviours, conflict) or lead to self-derogation (i.e., internalizing behaviours), where children fear, not respect, their parents (e.g., Barber, 2002; Stewart et al., 1999b, 2000a). Alternatively, parental inconsistency and lax use of control, which fail to provide children with necessary support for the attainment of important social requirements, serve to diminish parental status so that the child increasingly views the parent as ill-informed of his or her needs and incapable of fulfilling the parental role. However, parental requirements that are non-arbitrary, reasonable, supportively demanded, and that include the child’s legitimate claims are more likely to be accepted by the child and to positively influence child development. Thus, the “normative” nature of social goals or expecta-

tions within any culture does not necessarily determine whether goals will be or can be obtained in practice by all or the majority (given children’s weaknesses, strengths, and interests in goals that may not be culturally or socially prestigious). In fact, Chang (2004) and Chang et al. (2003b) indicate that current assumptions in the socialization literature, which posit Confucian philosophy as the foundation of Chinese parenting values and practices, may not accurately reflect the changes that have been taking place in Chinese society ever since the turn of the 20th century. The intellectuals of Chinese society during the 1920s and 1930s criticized the Confucian emphasis on hierarchy, the absolute nature of paternal authority, and father-son solidarity by suggesting diminution of filial piety and greater emphasis on the child’s expression of opinions, independence, creativity, self-respect, and mutuality in communication between parents and children. Furthermore, Ho (1987) indicates that filial piety (even when prevalent in China) emphasizes external actions (obedience), not internal psychological events. Ho suggests that on the psychological plane the Chinese child may have been distant from, fearful of, and even antagonistic toward his or her father. Ho’s suggestion is supported by studies cited in this review showing that children and adolescents (in China and other countries) negatively view parental unilateral demands for obedience and emphasis on family honour and may be psychologically harmed (i.e., depressed, aggressive, low self-esteem) by such demands and emphasis. Therefore, the attainment of parenting goals may depend on the mutually accommodating way that parents within cultures nurture and support children and provide conditions that are conducive to competent action and feelings of relatedness, which increase the incentives for cooperation.

Future directions and conclusion

Given the wealth of measures and means that are currently available for assessing psychological processes within cultures and the progress that has been made by many studies (reported herein) in understanding different parenting processes and identifying similarities and differences between cultures, several suggestions for future research could include the following. First, it would be useful to identify the diverse forms of parenting within cultures, so as to more effectively explain within-culture differences in child outcomes and to compare similar patterns of parenting between cultures. For example, Lim and Lim (2004) indicate that while the parenting dimension of warmth is often found to be associated with positive child outcomes across different cultures, the effects of the dimension of parental control is not as clear. Lim and Lim suggest that a clearer understanding of child outcomes requires that functional and dysfunctional forms of control among Chinese and Chinese American families be clearly delineated. On a related note, Smith and Bond (1999) and Supple et al. (2004) suggest the use of measures (e.g., parenting) that have been validated in the different cultures being studied. When measures have been validated in different cultures, they contain meaningful items that are similarly interpreted by the groups in question and would reduce the effect of confounding factors. Second, it would be worthwhile—as suggested by Leung (1989), Smith and Bond (1999), and Van de Vijver and Leung (1997)—for more parenting studies to rely on measures that directly verify the existence of the hypothesized cultural
processes and to rely less on indirect measures of cultural processes that include the variables of country, ethnicity, and immigrant status. Third, it is important to make an effort to reduce the problem of shared source variance by obtaining data for the “antecedent” and “consequent” factors from different sources, so as to reduce artificially high correlations and to reduce the social desirability factor. Fourth, given that many extant studies have been conducted in urban environments (in the US as well as China), it would be useful to examine parenting and child outcomes in rural areas in cultures that are described as independent and interdependent and to compare differences and similarities between rural and urban areas within and between cultures. Fifth, it has been suggested (Steinberg, 2001) that an alternative mode of understanding the processes associated with parenting and child outcomes would be to examine particular parenting dimensions in relation to child outcomes, instead of configurations of different parenting dimensions (e.g., parenting styles). Finally, the argument presented herein is limited or constrained by an assumption that emphasizes the similarity of certain psychological processes across cultures and of individual differences in reasoning about social conditions. Other arguments contend that social forces and differential frameworks of societal institutions carry greater weight in influencing the individual’s thoughts and actions.

In this review I have analysed studies that examine the question of whether Baumrind’s parenting styles have the same function in cultures that have been described as collectivist and individualist in the sense of being associated with the same child outcomes. Several cross-cultural researchers have identified the existence of Baumrind’s parenting styles in collectivist as well as individualist cultures. However, some found that the authoritative and authoritarian parenting distinction does not have the same effects in collective cultures, given either the positive associations between authoritarian parenting and grades or lack of difference between authoritative and authoritarian parenting in relation to grades of Chinese adolescents (e.g., Chao, 2001; Dornbusch et al., 1987). However, much of the research concluding that Baumrind’s authoritative and authoritarian distinction does not apply to collective cultures is based on data where both “antecedent” (parenting) and “consequent” variables (grades) are obtained from the same source and might be subject to social desirability bias. In contrast, cross-cultural studies that obtain data for the “antecedent” and “consequent” variables from different sources, by relying on official grades, teacher assessments of social competence, or peer ratings, rather than on participants’ self-report, have found that Baumrind’s parenting styles are relevant to collectivist cultures in that the authoritative and authoritarian distinctions are linked to child outcomes in ways similar to those in individualist cultures (e.g., Chen et al., 1997a; McBride-Chang & Chang, 1998).

Studies that examined the potential differential meaning of authoritarian parenting in collectivist and individualist cultures have found similar interpretation of and function of authoritarian parenting between cultures. For example, Rudy and Grusec (2001) were not able to confirm that authoritarian parenting in collectivist cultures (i.e., Egypt) in contrast to individualist cultures (i.e., Australia) covary with positive parental characteristics (e.g., low anger, high warmth), which would in turn explain adolescents’ positive interpretation of authoritarian parenting and between-group differences in the link between authoritarian parenting and achievement. Similarly, Chang et al. (2004a) found that harsh parenting in Hong Kong is associated with maternal depression or marital discord. Chao’s (1994, 2001) explanation and finding that the positive interpretation of authoritarian parenting rendered by adolescents in collectivist cultures ameliorates the effect of authoritarian parenting and contributes to its positive effects were not supported or replicated by several studies that consistently found adolescents’ perceptions (in collectivist cultures) of authoritarian parenting and parenting dimensions (e.g., obedience demands) to be associated with family conflict rather than harmony (Rosenthal et al., 1996), parental hostility rather than concern (Rohner & Pettengill, 1985), and adolescent self-derejection and maladjustment (Stewart et al., 1999a, 2000a, 2000b). Furthermore, Chao’s (1994) explanation of training as a culture-specific form of parenting in Chinese culture was not substantiated by her own research, in which both Chinese and European American parents related training to the same socialization goal of filial piety. Also, McBride-Chang and Chang (1998) were not able to confirm that training was related to academic achievement among young people in Hong Kong. Research (Stewart et al., 1998b, 1999a) that attempted to verify Chao’s claim, that training accounted for variance in child outcomes over and above that accounted for by authoritarian and authoritative parenting styles or dimensions of warmth and control, primarily found that training does not explain unique variance in child outcomes above and beyond dimensions of warmth and control (with the exception of the Stewart et al., 1999b, finding).

Therefore, the studies herein suggest that authoritarian parenting and parenting dimensions of shaming, unilateral obedience demands, curtailment of legitimate autonomy, and lack of positive affect are interpreted in similar ways by children and adolescents from a variety of cultures. Studies have also found that in different cultures, authoritarian parenting and its various dimensions (e.g., shaming) function in similar ways by being related to similar child outcomes (low achievement and psychosocial maladjustment) in cultures described as emphasizing independence and interdependence.
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