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ABSTRACT

What Parents Value Matters: Examining the Association Between Cultural Values, Parenting Styles/Practices, and Child Outcomes

Chen-Yun Wang
School of Family Life, BYU
Master of Science

Researchers have identified significant relationships between parenting styles and child outcomes. However, these associations might vary in different cultures because parenting behaviors could link to cultural values. Additionally, understanding the cultural values of parents would help researchers better understand the reasons of parents’ behaviors. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to examine the relationships between parental Asian values, parenting styles, parenting practices, and child outcomes. Parents of preschool-age children (N = 273) from Taiwan completed a series of parenting values and parenting behaviors questionnaires. Teachers rated child prosocial behaviors, modesty, sociability, and impulse control. Results revealed that some domains of parents’ cultural values were associated with parenting behaviors, and in turn, associated with child outcomes. Maternal and paternal effects varied. These findings suggest that researchers or practitioners should not simply assume the relationship between certain parenting behaviors and child outcomes are the same across cultures.
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What Parents Value Matters: Examining the Association Between Cultural Values, Parenting Styles/Practices, and Child Outcomes

Parents are fundamental to children’s development because they are one of the most direct influences, especially when children are young (Harter, 2012). Specifically, the style parents use to rear their children is one of the significant factors that researchers have found to be associated with child outcomes. These outcomes include, but are not limited to, social development (Zhou, Eisenberg, Wang, & Reiser, 2004), emotional development (Chang, Schwartz, Dodge, & McBride-Chang, 2003; Morris, Silk, Steinberg, Myers, & Robinson, 2007), and externalizing behaviors (Yan & Ansari, 2017).

Using Baumrind’s (1967, 1991) parenting styles typology, numerous studies found that authoritative parenting (i.e., high parental warmth and control) led to positive child outcomes, whereas authoritarian parenting (i.e., low warmth and high control) and permissive parenting styles (i.e., high warmth and low control) led to negative child outcomes (LeCuyer & Swanson, 2017; Piotrowski, Lapierre, & Linebarger, 2013). However, one problem with Baumrind’s parenting typology is that it may not always generalize across cultures (Dwairy & Achoui, 2010; Leung, Lau, & Lam, 1998; McBride-Chang & Chang, 1998). For example, Park and Bauer (2002) found that the positive relationship between authoritative parenting style and student academic achievement only applied to European Americans but not to other ethnic groups.

One of the reasons for the lack of generalization is that parenting practices relate to cultural parenting values (Varela et al., 2004; Xu et al., 2005). Researchers have asserted that broad cultural values may influence parents’ personal value, parenting styles, and practices (Pinquart & Kauser, 2018). In Keshavarz and Baharudin’s (2009) review, they suggested that every culture has its own pattern for raising children, and what is considered normal in one
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culture may be viewed as maladaptive in another culture.

Understanding the cultural context and values of society might potentially predict parenting styles and practices that predominate, and whether or how these parenting styles and practices are associated with child outcomes. For these reasons, I proposed to evaluate the association between parents’ Asian values, parenting styles and practices, and child outcomes in the Taiwanese cultural context. Specifically, my research question is whether a parent’s Asian value is associated with parenting styles/practices, and in turn, associated with child outcomes in Taiwan. I examined this research question by using survey data from a sample of 273 preschoolers, their parents, and teachers, from 12 kindergartens in Taipei City and New Taipei City, Taiwan. The measures of Asian parenting values and parenting styles/practices in this paper were reported by both mothers and fathers. This allowed for an investigation of the difference between maternal and paternal impacts on child outcomes (as reported by teachers).

The society of Taiwan shares the long tradition of Chinese culture with Mainland China, even though they differ in current social, political, and economic conditions (Chang & Shih, 2004). Although not many studies have compared Chinese and Taiwanese parenting styles, one study (Berndt, Cheung, Lau, Hau, & Lew, 1993) found that the difference in ratings of parents' warmth was not significant across Taiwanese, Chinese, and Hong Kong participants. Therefore, in this study, I use a number of Chinese studies to support my models and hypotheses.

Studying parents’ cultural values provides information regarding parenting styles and practices in other societies and broadens the cross-cultural database to better understand parenting and child outcomes. Research on this issue would provide valuable information about the applicability of Baumrind’s typology concerning parenting patterns in different cultural contexts. It would broaden cross-cultural research and would help scholars better understand the
role of cultural factors in parenting. Further, this more nuanced understanding could have implications for parenting programs that assist different cultural groups. For example, this information could help educators or clinicians understand the motivations and reasons (e.g., cultural values) behind certain parenting styles and practices (e.g., authoritarian parenting strategies). In addition, it provided evidence that researchers, educators, and clinicians should not simply assume that the associations between parenting styles, practices, and child outcomes are equal or similar across cultures (Varela et al., 2004).

**Theoretical Framework**

Using the concepts from Bronfenbrenner’s (1994) ecological systems and Darling and Steinberg’s (1993) integrative parenting model, I presented a conceptual model shown in Figure 1 as a framework to guide the analyses. This paper focuses on aspects of children’s macrosystem (i.e., cultural values) and its association with children’s microsystem (i.e., parenting styles and practices), which in turn, affects children’s outcomes.

Bronfenbrenner highlighted the importance of including different systems of the context while studying individual development. He examined the interactions (i.e., proximal processes, Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 1998) between each context (e.g., microsystem, macrosystem) and the individual (Bronfenbrenner, 1994). The processes, representing the everyday interactions between individuals and the symbols, objects, and significant others in their everyday contexts, are viewed as the primary mechanism for individual development in Bronfenbrenner’s theory (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 1998). These parent-child interactions help children to understand their world and formulate ideas about their place within it. However, the macrosystem (e.g., culture), the outer layer shown in Figure 1, influence parents’ values and behaviors, which in turn, affect child development.
Darling and Steinberg’s (1993) integrative parenting model showed the influences of parents’ values and goals on their parenting practices. In this model, parents’ values and goals of socializing their children influenced the parenting styles and practices they use, which in turn, affected children’s outcomes. For example, when parents put a higher value on children’s school achievement, they might be more likely to enact those values by strictly monitoring their children’s homework or limiting children’s playtime comparing to parents who do not view children’s school achievement as a priority.

Synthesizing the concepts from Bronfenbrenner’s (1994) ecological systems and Darling and Steinberg’s (1993) integrative parenting model, I presented an argument that cultural values are essential while examining parenting behaviors and child outcomes. As shown in Figure 2c, I examined the associations between parental Asian values, parenting styles/practices, and child outcomes in the Taiwanese cultural context. Since Taiwan is generally a society that emphasizes and values collectivism, Taiwanese parents are likely to adopt those cultural values. As a result, they might be more likely to use parenting styles and practices according to the culture (i.e., macrosystem) to help their children fit in the society, which in turn, influence child outcomes.

**Parenting Values in Cultural Contexts**

Cultural context and values, directly or indirectly, influence parents’ values, beliefs, attitudes, and socialization goals (Keshavarz & Baharudin, 2009; Tamminen, 2006). When individuals are exposed to their culture with high frequency, they are likely to adopt the norms and values of that culture (Schwarz, Schäfermeister, Trommsdorff, 2005). These social norms and values offer standards that parents often use to direct their own interaction with their children from early years (Huang & Gove, 2015; Olsen et al., 2002). In multiple studies, Chinese and US mothers scored differently on many of the parenting style and practice constructs
because of the differences in cultures (Chao, 1994; Schwarz et al., 2005; Wu et al., 2002). For example, Chao (1994) found that European American parents who hold individualistic values tend to foster the child’s independence. Chinese parents, in a collectivistic culture, are more likely to encourage children to view themselves as part of the integrated wholes of their family, community, and society, and not to emphasize their differences from others (Chao, 1994; Chen, Cen, Li, & He, 2005; Ruby & Grusec, 2001, 2006). Although all cultures are a blend of individualistic and collectivistic values, each culture differs in its emphasis (Kagitçibasi, 1990). These different orientations result in different values, the choices of parenting practices and styles, and parent-child interactions and relationships (Chao, 1994; Xu et al., 2005; Rudy & Grusec, 2006).

**Asian parenting values.** The Chinese culture embodies the collectivist perspective in which achieving and maintaining social order and interpersonal harmony have been primary concerns (Chen, Liu et al., 2000). Collectivist societies, such as Taiwan, often value and promote sociability, harmony, family integrity, obedience, and interdependent relationships with others (Oishi, Schimmack, Diener, & Suh, 1998). Further, because of the emphasis of interdependent relationships, individuals in collectivist societies often act in ways that maintain group cohesion and strive for conformity with their parents, family, and larger social groups (Chen, 2000).

Traditional Chinese culture emphasizes face (reputation, prestige; see Qi (2011) for a review), criticism, self-control, establishing interrelationships with others, conforming to norms, and humility (Fung, 1999; Ho, 1995; Li, 2001; Tu, 1998). In a collectivist society, one must not “stick out” in order to fit in the group and maintain the harmony of the community (Ho, 1986). Being moderate, humble, self-effacing, and socially conforming while interacting with others reflect “modesty” and are greatly valued in Chinese culture (Leung, 2010; Triandis, 1995, 2001).
Additionally, Confucianism and Taoism, which are central to the Chinese value system, emphasizes self-control, interpersonal harmony, conforming to norms, respecting parents and elders, and achieving family reputation through individual achievement (Ho, 1995; King & Bond, 1985). In general, these two philosophies advocate the subordination of individuality and self-assertion and the maintenance of a balance among natural, human, and spiritual entities (Huang & Gove, 2015; Tu, 1998). Thus, Asian values, in this study, refer to the five domains that are emphasized in Chinese/Taiwanese culture (i.e., collectivism, conformity, family recognition of achievement, emotional self-control, and humility).

These socially accepted norms influence parents’ choices. Studies of Chinese or Taiwanese population (e.g., Chen & Luster, 2002; Wu et al., 2002) have identified certain characteristics of the Chinese culture stemming from Confucian principles that influence the process of parenting (Ho, 1995). For example, Wu and colleagues (2002) found that Chinese mothers significantly scored higher in “modesty encouragement” parenting strategies (e.g., discourage the child from strongly expressing his/her point of view) compared to American mothers. Taken together, Chinese parents likely endorse these cultural values in their parenting practices/styles as a mean to socialize their children to fit the social norms (Huang & Gove, 2015; Kim & Wong, 2002; S. L. Lim & B. K. Lim, 2004).

The influence of these traditional values is still valuable and significant to some degree in contemporary Chinese society (Yin, 2003). For instance, in the Taiwanese schooling system, children are required to participate in the “Life” course, which was named the “Life and Ethics” course, since first grade (National Academy for Educational Research (NAER), 2018). In this particular course, parts of the objectives are to help children learn to respect others, experience the meaning of group norms, and consider the role of self in the group (NAER, 2018). These
course objectives demonstrate that the importance of traditional Chinese values in raising children are still emphasized in the Taiwanese society today.

**Parenting Styles and Practices**

Past studies have found that Chinese parents have distinct parenting strategies as they socialize their children (Wu et al., 2002). Applying Baumrind’s parenting styles is, thus, an etic approach (i.e. similar across cultures; outsider view) (Berry, 1989) which may not be the best way to measure Taiwanese parenting. Additionally, researchers have acknowledged the distinction between parenting styles and parenting practices (Stevenson-Hinde, 1998; Darling & Steinberg, 1993; Spera, 2005). Parenting style is a constellation of child-rearing attitudes while parenting practice is goal-oriented (Darling & Steinberg, 1993). Unlike parenting styles, parenting practices involved specific goals and values such as socializing children to meet the social expectations or helping child development in particular domains (e.g., achieving academic goals) (Darling & Steinberg, 1993), and may have varied meanings for different cultural groups reflecting in how much emphasis individuals in each culture place upon them (Chao, 2001).

Therefore, from an emic approach (i.e. arising from a specific culture; insider view), I added three additional parenting practices (i.e., shaming, encouragement of modesty/humility, parental directiveness) into the analytic model as mediators (Figure 2b) to examine how these specific parenting practices relate to Asian cultural values and child outcomes.

**Parenting styles.** Baumrind’s (1966, 1967, 1991) parenting scheme includes four typologies: (a) authoritative (high warmth and moderate control), (b) authoritarian (low warmth and high control), (c) permissive (high warmth and low control), and (d) rejecting/neglecting (low warmth and low control). Although there are debates about whether it is appropriate to use the etic approach when examining the effects of parenting in a different cultural context, some
researchers have proposed that the parenting parenting styles emphasized in the western culture can still be relevant for Chinese culture (Pinquart & Kauser, 2018; Wu et al., 2002).

Some researchers excluded permissive parenting style in their studies of Asian parents (e.g., Chan, Bowes, & Wyver, 2009; Muhtadie, Zhou, Eisenberg, & Wang, 2013) because it might not be as common in Chinese culture. For example, in a qualitative study, J. J. L. Chen, T. Chen, and Zheng (2012) found that some mothers were concerned about being permissive because they strongly believed in the need of disciplining rather than spoiling their children. However, Way et al., (2013) found that some mothers tend to use the permissive parenting style because they believe children would be happier when they are less controlled.

Thus, permissive parenting style is included in this study because (a) there are only a few scholars who have examined permissive parenting using a Taiwanese sample (e.g., Huang & Prochner, 2003), and (b) although one-child policy is not practiced in Taiwan, the birth rate in Taiwan is relatively low at 7.7 births per 1,000 child-bearing age women (National Statistics, R.O.C. (Taiwan), 2018), which is eighth to the last in the world (Central Intelligence Agency, 2017). In this case, parents may be more likely to use the permissive parenting style as they raise their children (Liu & Guo, 2010). However, I excluded rejecting/neglecting parenting style because rejecting/neglecting parents may be less likely to actively participate in the survey due to the neglect of children’s activities and lack of involvement.

In collectivistic countries, such as Taiwan, the characteristics of authoritarian parenting style (e.g., controlling) are commonly found (Dwairy & Achoui, 2010; Liu & Guo, 2010; Jose, Huntsinger, Huntsinger, & Liaw, 2000). To socialize their children, Chinese parents tend to emphasize child obedience and compliance and endorse the use of high power and authoritarian methods, such as physical punishment and controls, in child rearing (Chao, 1994). However,
Chao (1994) argues that although Chinese parents may exert more control over their children, they do so with the goal of “training” their children to achieve academically and to behave according to social norms. Chao (1994) refers to this concept in the Chinese terminology of “chiao shun”. The literal meaning of “chiao” is “to teach”, and “shun” is “to reprimand and to admonish”. The concept of “chiao shun” involves parental training of children to behave in socially appropriate ways and explains why Chinese parenting is considered more authoritarian. The notion of training explains why authoritarian parenting style may not be as detrimental and may even have a positive influence on Asian child development (Chao 1994, 1995), and how these concepts are different from the Western culture. Due to the cultural emphasis on parental authority and child obedience, Chinese parents have been found to be more authoritarian and less authoritative and permissive in child-rearing compared to North American parents (Chao, 1994; Leung et al., 1998).

**Asian parenting practices.** Wu et al. (2002) have examined several parenting practices (e.g., encouragement of modesty/humility, parental directiveness) that are reflective of Chinese values and beliefs. They found that those specific parenting practices were relatively independent from the constructs emphasized in the western culture (e.g., warmth). Additionally, these parenting practices (e.g., shaming) could involve the important components of being a supportive and successful parent in Chinese culture but are absent in the classic authoritative parenting style (Kim, Wang, Orozco-Lapray, Shen, & Murtuza, 2013). As a result, these culturally specific parenting practices in this study are not merely interchangeable with Baumrind’s classic parenting styles. Applying these culturally specific parenting practices provides an emic approach (Berry, 1989). For example, Kim and colleagues (2013) suggested that the use of these intrusive parenting practices is a component of being a supportive and successful parent in the
Chinese culture (emic approach), while another study viewed it as psychological control (etic approach) (Nelson, Hart, Yang, Olsen, & Jin, 2006).

Collectivistic cultures perceive the use of controlling child-rearing techniques as sensitive parenting (Carlson & Harwood, 2003). Parental control, strictness, and directiveness are more highly valued in collectivistic cultures, as is conformity to clearly prescribed role expectations for children (Chao, 1994; Liew, Kwok, Chang, Chang, & Yeh, 2014). Chen, Liu et al (2000) challenged that Chinese parenting practices (i.e., directiveness) should not be characterized as authoritarian in the North American sense of the term. As the concept of “chiao shun” demonstrated (Chao, 1994), parental training of children to behave in socially appropriate ways explains why Chinese parents are more likely to be directive in disciplining their children. Children are often required to pledge and demonstrate obedience and reverence to parents, and parents, in turn, are responsible for “governing” (i.e., teaching, disciplining) their children, and are held accountable for their children’s failures (Chao, 1994; Chen & Luster, 2002).

Additionally, Chinese parents use shaming and love withdrawal as a moral training technique to foster adherence to societal norms and to promote sensitivity towards the perceptions and feelings of others (Wu et al., 2002; Olsen et al., 2002). As noted by researchers (Fung, 1999; Ho, 1986; Wu & Tseng, 1985), shaming is a prevalent Chinese socialization practice designed to help children be sensitive to the perceptions of others, to teach them right from wrong, and to avoid children’s future behaviors that would bring shame or embarrassment to the family. It is tied to Confucianism and is thought to help children regulate and enact their behaviors in culturally appropriate and sensitive ways (Fung, 1999). As one Taiwanese father in Fung’s (1999) qualitative study said, “I’d rather let my child dislike me now, instead of letting other people dislike my child in the future (p. 189).” As a result, when Chinese parents try to
socialize their children to fit in with social norms (e.g., not sticking out from others, be humble), they are likely to endorse these values in their parenting practices. In turn, these parents may be more likely to use shaming, encouragement of modesty/humility, and parental directiveness as strategies to socialize and teach their children.

**Parenting Styles/Practices and Child Outcomes**

I included four specific child behavioral outcomes (i.e., prosocial behaviors, modesty, sociability, and impulse control) in this study because not only can these behaviors help maintain group harmony that are valued by collectivist society, they also help children to experience better outcomes, such as friendships (Abou-Ezzeddine et al., 2007). For example, the concept of modesty in Chinese culture, such as avoiding boasting and denigrating oneself, is largely accepted as an important Chinese social norm (Spencer-Oatey & Ng, 2001; Tangney, 2000). Thus, when children act in a modest way, they are more likely to be accepted by their peers and liked by others, such as teachers or elders (Chen, 1998). Additionally, children’s prosocial behaviors, sociability, impulse control, and modesty, are beneficial in fostering group harmony (Chen, D. Li, Z. Li, B. S. Li, & Liu, 2000; Batson & Powell, 2003). These outcomes may be, therefore, more concerned and emphasized by Chinese parents (Ho, 1986).

However, the same parenting practices and styles could lead to various child outcomes in different cultural contexts because these parenting behaviors may be interpreted differently depending on the cultural meaning (Deater-Deckard, Dodge, & Sorbring, 2005; Dwairy, Achoui, Abouerie, & Farah, 2006; Pinquart & Kauser, 2018). Park and Bauer (2002) proposed that it is inaccurate to generalize the relationship between parenting styles and child outcomes, especially for Asian ethnic group.

Interestingly, the findings between the links between parenting styles and child outcomes
in Chinese sample have been inconsistent. For instance, some studies suggested that authoritarian parenting has a negative influence on child development in Chinese/Taiwanese context, such as self-regulation, sociability, and peer acceptance (Huang & Prochner, 2003; Pearson & Rao, 2003). Other studies of Asian ethnic groups found authoritarian parenting style having only minor or negligible negative effects on children’s development (Ruby & Grusec, 2001), or even positive impacts on various outcomes (e.g., better adjustment in attitude towards school) (Leung et al., 1998; Ang, 2006) because it is more accepted in such culture as a goal of socializing children (Dwairy et al., 2006). It could also be that the characteristics of authoritarian parenting style is perceived as positive (Chao, 1994). For example, Kagitçibasi (1990) revealed that children in some eastern cultures, such as Japan and Korea, perceived parental control children perceived parental control as acceptance and warmth rather than hostility and rejection.

**Paternal and Maternal Roles**

Researchers have found that fathers and mothers have different influences on children (e.g., Liu, 2003) although it has still been a debate whether employing the same measures for mother’s and father’s parenting is appropriate (Fagan, Day, Lamb, & Cabrera, 2014; Palkovitz, Trask, & Adamsons, 2014). In order to better understand paternal and maternal roles in Taiwanese families, one also needs to take into consideration how traditional cultural values define parental roles in the family. Chinese parental roles are greatly distinguished based on gender. As an old Chinese idiom says, “men are in charge of the outside business, whereas women take care of the home,” fathers are often more distant from and mothers are more emotionally close to their children. Fathers, in traditional Taiwanese cultural context, are assigned a more powerful position in the family than mothers. They are often the one who control the financial resources and make important decisions about the family and the children.
Further, the Chinese saying, “strict father, kind mother” has traditionally portrayed fathers as more authoritarian, using more parental control and discipline with their children, compared with mothers, who were portrayed as nurturing and supportive (Yang et al., 2004; Berndt et al., 1993). Russell et al., (1998) also found that mothers tend to demonstrate parenting practices more consistent with an authoritative style, while fathers exhibit practices more consistent with an authoritarian style, particularly regarding disciplinary strategies. However, Shek (2005) suggested that the traditional view of the strict father, kind mother has shifted. Because the impact of gender on parenting is still unclear and most studies have only examined maternal parenting styles/practices (e.g., Leung, McBride-Chang, & Lai, 2004), I examined paternal and maternal influences separately in this study.

**Current Study**

The purpose of this study was to examine the impact of cultural values on parenting styles/practices and child outcomes regarding to the Taiwanese cultural context. According to the ecological model (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 1998) and Darling and Steinberg’s (1993) theoretical framework, cultural values are essential to parenting styles and practices which affect child outcomes. Specifically, I hypothesized that those Taiwanese parents who hold a higher level of Asian values (e.g., one should not boast about one’s accomplishment) would be more likely to utilize authoritarian, shaming, encouragement of modesty/humility, and directiveness as an attempt to socialize their children to fit in the society.

Further, I hypothesized that shaming, encouragement of modesty/humility, and directiveness would be positively related to prosocial behaviors, modesty, sociability, and impulse control because these outcome behaviors are valued and emphasized in Chinese cultures as they foster harmony in the group. However, permissive parenting would be negatively
associated with these child outcomes because being less controlling may not help children understand the expectations of others (Huang & Prochner, 2003).

As mentioned, researchers have mixed findings about the associations between authoritarian parenting style and child outcomes. According to the literatures, I hypothesized that, as an attempt to help children fit in the group, authoritarian parenting would lead to more prosocial behaviors, higher level of modesty and sociability in children. However, I hypothesize that authoritarian parenting would be negatively associated with impulse control (Chang et al., 2003; Zhou et al., 2004) because this type of parenting style is more likely used to set rules to shape and control children and have less opportunity for children to practice being self-regulated.

Although the different influences between paternal and maternal parenting are still unclear, past studies have shown possible gender differences in parenting style (Russell et al., 1998). Based on past studies, I hypothesized that the influences of maternal and paternal parenting styles would vary. Specifically, mothers’ parenting styles/practices would have stronger correlations with child outcomes compared to fathers’ because mothers might spend more time teaching and disciplining children at home, as the old Chinese idiom indicates

**Methods**

**Data and Sample**

Data for this study were taken from the Parents and Children in Families and in Cultures (PACIFIC) Project. The PACIFIC Project collected data from various sites, such as Japan, China, Malaysia, and Taiwan. In this study, I use the data collected from Taiwan, which included 273 preschoolers (152 males; 121 female), 273 mothers, 269 fathers, and teachers. Teachers of 28 classes from 12 different kindergarten rated children’s behaviors.

In the Taiwanese sample, 16 privately managed public kindergartens (non-profit) and
private kindergartens in New Taipei City and Taipei City were first invited in order to recruit families from different Taipei regions and social economic status (SES). A total of 12 kindergartens accepted the invitation of participating in the research. Then, these kindergartens send out invitations to parents and teachers of preschoolers. A total of 27 classes, including 54 teachers and 302 parents, agreed to join the study. Finally, the valid matching data was obtained for 269 fathers and 273 mothers to fill out the parenting questionnaire. Teachers were asked to fill out the child development questionnaire.

Measures

**Asian values.** Parents’ Asian values were measured using the Asian American Values Scale—Multidimensional (AAVS–M) (Kim, Li, & Ng, 2005). The measure included five dimensions: collectivism (e.g., “The welfare of the group should be put before that of the individual,”) conformity to norms (e.g., “One should recognize and adhere to the social expectations, norms, and practices,”) emotional self-control (e.g., “One should not be expressive with one’s feelings,”) family recognition (e.g., “One should achieve academically since it reflects on one’s family,”), and humility (reverse-coded) (e.g., “One should be able to brag about one’s achievements,”) which are analyzed separately in the models. These items were measured by using mother’s and father’s self-reports. Parents responded to how much they agreed or disagreed with statements of the Asian values, ranging from 1 (**Strongly Disagree**) to 4 (**Strongly Agree**).

In this study, I used the value of CFI and Chi-square change as indicators of measurement equivalence. Specifically, when the CFI decreases more than .01 (Little, 2013), or when the chi-square difference value was statistically significant, there were differences between mothers’ and fathers’ constructs. The measurement equivalence test indicated that the constructs of mother and
father’s Asian values were not equivalent (Table 1). Therefore, mother and father’s Asian values included different number of items according to the exploratory factor analysis (EFA).

Specifically, according to the EFA, mother’s and father’s Asian Values constructs both contained five factors, which were suggested by the original AAVS-M. I only kept items that had a factor loading higher than .50. For mother’s Asian values, there were three items in each factor. For father’s Asian values, there were three to four items in each factor. Cronbach’s alpha ranged from .60 to .73 for mothers, and .61 to .81 for fathers.

**Parenting styles (self-report).** Parenting Styles were measured using items that have been developed, borrowed, or modified from other parenting measures. The items were composed from Parenting Styles and Dimensions Questionnaire (PSDQ) (Robinson, Mandleco, Olsen, & Hart, 2001), parenting practices emphasized in China (Wu et al., 2002), and a few items that were constructed specifically for this project. Parents were asked to report how often they use specific items on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = Never; 5 = Always). Higher value indicated higher frequent use of that particular parenting style.

**Authoritarian parenting style.** There were originally 16 items in the authoritative parenting style construct. After running the exploratory factor analysis, the final construct included three factors with three to four items in each factor: physical coercion (e.g., “I spank when our child is disobedient,”) verbal hostility (e.g., “I tell or shout when our child misbehave,”) and non-reasoning (e.g., “I punish by taking away privileges from our child with little if any explanation.”) The overall Cronbach’s alpha for authoritarian parenting style was .82 for mothers and .85 for fathers. The constructs of paternal and maternal authoritarian parenting style had a strong equivalence (Table 2).
Authoritative parenting style. There were originally 22 items in the authoritative parenting style construct. The measurement equivalence test indicated that the constructs of mother and father’s authoritative parenting style were not equivalent (Table 3). Therefore, mother and father’s authoritative parenting style included different items according to the EFA. The final constructs included three factors with three to four items in each factor: warmth (e.g., “I express affection by hugging, kissing, and holding our child,”) reasoning (e.g., “I give our child reasons why rules should be obeyed,”) and autonomy granting (e.g., “I encourage our child to freely express himself/herself even when disagreeing with his/her parents.”) The EFA suggested three factors for both fathers and mothers. The difference between mother’s and father’s authoritative parenting style was the number of items in each factor. I only kept items that had a factor loading above .5. The overall Cronbach’s alpha for authoritative parenting style was .74 for mothers and .83 for fathers.

Permissive parenting style. Permissive parenting style consisted of five items (e.g., “I give into our child when he/she causes a commotion about something,” “I buy our child whatever he/she wants.”) The Cronbach’s alpha was .64 for mothers and .42 for fathers. The lower reliability of permissive parenting style has commonly been found in other studies (Önder & Gülay, 2009; Olivari, Tagliabue, & Confalonieri, 2013). The constructs of paternal and maternal authoritarian parenting style had a weak equivalence (Table 4).

Asian parenting practices (self-report). Asian parenting practices were assessed using parenting constructs emphasized in China from Wu et al.’s (2002) study and a few items that were constructed specifically for this project. Items that have been found to work well psychometrically in mainland China, Japan, and Malaysia (based on prior work or pilot data) comprised the parenting style measure. Parents were asked to report how often they use specific
items on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = *Never*; 5 = *Always*). Higher value indicated higher frequent use of permissive parenting practice.

**Shaming.** Shaming consisted of six items (e.g., “I tell our child that we get embarrassed when he/she does not meet our expectations,” “I tell our child that he/she should be ashamed when he/she misbehaves.”) The overall Cronbach’s alpha for shaming was .71 for mothers and .64 for fathers. The constructs of paternal and maternal use of shaming had a weak equivalence (Table 5).

**Encouragement of modesty/humility.** The scale of encouragement of modesty/humility consisted of five items (e.g., “I discourage our child from strongly expressing his/her point of view around others,” “discourage our child from proudly acknowledging compliments or praise from friends or adults.”) The overall Cronbach’s alpha for shaming was .72 for mothers and .68 for fathers. The constructs of paternal and maternal use of encouragement of modesty/humility had a strong equivalence (Table 6).

**Directiveness.** The parental directiveness scale consisted of four items (e.g., “I want to control whatever our child does,” “I do not allow our child to make many decisions independent from parents.”) The Cronbach’s alpha was .54 for mothers and .56 for fathers. The constructs of paternal and maternal use of directiveness had a strong equivalence (Table 7).

**Child outcomes (teacher-rating).** Teachers were asked to report items of child behavioral outcomes on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = *Almost never*; 5 = *Almost always*). Higher value indicated higher frequency of child behaviors.

**Prosocial behavior.** Prosocial behaviors included six items (e.g., “The child offers to help other children who are having difficulty with a task,” “The child comforts another child who is crying or upset.”) The Cronbach’s alpha was .88 for prosocial behavior. This variable was
normally distributed.

**Modesty.** Modesty was measured using four items (e.g., “The child does not appear over-confident with his/her ability,” “The child does not brag, boast, or proudly acknowledge compliments or praise.”) The Cronbach’s alpha was .76 for modesty. This variable was normally distributed.

**Impulse control.** Impulse control included five items (e.g., “The child expresses emotions in appropriate ways,” “The child controls temper.”) The Cronbach’s alpha was .76 for child impulse control. The distribution of this variable was relatively normal.

**Sociability.** Sociability included five items (e.g., The child maintains positive relationships with peers,” “The child cooperates with peers.”) The Cronbach’s alpha was .77 for child sociability. The distribution of this variable was slightly negative skewed.

**Control Variables.** To better understand the relationship between parenting styles and child behavioral outcomes, demographics (i.e., child age, parents’ education level) were controlled in the model. Each demographic variable was measured with a single item. Parents’ education levels were controlled, because mother’s education level has been associated with parenting attitudes, styles, and practices using Chinese samples (Chen, Liu et al., 2000; Xu et al., 2005; Shek, 2005). I also controlled for child age and gender because these variables are related to parents’ attitudes toward practices and strategies (Olsen et al., 2002) and various child behavioral outcomes, such as prosocial behavior, sociability, and impulse control (Nelson et al., 2006; Chen, D. Li et al., 2000).

**Analysis Plan**

Prior to the main analyses, I ran (1) bivariate correlations among the main variables and control variables, and (2) measurement invariance tests for maternal and paternal values and
The primary analyses for this study were conducted using path analysis in three different models to test if some constructs are potentially cancelling out the effect of each other. All the models mentioned below were tested on paternal and maternal influences separately. I did not use structural equational modeling because I did not have enough participants to analyze the models with all the variables (Kline, 2015).

The first model (Figure 2) involved conducting a path analysis in Mplus 8 with parental Asian value, three parenting styles (i.e., authoritarian, authoritative, permissive), and child outcomes (i.e., prosocial behavior, impulse control, modesty, sociability), controlling for child gender, child age, and parents’ education level.

The second model (Figure 3) involved conducting a path analysis in Mplus 8 with parental Asian value, three Asian parenting practices (i.e., shaming, encouragement of modesty/humility, directiveness), and child outcomes (i.e., prosocial behavior, impulse control, modesty, sociability), controlling for child gender, child age, and parents’ education level.

The third and full model (Figure 4) used a path analysis in Mplus 8. The full model included parental Asian value, parenting styles (i.e., authoritarian, authoritative, permissive), Asian parenting practices (i.e., shaming, encouragement of modesty/humility, directiveness), and child outcomes (i.e., prosocial behavior, impulse control, modesty, sociability), controlling for child gender, child age, and parents’ education level. Although this does not happen much, the data of this study did not have any missing data points. Thus, I did not use any additional method to deal with data missingness.

Results

First, a bivariate correlation analysis was conducted with all variables for fathers and
mothers. As shown in Table 8 and 9, there were several significant relationships between Asian values, parenting styles/practices, and child outcomes as expected. Therefore, further analyses were conducted.

**Maternal Asian Values, Parenting Styles/Practices, and Child Outcomes**

**Parenting styles model for mothers.** The model was conducted using path analysis with Mplus8 software (2010). The model was run with five Asian values (i.e., collectivism, conformity, emotional self-control, family recognition, and humility), parenting styles (i.e., authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive), and child outcomes (i.e., prosocial behaviors, modesty, sociability, and impulse control), controlling for child age, child gender, and mother’s education (*Figure 5*). Model fit was satisfactory ($\chi^2(4) = 4.00, \ p = .406; \ CFI = 1.00; \ TLI = 1.00; \ RMSEA = .000; \ SRMR = .008$) (Little, 2013).

Values of conformity were significantly and positively associated with authoritative ($\beta = .142, \ p = .016$) and permissive parenting style ($\beta = .135, \ p = .037$). Values of family recognition were positively associated with authoritative parenting style ($\beta = .160, \ p = .012$). Values of humility were positively associated with authoritarian parenting style ($\beta = .326, \ p < .001$).

Permissive parenting style was positively associated with prosocial behavior ($\beta = .222, \ p = .004$) and negatively associated with sociability ($\beta = -.299, \ p < .001$). Authoritative parenting style was positively associated with sociability ($\beta = .182, \ p = .017$).

It is notable that there were some direct effects of Asian values that remained statistically significant predictors of child outcomes. Values of family recognition of achievement was positively associated with prosocial behavior ($\beta = .148, \ p = .023$) and modesty ($\beta$
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Values of humility was positively associated with modesty (β = .171, \( p = .008 \)).

**Parenting practices model for mothers.** The model was run with five Asian values (i.e., collectivism, conformity to norms, emotional self-control, family recognition, and humility), parenting practices (i.e., shaming, encouragement of humility, and directiveness), and child outcomes (i.e., prosocial behaviors, modesty, sociability, and impulse control), controlling for child age, child gender, and mother’s education (*Figure 6*). Model fit was satisfactory (\( \chi^2 (6) = 6.478, \ p = .372; \ CFI = .998; \ TLI = .975; \ RMSEA = .017; \ SRMR = .011 \)) (Little, 2013).

For mothers, none of the Asian values were associated with parenting practices or parenting styles. Mother’s use of shaming was positively associated with prosocial behavior (β = .178, \( p = .007 \)). Encouragement of modesty/humility was negatively associated with modesty (β = -.202, \( p = .013 \)).

Values of family recognition of achievement was positively associated with prosocial behavior (β = .148, \( p = .026 \)) and modesty (β = .148, \( p = .016 \)), but negatively associated with sociability (β = -.188, \( p = .004 \)). Values of collectivism and values of conformity were positively associated with sociability, respectively (β = .128, \( p = .025 \); β = .121, \( p = .034 \)).

**Full model for mothers.** The model was run with five Asian values (i.e., collectivism, conformity to norms, emotional self-control, family recognition, and humility), parenting styles (i.e., authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive), parenting practices (i.e., shaming, encouragement of humility, and directiveness), and child outcomes (i.e., prosocial behaviors, modesty, sociability, and impulse control), controlling for child age, child gender, and mother’s education (see *Figure 7*). Model fit was satisfactory (\( \chi^2 (4) = 3.808, \ p = .433; \ CFI = 1.00; \ TLI = 1.00; \ RMSEA = .000; \ SRMR = .007 \)) (Little, 2013). The model was run with 2,000 bootstraps.
Values of conformity were significantly and positively associated with authoritative ($\beta = .142, p = .016$) and permissive parenting style ($\beta = .135, p = .037$). Values of family recognition were positively associated with authoritative parenting style ($\beta = .160, p = .012$). Values of humility were positively associated with authoritarian parenting style ($\beta = .326, p < .001$).

Permissive parenting style was positively associated with prosocial behavior ($\beta = .210, p = .007$) and negatively associated with sociability ($\beta = -.273, p < .001$). Authoritative parenting style and authoritarian parenting style were positively associated with sociability, respectively ($\beta = .206, p = .010; \beta = .143, p = .024$). Encouragement of modesty/humility was negatively associated with modesty ($\beta = -.195, p = .018$).

There were some direct effects of Asian values that remained statistically significant predictors of child outcomes in the full model. Values of family recognition of achievement were positively associated with prosocial behavior ($\beta = .145, p = .026$) and modesty ($\beta = .168, p = .008$), but negatively associated with sociability ($\beta = -.230, p < .001$). Values of humility was positively associated with modesty ($\beta = .162, p = .012$).

**Paternal Asian Values, Parenting Styles/Practices, and Child Outcomes**

**Parenting styles model for fathers.** The model was conducted using path analysis with Mplus8 software (2010). The model was run with five Asian values (i.e., collectivism, conformity to norms, emotional self-control, family recognition, and humility), parenting styles (i.e., authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive), and child outcomes (i.e., prosocial behaviors, modesty, sociability, and impulse control), controlling for child age, child gender, and father’s education (*Figure 8*). Model fit was satisfactory ($\chi^2(4) = .530, p = .971; \text{CFI} = 1.000; \text{TLI} = 1.249; \text{RMSEA} = .000; \text{SRMR} = .003$) (Little, 2013).
Collectivism values were significantly and negatively associated with permissive parenting style ($\beta = -.206, p = .002$). Values of emotional self-control were positively associated with authoritative parenting style ($\beta = .231, p < .001$) and authoritarian parenting style ($\beta = .163, p = .017$). Values of family recognition of achievement were positively associated with authoritative parenting style ($\beta = .174, p = .005$). Values of humility were positively associated with authoritarian parenting style ($\beta = .216, p = .001$).

Permissive parenting style was positively associated with prosocial behavior ($\beta = .179, p = .021$) and modesty ($\beta = .187, p = .007$), but negatively associated with impulse control ($\beta = -.313, p < .001$).

There were some direct effects of Asian values that were statistically significant predictors of child outcomes. Values of emotional self-control were positively associated with modesty ($\beta = .158, p = .014$), but negatively associated with sociability ($\beta = -.227, p = .001$). Values of humility were negatively associated with impulse control ($\beta = -.160, p = .015$). Values of conformity were positively associated with impulse control ($\beta = .150, p = .013$).

**Parenting practices mode for fathers.** The model was run with five Asian values (i.e., collectivism, conformity to norms, emotional self-control, family recognition, and humility), parenting practices (i.e., shaming, encouragement of humility, and directiveness), and child outcomes (i.e., prosocial behaviors, modesty, sociability, and impulse control), controlling for child age, child gender, and father’s education (see Figure 9). Model fit was satisfactory ($\chi^2 (4) = 2.655, p = .617$; CFI = 1.000; TLI = 1.170; RMSEA = .000; SRMR = .008) (Little, 2013). The model was run with 2,000 bootstraps.

Father’s values of collectivism were negatively associated with the use of shaming ($\beta = -.143, p = .049$). Values of conformity and values of emotional self-control were positively
associated with father’s use of shaming, respectively (β = .163, \(p = .038\); \(β = .150, p = .032\)). Values of conformity were positively associated with the use of encouragement of modesty/humility (β = .121, \(p = .048\)).

The use of shaming was positively associated with modesty (β = .150, \(p = .011\)). This is the only significant path between paternal parenting practices and child outcomes.

The remained direct paths revealed that values of emotional self-control were positively associated with modesty (β = .150, \(p = .021\)), but negatively associated with sociability (β = -.226, \(p = .001\)). Values of conformity were positively associated with impulse control (β = .126, \(p = .041\)). Values of humility were negatively associated with impulse control (β = -.176, \(p = .005\)).

**Full model for fathers.** The model was run with five Asian values (i.e., collectivism, conformity to norms, emotional self-control, family recognition, and humility), parenting styles (i.e., authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive), parenting practices (i.e., shaming, encouragement of humility, and directiveness), and child outcomes (i.e., prosocial behaviors, modesty, sociability, and impulse control), controlling for child age, child gender, and father’s education (Figure 10). Model fit was satisfactory (\(\chi^2 (4) = .594, p = .963\); \(CFI = 1.000\); \(TLI = 1.259\); \(RMSEA = .000\); \(SRMR = .003\)) (Little, 2013).

Collectivism values were significantly and negatively associated with permissive parenting style (β = -.206, \(p = .002\)), but negatively associated with shaming (β = -.143, \(p = .049\)). Values of conformity were positively associated with shaming (β = .163, \(p = .034\)) and encouragement of modesty/humility (β = .121, \(p = .048\)). Values of emotional self-control were positively associated with authoritative parenting style (β = .231, \(p < .001\)), authoritarian parenting style (β = .163, \(p = .017\)), and shaming (β
Values of family recognition of achievement were positively associated with authoritative parenting style ($\beta = .150, p = .005$). Values of humility were positively associated with authoritarian parenting style ($\beta = .216, p = .001$).

Permissive parenting style was positively associated with prosocial behavior ($\beta = .221, p = .007$) and modesty ($\beta = .176, p = .014$), but negatively associated with impulse control ($\beta = -.354, p < .001$). Authoritative parenting style and authoritarian parenting style were positively associated with impulse control, respectively ($\beta = .171, p = .022$; $\beta = .174, p = .005$). Parents’ use of directiveness was negatively associated with impulse control ($\beta = -.156, p = .013$).

Values of emotional self-control were positively associated with modesty ($\beta = .155, p = .018$), but negatively associated with sociability ($\beta = -.232, p = .001$). Values of humility and values of family recognition of achievement were negatively associated with impulse control, respectively ($\beta = -.169, p = .009$; $\beta = -.129, p = .045$). Values of conformity were positively associated with impulse control ($\beta = .152, p = .012$) and negatively associated with impulse control. See Table 10 for maternal and paternal full models.

**Additional Post Hoc Test**

To test if there are possible mean differences between mothers and fathers’ use of parenting practices, I conducted a paired-sample t-test as a post-hoc analysis. The results showed that there are no significant differences in the means of shaming and encouragement of modesty/humility, which mean mothers use these parenting practices as often as fathers.

**Discussion**

This study is among the first study to examine specific domains of parental Asian values and how these values relate to parenting styles/practices and child outcomes. According to the
ecological model (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 1998) and Darling and Steinberg’s (1993) theoretical framework, cultural values are fundamental to parenting behaviors which affect child outcomes. The goal of this study was to investigate the impact of cultural values on parenting styles/practices and child outcomes regarding the Taiwanese cultural context. Investigating the cultural context and values can help researchers, therapists, and practitioners to understand parenting styles and practices that predominate in that society and how they relate to child outcomes. Thus, this study examined the relationship between parental Asian values (i.e., collectivism, conformity to norms, emotional self-control, family recognition, and humility), parenting styles (i.e., permissive, authoritative, and authoritarian parenting styles), parenting practices (i.e., shaming, encouragement of modesty/humility, and directiveness), and child outcomes (i.e., prosocial behaviors, modesty, sociability, and impulse control).

The results of this study partially support the hypothesis that Taiwanese parents who hold a higher level of Asian values would be more likely to utilize an authoritarian parenting style, shaming, encouragement of modesty/humility, and directiveness behaviors as an attempt to socialize their children to fit in the society. The results show that only some domains of the Asian values were related to parenting styles and practices. Specifically, for both mothers and fathers, values of humility have a positive relationship with authoritarian parenting style, but not any other parenting practices. This finding is in line with Xu et al.’s (2005) finding that values of humility were positively associated with maternal authoritarian parenting styles. Taiwanese society, which values the teaching of Confucius, encourages humility because “not sticking out” or “not boasting about one’s achievement” are seen as virtues (Fung, 1999; Leung, 2010; Li, 2001). Preschool age is a time of exploration. It is normal that children at this age have positive self-evaluation and do not fully understand others’ view and critiques (Harter, 2012). In this
case, when parents value humility, they might tend to use strategies that are more intrusive, such as enforcing strict rules or using physical punishment, to help their young children act in “the right way”.

Additionally, it is interesting that some of the Asian values only related to certain parenting practices for fathers, but not mothers. Specifically, the results suggest that when fathers highly value conformity and emotional self-control, they are more likely to use shaming and encouragement of modesty/humility. As mentioned, Chinese parents use shaming as a technique to promote sensitivity towards the perceptions and feelings of others (Wu et al., 2002; Olsen et al., 2002) which is absent in early childhood (Harter, 2012). In order to help and make sure their children follow the group norms, fathers might be more likely to use these parenting practices when they see those values as important. This finding is similar to Fung’s (1999) qualitative study, which found that one father reported using shaming to discipline his child, even if the child disliked it, because it would be better than having members in the society dislike the child. Further, because boasting about self-achievement or sticking out violates the cultural norms of being humble, it could be detrimental to group harmony and might harm one’s relationship with peers. Therefore, when fathers put emphasis on conformity, they are likely to encourage their children to be modest and humble as a mean to socialize their children.

Another notable finding is that values of emotional self-control were associated with the use of shaming and authoritarian parenting style for fathers. As a Chinese idiom says, “a man should not easily shed tears (Nán’ér yǒu lèi bù qīng tán in Mandarin)”, boys are taught from an early age that they should be emotionally strong by not showing emotions easily. To conform to the social norm, fathers are likely to value emotional self-control. In addition, in the collectivistic society, fathers are expected to also teach their sons to be strong and tough to meet the social
expectations. As a result, these values might influence how fathers teach their children. Specifically, fathers are likely to use these intrusive parenting techniques to teach their children to regulate their own emotions because, according to the Chinese “emotional-control masculine norm” (Yeung, Mak, & Cheung, 2015), a man should be strong in order to become a protector of the family. However, future research should examine the gender difference in children because fathers might care more about emotions for their sons due to the social expectation.

It is surprising and unexpected that none of the Asian values was significantly related to mothers’ Asian parenting practices (i.e., shaming, encouragement of modesty/humility, and directiveness). The paired-sample t-test has shown that there is no significant difference between mothers’ and fathers’ use shaming and encouragement of modesty/humility in frequency. Nevertheless, it could be that mothers choose to use different parenting practices to socialize their children. Past studies have identified that Chinese fathers are stricter and more controlling while Chinese mothers were more nurturing and supportive in family (Berndt et al., 1993; Yang et al., 2004). Mothers are often expected to be “kind and warm” in traditional Chinese culture as researchers have found that mothers tend to demonstrate higher level of warmth in their parenting practices (Russell et al., 1998; Yang et al., 2004).

Besides, another reason for the nonsignificance could be because the measurement equivalence tests showed that parents’ Asian values and authoritative parenting style were not equivalent for mothers and fathers. In other words, mothers and fathers interpreted these constructs differently. It could be that fathers view these cultural values as more important than mothers do because fathers might have more social burdens because of the expectation that they are the lead of the family. Specifically, if any member of the family fails to meet social expectation, others might think that a father is not fulfilling his responsibility.
Additionally, this result of the measurement equivalence tests suggests that it was appropriate to examine the effects of maternal and paternal effects in the separate models. Additionally, due to the variance of the constructs, I was not able to draw conclusion about whether mothers’ parenting styles/practices have stronger correlations with child outcomes compared to fathers’ parenting styles/practices.

Further, the results partially support the hypothesis that shaming, encouragement of modesty/humility, and directiveness would be positively related to prosocial behaviors, modesty, sociability, and impulse control. Mothers’ use of shaming was related to more prosocial behaviors in children, while fathers’ use of shaming was related to more modest behaviors. These are fascinating cultural insights because shaming is generally seen as a negative parenting practices in the western society (Lamb, 2002). It could be that shaming is a culturally accepted parenting practice in the Taiwanese context which parents and children did not perceived it as negative. Like Fung and Lau (2009) suggested, the link between parenting practices and child behaviors might be moderated by caregivers’ ideologies of these behaviors and could buffer the effects of parental behaviors. In this case, parents’ use of shaming potentially brings out some positive behaviors of their young children. Additionally, the participants of this studies are parents and teachers of preschoolers. When children are young, they are likely to take whatever parents say and obey parents’ commandments. As a result, these children might behave better when their parents use shaming as a technique.

Unexpectedly, encouragement of modesty/humility was negatively associated with child modesty, for mothers. This finding might seem odd; however, the casual direction of this relationship might be the other way around due to the cross-sectional nature of the data. In other words, it could be that when children show more modest behaviors, mothers tend to talk about or
emphasize modesty less frequent. Additionally, the positive association between maternal permissive parenting style and prosocial behaviors, as well as the relationship between paternal permissive parenting style and prosocial behaviors and modesty, could be the same way as well. These results could be explained by the bidirectional relationship between parenting styles and child outcomes. Parents may adapt their practices and behaviors according to their children’s characteristics, such as temperament (Lengua & Kovacs, 2005) and behaviors (Van Zalk & Kerr, 2011). For example, in a longitudinal study, researchers found the bidirectional relationship between prosocial behaviors and maternal sensitivity, which parents respect more for the child’s autonomy when they see more prosocial behaviors in their children (Newton, Laible, Carlo, Steele, & McGinley, 2014). This suggests that the child might drive the parent-child system regarding the relationships between child outcomes and parenting behaviors. In this case, when parents see their children acting kind, compassionate, and helpful, they may be more likely to let their children make their own choices with less intrusive guidance because these children have already behaved so well.

The findings partially support the hypothesis that authoritarian parenting style would lead to more prosocial behaviors, higher level of modesty and sociability, and lower level of impulse control. In the full models, authoritarian parenting styles was associated with better sociability in children, for mothers; and related to better child impulse control, for fathers. Chinese parents tend to emphasize child obedience and endorse the use of high power and authoritarian methods in child rearing (Chao, 1994). As Kagitçibasi (1990) asserted, children in some eastern cultures might perceive parental control as acceptance and warmth. Therefore, these parental controls or strictness did not lead to negative outcomes in this case. Rather, parents authoritarian parenting styles help their children to have better sociability and impulse control.
In addition, the findings support the hypothesis that the influences of maternal and paternal parenting behaviors would vary. Past research has consistently found that mothers and fathers have different impacts on their children (e.g., Chuang & Su, 2009; Liu, 2003). For example, Chen, D. Li et al. (2000) found that maternal warmth, but not paternal warmth, significantly predicted child emotional adjustment. In addition, paternal warmth, but not maternal warmth, predicted child social achievement.

In sum, the findings from this study provides some supports that it might be inappropriate to overgeneralize the relationship between parenting styles and child outcomes from different cultures (Park & Bauer, 2002). First, these parenting practices and styles are related to parents’ values (Darling & Steinberg, 1993). When Taiwanese parents put emphasis on these cultural values, they are likely to endorse those values in their parenting behaviors as they socialize their children (Huang & Gove, 2015; Kim & Wong, 2002). Second, the findings reveal that authoritarian parenting style and shaming did not necessarily lead to negative child outcomes as past research has indicated (e.g., Huang & Prochner, 2003; Pearson & Rao, 2003). Rather, these parenting behaviors that contains intrusive characteristics lead to some positive outcomes. It could be that the characteristics of authoritarian parenting style is perceived as positive (e.g., sensitive and warm) in the Taiwanese cultural context (Chao, 1994; Kagitçibasi, 1990).

Taken together, this study examined the effects of Asian values and parenting styles/practices from both etic approach and emic approach. Parenting behaviors that contain intrusive or controlling characteristics were found as negative effects on child outcomes from an etic approach (e.g., LeCuyer & Swanson, 2017). However, from a cultural perspective, the effects of these parenting behaviors might not be so negative because it could be perceived more positive (e.g., sensitive) in the Taiwanese culture (Carlson & Harwood, 2003). Additionally,
investigating the cultural values that link with specific cultural parenting practices provides evidence from an emic approach.

Implication, Limitations, and Future Directions

Studying parents’ cultural values provides information regarding parenting styles and practices in other societies and broadens the cross-cultural database to better understand parenting and child outcomes for researchers, educators, and clinicians. The results indicated that one should not simply assume that the associations between parenting styles, practices, and child outcomes are equal or similar across cultures. Specifically, it could be helpful for practitioners to be aware that authoritarian parenting style might not be universally associated with negative child outcomes (Varela et al., 2004). Additionally, these findings suggest that researchers and practitioners should continue to see the importance of multicultural viewpoints and the use of culturally sensitive intervention strategies (Kagitcibasi, 1996).

However, this study is not without limitations. Western ideologies and parenting practices have been introduced to Taiwanese society, especially to upper- and middle-class parents in the urban area. The data of this study was collected in Taipei City and New Taipei City which are relatively modernized. The participants in the current study are from the same residential region and high social economic status (SES) families. This fact also created some potential biases by not having variety in the sample. Using a different sample might produce different results. Future research should examine these relationships in the Taiwanese rural area with a different population.

Moreover, traditional Taiwanese society have different expectations based on gender. Therefore, parents might treat their sons and daughters accordingly. For example, fathers might enforce their values of emotional self-regulation on their sons more than on their daughters as the
Chinese idiom says. Future study should examine whether the relationships between the studied variables vary by child gender.

This study is limited by using self-report data. Confucian societies encourage moderation in all actions and thought while avoiding extreme (Tu, 1998). Additionally, as an old Chinese proverb says, “The bad thing that happened at home must not be spread (jiā chǒu bù kě wài yang in Mandarin).” As a result, parents might rate their own parenting according to the cultural norms, which avoid any response that is not according to social norms or extreme response. Because these response bias may have an influence on the results, observational studies would be helpful in future research.

Further, the analysis revealed that parental Asian values directly linked to child outcomes. The findings also show that maternal Asian values did not relate to any of those intrusive parenting practices. These results imply that mothers might use different parenting practices that contains more warmth. Thus, future study should examine other parenting practices as mediators.

Taken together, future research should continue to examine specific parenting practices from an emic approach. For example, past study has indicated that children in eastern country view parenting differently compared to those in western country (Kagitçibasi, 1990). Researchers should examine whether children perceive these intrusive parenting practices as sensitive or controlling because children’s perception might greatly influence the effects of parenting behaviors. Additionally, future study should further investigate the construct of parenting styles in Taiwanese context because researchers have revealed that authoritative and authoritarian parenting styles are intertwined in the Chinese sample (Xu et al., 2005). This implies that these constructs might overlap.
Conclusion

The results of this study suggest that parental Asian values are related to both mothers’ and fathers’ parenting practices, and in turn, related to child behavioral outcomes. This study provides some significant cultural insights that values of humility were significantly related to authoritarian parenting style for both mothers and fathers. This implies that humility is an important domain of Asian values that should be paid attention to because these values could possibly influence parenting behaviors. It also suggests that researcher, educators, or other practitioners should not simply assume the effects of parenting behaviors on child behavioral outcomes are similar across cultures. Instead, one should take the cultural values into account while looking at these relationships.
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Table 1. *Goodness-of-Fit Indicators for Measurement Equivalence Models of Maternal and Paternal Asian Values*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Invariance model</th>
<th>( \chi^2 ) (df)</th>
<th>( \Delta \chi^2 ) (df)</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>( \Delta \text{CFI} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Configural</td>
<td>( \chi^2 (684) = 1103.49 )</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.825</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>( \chi^2 (703) = 1202.65 )</td>
<td>( \chi^2 (19) = 99.16 )</td>
<td>.792</td>
<td>.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>( \chi^2 (722) = 1246.30 )</td>
<td>( \chi^2 (19) = 43.65 )</td>
<td>.782</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* According to Chi-square difference test and CFI, the constructs of Asian values between fathers and mothers are not equivalent.
Table 2. Goodness-of-Fit Indicators for Measurement Equivalence Models of Maternal and Paternal Authoritarian Parenting Style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Invariance model</th>
<th>( \chi^2 ) (df)</th>
<th>( \Delta \chi^2 ) (df)</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>( \Delta \text{CFI} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Configural</td>
<td>( \chi^2 ) (154) = 310.81</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.916</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>( \chi^2 ) (163) = 330.20</td>
<td>( \chi^2 ) (9) = 19.39</td>
<td>.910</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>( \chi^2 ) (172) = 349.82</td>
<td>( \chi^2 ) (9) = 19.62</td>
<td>.905</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* According to Chi-square difference test and CFI, the constructs of authoritarian parenting style between fathers and mothers have strong equivalence.
Table 3. Goodness-of-Fit Indicators for Measurement Equivalence Models of Maternal and Paternal Authoritative Parenting Style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Invariance model</th>
<th>( \chi^2 ) (df)</th>
<th>( \Delta \chi^2 ) (df)</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>( \Delta \text{CFI} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Configural</td>
<td>( \chi^2 ) (158) = 246.21</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.926</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>( \chi^2 ) (167) = 290.07</td>
<td>( \chi^2 ) (9) = 43.86</td>
<td>.896</td>
<td>.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>( \chi^2 ) (176) = 328.23</td>
<td>( \chi^2 ) (9) = 38.16</td>
<td>.871</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. According to Chi-square difference test and CFI, the constructs of permissive parenting style between fathers and mothers have strong equivalence.
Table 4. Goodness-of-Fit Indicators for Measurement Equivalence Models of Maternal and Paternal Permissive Parenting Style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Invariance model</th>
<th>$\chi^2$ (df)</th>
<th>$\Delta \chi^2$ (df)</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>$\Delta$CFI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Configural</td>
<td>$\chi^2$ (45) = 65.30</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.940</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>$\chi^2$ (50) = 74.12</td>
<td>$\chi^2$ (5) = 8.82</td>
<td>.929</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>$\chi^2$ (55) = 95.38</td>
<td>$\chi^2$ (5) = 21.26</td>
<td>.880</td>
<td>.049</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* According to Chi-square difference test, the constructs of permissive parenting style between fathers and mothers have weak equivalence.
Table 5. *Goodness-of-Fit Indicators for Measurement Equivalence Models of Maternal and Paternal Use of Shaming*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Invariance model</th>
<th>$\chi^2$ (df)</th>
<th>$\Delta \chi^2$ (df)</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>$\Delta$CFI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Configural</td>
<td>$\chi^2$ (47) = 76.74</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.936</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>$\chi^2$ (52) = 88.41</td>
<td>$\chi^2$ (5) = 11.67</td>
<td>.921</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>$\chi^2$ (57) = 110.92</td>
<td>$\chi^2$ (5) = 22.51</td>
<td>.883</td>
<td>.038</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* According to Chi-square difference test, the constructs of the use of shaming between fathers and mothers have weak equivalence.
Table 6. Goodness-of-Fit Indicators for Measurement Equivalence Models of Maternal and Paternal Use of Encouragement of Modesty/Humility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Invariance model</th>
<th>$\chi^2$ (df)</th>
<th>$\Delta \chi^2$ (df)</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>$\Delta$CFI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Configural</td>
<td>$\chi^2$ (28) = 51.46</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.954</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>$\chi^2$ (32) = 56.57</td>
<td>$\chi^2$ (4) = 5.11</td>
<td>.951</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>$\chi^2$ (36) = 60.89</td>
<td>$\chi^2$ (4) = 4.32</td>
<td>.951</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. According to Chi-square difference test and CFI, the constructs of the use of encouragement of modesty/humility between fathers and mothers have strong equivalence.
Table 7. Goodness-of-Fit Indicators for Measurement Equivalence Models of Maternal and Paternal Use of Directiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Invariance model</th>
<th>$\chi^2$ (df)</th>
<th>$\Delta \chi^2$ (df)</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>$\Delta$CFI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Configural</td>
<td>$\chi^2$ (15) = 27.33</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.940</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>$\chi^2$ (18) = 31.44</td>
<td>$\chi^2$ (3) = 4.11</td>
<td>.934</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>$\chi^2$ (21) = 39.16</td>
<td>$\chi^2$ (3) = 7.72</td>
<td>.911</td>
<td>.023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. According to Chi-square difference test and CFI, the constructs of the use of directiveness between fathers and mothers have weak equivalence.
Table 8. Bivariate Correlations Among Main Variables and Control Variables for Mothers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1Collectivism</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Conformity</td>
<td>.31***</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3Emotion</td>
<td>.25***</td>
<td>.26***</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Family Rec.</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.30***</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5Humility</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>- .02</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.19**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6Permissive</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7Authoritative</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.19**</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>-.36***</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8Authoritarian</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.28***</td>
<td>-.18**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9Shaming</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.24***</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.58***</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10Enc. of Hum.</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.31***</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>-.25***</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11Directiveness</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.36***</td>
<td>.43***</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12Prosocial</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13Modesty</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14Sociability</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.05*</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.62***</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15Control</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.57***</td>
<td>.37***</td>
<td>.05***</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16Child Age</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.06***</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17Child Gender</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.26***</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.22***</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18Mom Edu.</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.18**</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.21***</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>12*</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001
Table 9. *Bivariate Correlations Among Main Variables and Control Variables for Fathers*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1Collectivism</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Comformity</td>
<td>.33***</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3Emotion</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>.21***</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Family Rec.</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.27***</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5Humility</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.22***</td>
<td>-.31***</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6Permissive</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7Authoritative</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8Authoritarian</td>
<td>-.14*</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>-.19**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9Shaming</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.26***</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.41***</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10Enc. of Hum.</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.21***</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.22***</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.34***</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11Directiveness</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.42***</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.23***</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12Prosocial</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.27***</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13Modesty</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14Sociability</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.16**</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.62***</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15Control</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.21***</td>
<td>-.14*</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.16**</td>
<td>.57***</td>
<td>.37***</td>
<td>.50***</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16Child Age</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.06***</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17Child Gender</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.16*</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.26***</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.22***</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18Mom Edu.</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.13*</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.22***</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.16*</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. *p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001*
Table 10. Standardized Beta Coefficients of the Full Models for Mothers and Fathers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mother</th>
<th>Father</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collectivism</td>
<td>.03 - .05 - .12</td>
<td>.00 - .01 .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformity</td>
<td>.13 .14* .14*</td>
<td>.07 - .01 .03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emo. SR.</td>
<td>.05 .03 - .02</td>
<td>.12 - .02 .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fam. Recog.</td>
<td>.11 .16* .05</td>
<td>.07 - .04 .03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humility</td>
<td>.33*** .03 - .02</td>
<td>- .06 .01 .09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarian</td>
<td>-.11 -.11 .21*</td>
<td>-.07 .10 -.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritative</td>
<td>.10 -.04 .14*</td>
<td>.07 .02 .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permissive</td>
<td>.21** .13 - .27***</td>
<td>-.13 .21** .18*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaming</td>
<td>.08 .00 -.12</td>
<td>-.02 -.06 .08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End. of Mod.</td>
<td>-.01 -.20* .12</td>
<td>-.02 -.01 .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directiveness</td>
<td>.08 .17* -.13</td>
<td>-.05 .10 .08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001

Note: 1 = Authoritarian, 2 = Authoritative, 3 = Permissive, 4 = Shaming, 5 = Encouragement of Modesty, 6 = Directiveness, 7 = Prosocial behaviors, 8 = Modesty, 9 = Sociability, 10 = Impulse control.
Figure 1. The Conceptual Model of the Relationship of Cultural Values, Parenting Styles/Practices, and Child Outcomes
Figure 2. The analytic model of the relationship between parental Asian values, parenting styles, and child outcomes

*Note:* Asian values include five constructs (i.e., collectivism, conformity, emotional self-regulation, family recognition of achievement, and humility) that were analyzed separately.
Figure 3. The analytic model of the relationship of parental Asian values, Chinese parenting practices, and child outcomes.

Note: Asian values include five constructs (i.e., collectivism, conformity, emotional self-regulation, family recognition of achievement, and humility) that were analyzed separately.
Figure 4. The full analytic model of the relationship of parental Asian values, parenting styles and practices, and child outcomes

Note: Asian values include five constructs (i.e., collectivism, conformity, emotional self-regulation, family recognition of achievement, and humility) that were analyzed separately.
Figure 5. The relationship between maternal Asian values, parenting styles, and child outcomes

Note: Only standardized values are shown. Endogenous error correlations, control variables, and indirect effects are not shown for parsimony. Mother’s education, child age, and child gender were control variables.

Model fit: \( \chi^2 (4) = 4.00, p = .406; \) CFI = 1.00; TLI = 1.00; RMSEA = .000; SRMR = .008

\(*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001.\)
Figure 6. The relationship between maternal Asian values, Chinese parenting practices, and child outcomes

Note: Only standardized values are shown. Endogenous error correlations, control variables, and indirect effects are not shown for parsimony. Mother’s education, child age, and child gender were control variables.

Model fit: $\chi^2(6) = 6.478, p = .372; \text{CFI} = .998; \text{TLI} = .975; \text{RMSEA} = .017; \text{SRMR} = .011$

*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001.
Figure 7. The relationship between maternal Asian values, parenting styles, Chinese parenting practices, and child outcomes

Note: Only standardized values are shown. Endogenous error correlations, control variables, and indirect effects are not shown for parsimony. Mother’s education, child age, and child gender were control variables.

Model fit: $\chi^2 (4) = 3.808, p = .433; CFI = 1.00; TLI = 1.00; RMSEA = .000; SRMR = .007$

*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001.
Figure 8. The relationship between paternal Asian values, parenting styles, and child outcomes

Note: Only standardized values are shown. Endogenous error correlations, control variables, and indirect effects are not shown for parsimony. Father’s education, child age, and child gender were control variables.

Model fit: $\chi^2 (4) = .530, p = .971; \text{CFI} = 1.000; \text{TLI} = 1.249; \text{RMSEA} = .000; \text{SRMR} = .003$

*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001.
Figure 9. The relationship between paternal Asian values, Chinese parenting practices, and child outcomes

Note: Only standardized values are shown. Endogenous error correlations, control variables, and indirect effects are not shown for parsimony. Father’s education, child age, and child gender were control variables.

Model fit: $\chi^2 (4) = 2.655, p = .617$; CFI = 1.000; TLI = 1.170; RMSEA = .000; SRMR = .008

*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001.
Figure 10. The relationship between paternal Asian values, parenting styles, Chinese parenting practices, and child outcomes

Note: Only standardized values are shown. Endogenous error correlations, control variables, and indirect effects are not shown for parsimony. Father’s education, child age, and child gender were control variables.

Model fit: $\chi^2 (4) = .594, p = .963; CFI = 1.000; TLI = 1.259; RMSEA = .000; SRMR = .003$

*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001.