



All Theses and Dissertations

---

2006-07-09

# Japanese Mothers' Parenting Styles with Preschool-Age Children

Ai Shibazaki Lau

*Brigham Young University - Provo*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/etd>



Part of the [Family, Life Course, and Society Commons](#)

---

## BYU ScholarsArchive Citation

Lau, Ai Shibazaki, "Japanese Mothers' Parenting Styles with Preschool-Age Children" (2006). *All Theses and Dissertations*. 481.  
<https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/etd/481>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by BYU ScholarsArchive. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of BYU ScholarsArchive. For more information, please contact [scholarsarchive@byu.edu](mailto:scholarsarchive@byu.edu), [ellen\\_amatangelo@byu.edu](mailto:ellen_amatangelo@byu.edu).

JAPANESE MOTHERS' PARENTING STYLES WITH  
PRESCHOOL-AGE CHILDREN

by

Ai Shibazaki Lau

A thesis submitted to the faculty of

Brigham Young University

In part fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Science

Marriage, Family, and Human Development

School of Family Life

Brigham Young University

August 2006

BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE COMMITTEE APPROVAL

of a thesis submitted by

Ai Shibazaki Lau

This thesis has been read by each member of the following graduate committee and by majority vote has been found to be satisfactory.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Craig H. Hart, Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Susanne Olsen Roper

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Larry J. Nelson

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Clyde C. Robinson

BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY

As chair of the candidate's graduate committee, I have read the thesis of Ai Shibazaki Lau in its final form and have found that (1) its format, citations, and bibliographical style are consistent and acceptable and fulfill university and department style requirements; (2) its illustrative materials including figures, tables, and charts are in place; and (3) the final manuscript is satisfactory to the graduate committee and is ready for submission to the university library.

---

Date

---

Craig H. Hart  
Chair, Graduate Committee

Accepted for the Department

---

Thomas W. Draper  
Graduate Coordinator  
Marriage, Family, and Human Development

Accepted for the College

---

James M Harper  
Director, School of Family Life

## ABSTRACT

### JAPANESE MOTHERS' PARENTING STYLES WITH PRESCHOOL-AGE CHILDREN

Ai Shibazaki Lau

Marriage, Family, and Human Development Program

School of Family Life

Master of Science

The purpose of this study was to examine whether Western typologies of parenting (authoritative, authoritarian, permissive, and psychological control) and their dimensions (e.g., connection, regulation, physical punishment, verbal hostility) can be measured in the context of Japanese parenting. Based on the literature review, it was hypothesized that these parenting constructs are measurable in Japan. The participants were 214 Japanese mothers of preschool-age children (101 boys and 113 girls) from several preschools in Kushiro-city, Japan. A series of two-group (boys and girls) Confirmatory Factor Analysis was carried out with Mplus statistical software to test the measurement models of authoritative, authoritarian, permissive, and psychological control constructs and to establish measurement invariance across child gender. In addition, latent intercorrelations and gender differences in the means of the latent constructs were

computed. To a large extent, our hypotheses were confirmed. In line with expectations, authoritative and authoritarian parenting items formed a 23-item, five-factor model. For psychological control, a 9-item, two-factor model emerged, indicating that the constructs of shaming and directiveness are also measurable in Japan. However, an invariant measurement model for permissive parenting could not be identified. Based on latent intercorrelations, many parenting dimensions were highly correlated, but a series of chi-square difference tests showed that most dimensions were statistically distinguished within our measurement models.

Interestingly, shaming and directiveness were associated with dimensions of both authoritative and authoritarian parenting. Latent mean comparisons identified no significant gender difference in Japanese mothers' parenting patterns for boys and girls. This study was one of the first quantitative, systematic studies of parenting styles in Japan using advanced statistical modeling and represents a starting point for cross-cultural research in Japanese parenting.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I owe much to those who have helped and supported me as I have worked toward the completion of this thesis. First of all, I want to thank my graduate committee members. As a mentor, Dr. Craig Hart not only guided me with his tremendous knowledge and resources but also taught me the enjoyment of doing research. It would have been absolutely impossible for me to finish my thesis without his emotional support, kind words, and great sense of humor. I express my gratitude to Dr. Susanne Olsen Roper for her friendship, encouragement, and outstanding editing skills. I want to thank Dr. Larry Nelson for his passion for research and insightful feedback on my work. I also express my appreciation to Dr. Clyde Robinson, who taught me important statistical skills and helped outline my paper.

I want to thank Dr. Sueko Toda at Hokkaido University, who collected the data used for this thesis, and Dr. Chongming Yang at Duke University and Dr. Joseph Olson for their help with my statistical analyses. I appreciate the constant support and encouragement I received from my fellow graduate students in the program.

Lastly, I want to express my love and appreciation to my family members. I want to thank my husband's family, who offered a tremendous amount of assistance to help me complete my degree. I can never express enough gratitude to my own parents: Masayuki and Fusako Shibazaki. They are not only great experts in early childhood development, but also are wonderful parents whose dedication and selflessness have always inspired me to become a better person. Special thanks to my son, Kent, whose smiles and laughter have cheered me up in times of hardships. Finally, I want to express my deep love and gratitude to my husband, Jeremy, for always inspiring me through his hard work and giving me confidence to finish this thesis and pursue my future goals.

## Table of Contents

Title Page .....	i
Graduate Committee Approval.....	ii
Final Reading Approval and Acceptance.....	iii
Abstract .....	iv
Acknowledgements .....	vi
Table of Contents .....	vii
List of Tables .....	x
Chapter I Introduction .....	1
Chapter II Review of Literature .....	6
Parenting Styles .....	6
Historical Context .....	6
Baumrind’s Parenting Styles .....	7
Authoritative Parenting Style .....	7
Authoritarian Parenting Style .....	8
Permissive Parenting Style .....	9
Uninvolved Parenting Style .....	10
Psychological Control .....	10
Application for Other Cultures .....	12
The Emic vs. Etic Issue .....	12
Parenting Styles in Other Cultures .....	13
Japanese Culture and Parenting .....	19
Cultural Context .....	19

Parent-Child Relationship .....	20
Parenting Goals .....	21
Parenting Styles in Japan .....	23
Authoritative Parenting in Japan .....	25
Connection .....	25
Regulation .....	27
Autonomy Granting .....	28
Authoritarian Parenting in Japan .....	30
Physical Punishment .....	30
Verbal Hostility .....	32
Non-Reasoning/Punitive .....	33
Permissive Parenting in Japan .....	34
Psychological Control in Japan .....	35
Shaming .....	36
Directiveness .....	39
Hypotheses .....	42
Chapter III Method .....	45
Participants .....	45
Procedure .....	45
Measures .....	45
Chapter IV Results .....	48
Measurement Models of Parenting Styles.....	49
Authoritative Parenting .....	49

Authoritarian Parenting .....	51
Permissive Parenting .....	52
Combined PSQD Model .....	53
Measurement Model of Psychological Control .....	54
Relations between Authoritative-Authoritarian and Psychological Control Constructs.....	55
Latent Mean Comparison .....	56
Chapter V Discussion .....	57
Measurement Models .....	58
Authoritative Parenting .....	58
Authoritarian Parenting .....	59
Permissive Parenting .....	60
Psychological Control .....	61
Relations between Parenting Constructs .....	62
Gender Difference .....	66
Limitations and Future Directions .....	66
Notes .....	70
References .....	71
Table .....	90

## List of Tables

1. Descriptive Statistics of Permissive Parenting Items
2. 5-Factor Structure of Japanese Mothers' Authoritative & Authoritarian Styles
3. Latent Intercorrelations of Authoritative & Authoritarian Constructs
4. 2-Factor Structure of Japanese Mothers' Psychological Control
5. Latent Intercorrelations between Authoritative/Authoritarian and Psychological Control
6. Latent Mean Comparisons of Parenting Constructs across Child Genders

## Chapter I

### Introduction

“*Mitsugo no tamashii hyaku made* (The soul of a three-year-old until a hundred).” As reflected in this traditional proverb, the Japanese society regards early childhood as a crucial period for a person’s later development (Hendry, 1986; Holloway, 2000; Lewis, 1995).

Recognizing the special attention given to early childhood in Japan, many Western scholars have studied Japanese early socialization practices for clues to help understand unique characteristics of the Japanese society as a whole. For example, Lewis (1995), who conducted ethnographical research in Japanese preschools, argued that Japan’s high academic achievement after elementary education should be credited to Japanese early childhood education and its emphasis on creating a sense of community. Lewis’ argument is supported by her contemporary researchers including Peak (1991), who also observed that early emphasis on connection, friendship, and collaboration likely accounts for later academic success in Japan. These researchers believed that the unique foci of Japanese early childhood socialization practices are reflections of the society’s traditional values and may help explain many distinctive characteristics seen among Japanese adults, such as politeness, persistence, and a strong work ethic.

While Japanese early socialization has received much attention from Western scholars, there are also significant gaps in the socialization literature. First, many well-cited studies on Japanese socialization practices utilized qualitative analyses instead of systematic, quantitative approaches (Shwalb & Shwalb, 1996). For instance, Benedict’s (1946/1989) classic anthropological piece, *The Chrysanthemum and the Sword*, is based on her interviews with Japanese Americans in relocation camps during World War II. Other renowned books, such as

Vogel's (1963) *Japan's New Middle Class: The Salary Man and His Family in a Tokyo Suburb*, Hendry's (1986) *Becoming Japanese: The World of the Preschool Child*, and Lewis' (1995) *Educating Hearts and Minds: Reflections on Japanese Preschool and Elementary Education*, are all based on the authors' participant-observations as anthropologists and provide ethnographical accounts on Japanese socialization. In addition, some qualitative accounts are historical descriptions of Japanese socialization (e.g., Ikegami, 2003; Kojima, 1986, 1996; Shibazaki & Anzai, 2005). Moreover, many influential works, such as Lebra's (1976) *Japanese Patterns of Behavior* and Doi's (1973) *The Anatomy of Dependence*, mainly focus on conceptual and theoretical issues and do not provide empirical, quantitative data. These qualitative accounts have certainly provided rich, detailed descriptions of Japanese socialization and have helped establish conceptual frameworks for future studies. However, it is important to ascertain the veracity of qualitative findings through more systematic, quantitative studies.

Secondly, the general focus of research on Japanese socialization has shifted from studies of family influence to studies of school life socialization practices during recent decades. While early scholars, such as Benedict (1946/1989) and Vogel (1963), described Japanese childrearing in thorough qualitative accounts, more recent studies have focused on socialization practices as they take place in school settings (Kotloff, 1993, 1998; Lewis, 1984, 1995; Peak, 1991; Tobin, Wu, & Davidson, 1989; Holloway, 2000). After stating, "Among my generation of Western specialists on Japan, I am not alone in abandoning the family to study school life," Lewis (1996) points out that "we know little...about how Japanese childrearing has changed, as we must assume it has, over the past four decades" (p. 133). Therefore, it is important for us to revisit the issue of Japanese socialization as it takes place in the family context and to describe contemporary Japanese childrearing.

Third, many recent studies that employ quantitative methods and examine family socialization often focus on Japanese mothers' beliefs and views about childrearing rather than describing their actual socialization practices. For instance, Olson, Kashiwagi, and Crystal (2001) and White and LeVine (1986) examined Japanese mothers' perceptions of good child behavior and desirable characteristics. Others have studied Japanese mothers' expectations regarding child development (Joshi & MacLean, 1997), their motivations for having children (Kashiwagi, 1999), their views on child autonomy (Osterweil & Nagano, 1991) and on aggression (Osterweil & Nagano-Nakamura, 1992), and their parenting self-efficacy (Holloway, Suzuki, Yamamoto, & Behrens 2005). Although the knowledge of underlying maternal beliefs and views is essential for understanding child socialization, it does not provide a complete picture. This body of inquiry needs to be accompanied by studies describing actual parent-child interactional processes and socialization patterns employed by Japanese parents.

Finally, although there are a few recent systematic, quantitative studies on Japanese socialization within the family context, each tends to focus on one specific parenting practice without attempting to capture an overall interactional climate, often defined as "parenting style." For example, the parenting practice of obtaining child compliance was examined by Conroy, Hess, Azuma, and Kashiwagi (1980), who asked mothers to respond to six hypothetical compliance-relevant situations. In addition, Ujiie (1997) conducted short structured interviews with Japanese mothers and examined their parenting practices for dealing specifically with child negativism. These parenting practices are "particular efforts that parents undertake to accomplish specific goal-oriented tasks with children" (Hart, Newell, & Olsen, 2003, p. 762). On the other hand, Darling and Steinberg (1993) define parenting style as "a constellation of attitudes toward the child that are communicated to the child and that, taken together, create an

emotional climate in which the parent's behaviors are expressed" (p. 488). Among the most commonly studied parenting styles in the Western context are authoritative, authoritarian, permissive, and psychological control. (These parenting styles will be elaborated upon later.) Unlike parenting practices, parenting styles capture "parent-child interactions *over a wide range of situations*" (Mize & Pettit, 1997, p. 312, emphasis added). While parenting practices can be reflective of overall parenting styles and are important concepts to examine, parenting styles provide a larger picture of parent-child interactional processes. Thus, it is also important to examine how typologies of parenting styles can be applied to understanding and describing Japanese early socialization processes. This work has yet to be undertaken and is the focus of this investigation.

In summary, the purpose of this study is to fill the research gaps identified above and to examine whether Western typologies of parenting (authoritative, authoritarian, permissive, and psychological control) can be measured in the context of Japanese parenting. In order to meet this goal and to establish the foundation for this study, a review of the literature will be presented in the following areas. First, Western typologies of parenting styles (authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive) described by Baumrind (1967, 1971) and others (e.g., Maccoby & Martin, 1983) will be introduced. Second, psychological control, another parenting construct more recently proposed by Barber (1996) and sometimes conceptualized as a feature of the authoritarian style (Baumrind, 2005), will be described. This will be followed by a discussion of the emic vs. etic issue and the applicability of Western parenting typologies in other cultures. Furthermore, descriptions of the Japanese culture and its influence on parent-child relationships and parental goals will be given. The last part of our literature review will provide the conceptual foundation

for whether Western parenting styles and their dimensions exist in the context of the Japanese culture. Hypotheses will be presented after a review of the literature.

## Chapter II

### Review of Literature

#### *Parenting Styles*

##### *Historical Context*

The foundation of Western parenting typologies used today consists of early factor-analytic studies conducted more than four decades ago. These early factor analyses identified important parenting dimensions, and this dimensional approach was widely used in examining socialization influence (Hart, Newel et al., 2003). For instance, Symonds (1939) identified two parenting dimensions, acceptance/rejection and dominance/submission. Similarly, Schaefer (1959) employed two dimensions, love/hostility and autonomy/control, and further explored parenting styles that varied along those dimensions. While this dimensional approach was popular and substantially increased our understanding of the influence of socialization, those dimensions were largely based on empirical findings from factor analyses and often lacked a strong theoretical groundwork (Darling & Steinberg, 1993).

Diana Baumrind's (1967, 1971) work has been recognized as a meaningful divergence from the early empirical, factor-analytic tradition. Her model was more theoretical than earlier ones and elaborated on one single parenting domain—parental control (Darling & Steinberg, 1993). In her influential monograph, "Current Patterns of Parental Authority," Baumrind (1971) identified three distinct patterns of parental authority: authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive parental control. Rather than focusing solely on the amount of parental control like some of the earlier studies on parenting, Baumrind (1967, 1971) identified "three qualitatively different types of control" (Darling & Steinberg, 1993, p. 490). While Baumrind's typologies derived from her study of various patterns of parental authority, she found that other parental attributes, such as

socialization goals and communication skills, were also closely related to the distinction that she had made among the three patterns of parental control.

Maccoby and Martin's (1983) work was influential in linking Baumrind's typologies back to the earlier studies on dimensions. They attempted to combine Baumrind's approach with a dimensional approach by describing Baumrind's parenting styles as a function of two theoretical dimensions: responsiveness and demandingness. Based on differences in the two parental dimensions, four parenting styles were categorized as authoritative (high responsiveness/ high demandingness), authoritarian (low responsiveness/ high demandingness), permissive (high responsiveness/ low demandingness), and uninvolved (low responsiveness/ low demandingness) (Maccoby & Martin, 1983).

#### *Baumrind's Parenting Styles*

*Authoritative parenting style.* Generally, authoritative parents are affectively responsive. They are not only loving and supportive, but also sensitive to children's individual interests and needs, which requires a certain amount of flexibility in parenting (Baumrind, 1989).

Authoritative parents exercise control, but they do so in combination with warmth, democracy, and open communication (Baumrind, 1971). Accordingly, they seek to make rules and expectations clear for children and reason with them so they can understand the rationales for setting rules and the consequences for not meeting them (Baumrind, 1996; Pettit, Bates, & Dodge, 1997). This facilitates verbal give and take (Baumrind, 1989) and teaches children to think independently (Baumrind, 1996).

These unique features of authoritative parenting have been summarized in terms of three stylistic dimensions: connection, regulation, and autonomy granting (Barber & Olsen, 1997; Hart, Newell et al., 2003). Connection refers to the degree of warmth and acceptance shown to a

child, and regulation is concerned with the degree of behavioral control placed on a child. Autonomy granting indicates the degree to which parents grant psychological and emotional autonomy to children, and it is also reflected in the degree of democratic participation (Hart, Newell et al., 2003).

*Authoritarian parenting style.* Although both authoritative and authoritarian parents attempt to regulate their children's behavior, the two styles differ in their degrees of parental warmth and responsiveness. Unlike authoritative parents, authoritarian parents typically attempt to control children's behaviors without exhibiting much acceptance and support (Baumrind, 1971). Whereas authoritative parents generally regulate children's behavior in a logical, issue-oriented manner, authoritarian parents are less concerned than authoritative parents with teaching or preparing children (Hasting & Rubin, 1999). Verbal give and take is not commonly encouraged by authoritarian parents who place great emphasis on authority and strict obedience (Baumrind, 1991; Maccoby & Martin, 1983). Authoritarian parenting has been found to consist of three disciplinary dimensions: verbal hostility (e.g., shouting, yelling), corporal punishment (e.g., spanking, slapping), and nonreasoning/punitive strategies (e.g., punishing without explanation, threatening without justification) (Robinson, Mandlco, Olsen, & Hart, 1995; Wu et al., 2002).

It should be noted that although authoritative and authoritarian parents both exercise a high degree of control, they engage in "qualitatively different types of control" (Darling & Steinberg, 1993, p. 490). Therefore, it seems important to distinguish different forms of behavioral control used by authoritative and authoritarian parents. As pointed out by Aunola and Nurmi (2005), "the operationalization of behavioral control has varied from one study to another" (p. 1149). More specifically, behavioral control has been examined in terms of limit

setting and maturity demands (e.g., Baumrind, 1989, 1991; Maccoby & Martin, 1983), monitoring and supervising (e.g., Gray & Steinberg, 1999; Pettit & Laird, 2002; Pettit, Laird, Dodge, Bates, & Criss, 2001), or harsh control, such as yelling, name calling, and physical threats and aggression (e.g., Chang, Schwartz, Dodge, & McBride-Change, 2003; Nelson & Crick, 2002; Pettit et al., 1997). While positive forms of behavioral control, such as maturity demands, limit setting, reasoning, monitoring, and supervising, are more often employed by authoritative parents (Baumrind, 1971, 1996), authoritarian parents tend to engage in harsh, negative forms of behavioral control such as verbal hostility and physical punishment (Ambert, 1997; Baumrind, 1996; Brody et al., 2001).

*Permissive parenting style.* In contrast to authoritative and authoritarian parents, permissive parents exercise relatively little control over their children and may overindulge them (Hart, Newell et al., 2003). Permissive parents are not only warm toward their children, but also tend to show more tolerant, accepting attitudes toward child impulses. Consequently, they make few demands for mature behavior and offer few consequences for misbehavior (Maccoby & Martin, 1983). Another tendency of permissive parents is to not use overt power or authority to accomplish their objectives and in fact, often avoid using it at all costs (Hart, Newell et al., 2003). Moreover, permissive parents have a tendency to encourage children's autonomy without providing parental guidance or parameters (Maccoby & Martin, 1983). For instance, they may provide minimum restrictions governing their children's time schedule with regard to TV watching and bedtime.

Compared to authoritative and authoritarian parenting styles, little attention has been given to the conceptualization of permissive parenting dimensions. In an empirical, factor-analytic study, exploratory factor analysis yielded three parenting dimensions within the

typology of permissive style: not following through, ignoring misbehavior, and low self-confidence (Robinson et al., 1995). Conceptually, failing to follow through and ignoring misbehavior seem to be closely related as they both reflect parents' tendency to indulge children and refrain from exercising firm control. However, no study has examined the conceptual or empirical linkage between permissive parenting and parents' low self-confidence. More research is needed to explore this linkage and help construct well-defined permissive parenting dimensions.

*Uninvolved parenting style.* Uninvolved parents are low on both "responsiveness" and "demandingness" and may engage in rejection or neglect in extreme cases. While uninvolved parenting can be an important area of study particularly for understanding child neglect, a majority of parents usually fall into one of the other three categories: authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive parenting styles. Therefore, like most previous studies on Baumrind's parenting typologies (e.g., Robinson et al., 1995), this paper will also focus on the three parenting styles (authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive), excluding further discussion on uninvolved parenting.

### *Psychological Control*

While various types of behavioral control were discussed with authoritarian parenting, recent studies have also pointed out the importance of studying another major type of control: psychological control (Barber, 1996; Barber & Harmon, 2002). The distinction between behavioral and psychological control is based on the difference between strategies parents engage in to control children's behavior versus their psychological experiences (Barber, 1996; Barber & Harmon, 2002). Many recent studies (e.g., Aunola & Nurmi, 2005; Finkenauer, Engels, & Baumeister, 2005; Galambos, Barker, & Almeida, 2003) have applied this distinction

and have deepened our understanding of how behavioral and psychological control uniquely impacts children's social development.

According to Barber's (1996) conceptualization, psychological control refers to parental attempts that intrude into children's psychological experience and involve behaviors such as constraining verbal expressions, invalidating feelings, personal attacks on children, guilt induction, love withdrawal, and erratic emotional behavior. In contrast to behavioral control, which can take an either positive or negative form, psychological control is typically regarded as a negative type of parental control because it seems to be "associated with disturbances in psychoemotional boundaries between the child and parent, and hence with the development of an independent sense of self and identity" (Barber & Harmon, 2002, p. 15). The characteristics of psychologically controlling parents have been described as possessive, dominant, and enmeshing (Barber & Harmon, 2002). Most of the earlier studies on psychological control have focused on adolescents. However, more recent studies have shown that the construct is also relevant to parents of young children (Nelson, Hart, Yang, Olsen, & Jin, 2006; Olsen et al., 2002).

While some scholars consider psychological control to be a separate parenting style, others have pointed out that psychologically controlling means are often employed by authoritarian parents to deride, demean, or diminish children (Baumrind, 2005; Hart, Newell, & Sine, 2000). Although Baumrind did not specifically mention the term psychological control in her earlier studies (e.g., Baumrind, 1967, 1971, 1991, 1996), Barber and Harmon (2002) commented, "She has written more than any other researcher about parental attitudes and behaviors that violate the psychological integrity of children in the context of her description of authoritarian parenting" (p.17). Although authoritarian parenting includes other dimensions such as verbal hostility and physical punishment, psychological control can be also viewed as an

element of authoritarian control. In fact, in her recent work, Baumrind (2005) stated that “intrusive processes included in Barber’s Psychological Control Scale... are markers of an authoritarian style of control, typically associated with poor adjustment” (p. 67). Thus, at least in the Western context, there seems to be a close association between authoritarian parenting and psychological control. Nevertheless, there is still room for debate regarding whether psychological control is part of authoritarian parenting or should be considered a separate parenting style.

### *Application for Other Cultures*

Before discussing how Western parenting typologies have been applied to describe parenting in other cultural contexts, it seems important to briefly review the ongoing debate between emic vs. etic as two different approaches to studying human behaviors.

#### *The Emic vs. Etic Issue*

The emic-etic debate has a long tradition in the history of anthropology (see Headland, Pike, & Harris, 1990). In 1954, the concepts of emic and etic were first introduced by the famous linguist, Kenneth Pike, who drew on an analogy with the linguistic terms “phonemic” and “phonetic” (Pike, 1967). Pike suggested that just as in the study of a language’s sound system, there were also two perspectives that could be applied in the study of a society or culture. Generally, emic refers to taking the viewpoint of the insider whereas etic means taking the outsider’s viewpoint. In the 1960s, the concepts of emic and etic were picked up by the well-known founder of Cultural Materialism, Marvin Harris (1964, 1968) and began to be more widely used both inside and outside anthropology.

Today, this emic-etic debate continues to be one of the most intriguing questions in cultural psychology (Berry, 1969, 1989). Cross-cultural researchers continue deal with questions

such as “are there behavioral patterns that are identifiable and similar across cultures?” and “is it better to focus on behaviors particularly arising from the culture under investigation?” While emic and etic are often thought to create a conflicting dichotomy, Berry (1999) emphasizes that Pike (1967) originally conceptualized them as complementary viewpoints. According to Berry (1999), rather than posing a “dilemma,” the use of both approaches can deepen our understanding of important issues in cultural psychology.

### *Parenting Styles in Other Cultures*

In recent decades, researchers have raised questions regarding the ethnocentricity of the Western parenting typologies and have debated over the typologies’ applicability for other cultural groups (Baumrind, 1996; Chao, 1994; Darling & Steinberg, 1993). Baumrind’s initial studies (1967, 1971) were based on samples of white, predominantly middle-class families in the United States. Two stylistic dimensions of parenting, responsiveness and demandingness, are derived from those early studies, and consequently, may reflect the mainstream American values of that time. Therefore, it has been argued that authoritative and authoritarian styles, founded upon the Western conceptualizations of love and control, may not fully portray the scope of variation in parenting outside the Western context (Chao, 1994). Furthermore, it has also been argued that the use of Western typologies in describing parenting in other cultures is an example of “imposed etic” (Berry, 1969, 1999), which suggests that we are imposing our worldview on other cultures.

In order to give a better depiction of Eastern parenting and to engage in more “emic exploration” (Berry, 1999), Ruth Chao (1994) and others (e.g., Chen, 1998; Fung, 1999; Ho, 1986) dedicated their studies to conceptualizing indigenous parenting patterns in the Chinese culture. For instance, Chao (1994) proposed the concept of “training” as a parenting construct,

which captures the uniqueness of Chinese parenting. The concept of training reflects two important characteristics of Chinese parenting. The first is the intentions and motivations behind parental control. According to Lau and Cheung (1987), Asian parents' intentions for exercising control are often to assure the cultural goal of fostering harmonious relationships with family members and others, rather than to dominate their children. Although Chinese parents have been generally described as authoritarian (Dornbusch, Ritter, Leiderman, Roberts, & Fraleigh, 1987; Steinberg, Dornbusch, & Brown, 1992) largely due to their emphasis on obedience and respect to adult authority, Chao (1994) argues that authoritarian parenting is a Western construct, which stresses parental domination of children, and does not accurately reflect the motivations of Chinese parents who are strict but not necessarily domineering. On the other hand, Chao's (1994) conceptualization of training takes into account Chinese parents' motivations to teach their children the important societal goal of maintaining harmonious relationships.

The second characteristic of Chinese parenting is parents' immense devotion and great care for their children. While Western parents may be more explicit in showing affection than Chinese parents, Chinese parents show love and support in more subtle, implicit ways (Chao, 1994; Ho, 1986). Parental care and concern are communicated through firm control, and their love for children is denoted by involvement and guidance. While the Western authoritarian construct does not fully capture this compatibility between love and strict control in Chinese parenting, training is regarded to take place "in the context of supportive, highly involved, and physically close mother-child relationship" (Chao, 1994, p. 1112).

In accordance with Chao's (1994) argument that the Western parenting typologies fail to capture some unique characteristics of Chinese parenting, several empirical studies have shown the associations between traditional Chinese parenting patterns and both authoritative and

authoritarian parenting styles in Chinese parents. For instance, Chao (2000) found that Chinese American mothers' authoritative and authoritarian parenting styles were related to her concept of training, which was defined in terms of (1) "ideologies on child development and learning" (e.g., the nature of the child as inherently good, the earliest possible introduction of training) and (2) "ideologies on the mother-child relationships" (e.g., a child is in constant care of the mother, a child is taken everywhere with the mother) (Chao, 1994, p. 1115). Similarly, Wu et al. (2002) found Mainland Chinese mothers' directiveness (e.g., I demand my child to do things) and shaming (e.g., I tell my child we get embarrassed when he/she doesn't meet our expectations) were associated with both parenting styles. Furthermore, in Xu et al.'s (2005) study, the Chinese values of collectivism (e.g., one should think about one's group before oneself) and conformity to norm (e.g., following familial and social expectations is important) were found to be correlated with both authoritative and authoritarian styles in Mainland Chinese mothers. These findings suggest that "authoritative and authoritarian parenting styles are intertwined with the Chinese value system" (Xu et al., 2005, p. 525) and support Chao's (1994) argument that the Western distinction of authoritative and authoritarian parenting may not fully capture the unique features of Chinese parenting.

Nevertheless, it should also be noted that these findings do *not* suggest that the Western typologies of parenting are either irrelevant or of no value in studying parenting in other cultures. As stated above, etic and emic perspectives are both important views to be addressed and together deepen our understanding of parenting patterns in various cultures. As valuable as the "emic exploration" (Berry, 1999), it does not simply replace the "imposed etic" (Berry, 1969, 1999) since they contribute to our understanding in different ways (Sorkhabi, 2005).

The “imposed etic” (Berry, 1969, 1999) is especially valuable in identifying similar behavioral patterns across cultures. In fact, a number of scholars have identified similar factor structures across cultures in terms of parenting styles and their dimensions (Nelson, Nelson, Hart, Yang, & Jin, 2006). For example, Wu et al. (2002) showed that parenting styles were factorally invariant from maternal self-reports in the Mainland Chinese and the U.S. samples. In both samples, authoritative parenting consisted of connection, regulation, and autonomy granting, while authoritarian parenting consisted of physical coercion, verbal hostility, and nonreasoning/punitive (Wu et al., 2002). Likewise, Porter et al. (2005) obtained similar factor structures of authoritative (connection, regulation, and autonomy granting) and authoritarian (verbal hostility/physical coercion, and nonreasoning/punitive) based on the Mainland Chinese parents’ spousal reports. In addition, Hart, Nelson et al. (2000) attained three factor structures of authoritative (reasoning/reinforcing, responsive/easy going, democratic participation, and warmth/involvement), authoritarian (corporal punishment/verbal hostility, and nonreasoning/coercion), and permissive styles from Russian parents’ self-reports. Russell, Hart, Robinson, and Olsen (2003) studied U.S. and Australian parents and obtained the factor structures of authoritative (connection, regulation, and autonomy granting) and authoritarian (verbal hostility, physical coercion, and nonreasoning/punitive) with moderate to higher reliabilities. These empirical findings show that parenting typologies can be similarly identified in different cultures, while they may have cultural-specific implications as suggested by Chao (1994).

In addition, some recent studies have further argued for the applicability of Baumrind’s parenting styles in both individualist and collectivist cultures by pointing out the possibility that the concept of training is more reflective of authoritative parenting than a distinct parenting

pattern (e.g., Nelson, Hart, Yang et al., 2006; Sorkhabi, 2005). For example, Nelson, Hart, Yang et al. (2006) proposed the idea that Chao's (1994) concept of training is consistent with the authoritative parenting construct without the autonomy granting dimension. In other words, the remaining two authoritative dimensions (connection and regulation) closely correspond to Chao's conceptualization of Chinese training.

Several other empirical studies support Nelson, Hart, Yang et al.,'s (2006) argument. For instance, Stewart, Rao, Bond, McBride-Chang, Fielding, and Kennard (1998) studied Hong Kong adolescents and found that parenting characteristics associated with the training concept were significantly correlated with parental warmth. Similarly, in their study of Pakistani students, Stewart et al. (1999) observed that the warmth dimension was a universally recognized construct and that "there exists the possibility that the training items reflect simply the Pakistani equivalent of warmth" (Stewart et al., 1999, p.766). Furthermore, when warmth and training were treated as separate constructs, the training concept did not contribute to the prediction of self-esteem or life-satisfaction above and beyond the warmth and control dimensions (Stewart et al., 1999). In addition, Stewart, Bond, Kennard, Ho, and Zaman (2002) found that the concept of training was not only positively associated with parental warmth in the U.S., Hong Kong, and Pakistan, but also was viewed as the ideal parenting pattern in all three cultures. This finding is noteworthy because it suggests that the training concept functions similarly in individualistic and collectivistic cultures and is regarded as the ideal form of parenting much like the general notion of authoritative parenting.

This raises a question concerning whether Chao's (1994) concept of training is as cultural-specific as it was once thought. Therefore, the preliminary nature of our current understanding of parenting typologies (Baumrind's parenting styles) and indigenous parenting

practices (e.g., Chao's concept of training) with regard to their applicability to a variety of cultural contexts makes it difficult to reach firm conclusions about whether one is more useful than the other.

### *Japanese Culture and Parenting*

In this part of the literature review, brief introductions to the Japanese culture and its unique self construal will be presented. They will be followed by descriptions of the Japanese parent-child relationship and parenting goals as they reflect the uniqueness of the Japanese culture and its self construal.

#### *Cultural Context*

Despite its modernization and many visible evidences of Western influence, the Japanese culture is still typically described as a collectivistic, group-oriented culture (Triandis, 1989; Markus & Kitayama, 1991). In fact, many researchers find Japan as an attractive subject of study because Japan is comparable to the U.S. with regard to its degrees of industrialization and economic development, yet it seems to hold traditional core values that are strikingly different from those of Western cultures (Azuma, 1986; Conroy et al., 1980; Olson et al., 2001; Shigaki, 1983; Yamada, 2004; Shimizu & LeVine, 2001). Compared to the American culture, which is generally perceived as individualistic, the Japanese culture is observed to have more emphasis on the creation and maintenance of relationships and group harmony. In Rothbaum, Pott, Azuma, Miyake, and Weisz's (2000) words, while the U.S. path of developing close relationships is that of "generative tension," which goes through "the lens of individuation," the Japanese path is that of "symbiotic harmony," which goes through the "lens of accommodation" (p. 1123). In Japan, where "the nail that sticks out will get hammered" (a traditional Japanese proverb), accommodation is key for fitting in and maintaining group harmony. According to Kojima

(1996), this emphasis on interpersonal harmony has been apparent in Japan since the middle of the 17<sup>th</sup> century. In addition, Confucianism emphasizes the importance of maintaining ethical human relationships and reinforces the traditional value of collectivism (Kojima, 1986).

According to Markus and Kitayama (1991, 1994), cultural differences between the U.S. and Japan result in two different construals of the self: the independent self and the interdependent self. They argue that, in collectivistic societies like Japan, “the self is viewed as interdependent with the surrounding context, and it is the ‘other’ or the ‘self-in-relation-to-other’ that is focal in individual experience” (Markus & Kitayama, 1991, p.225). While the American independent self is largely defined by its separation from others, the Japanese interdependent self is defined in terms of its connectedness with others. These two construals of the self play important roles in shaping our daily individual experiences, including cognition, emotion, and motivation (Markus & Kitayama, 1991, 1994; Cross & Madson, 1997; Dennis, Cole, Zahn-Waxler, & Mizuta, 2002). For instance, sympathy and subtle emotional expressions are highly valued in Japan (Lebra, 1976) as they contribute to the perpetuation of group harmony and thus the primary objective of the interdependent self. Furthermore, the Japanese emphasis on the development of the interdependent self is apparent in various aspects of Japanese parenting.

#### *Parent-Child Relationship*

The Japanese parent-child relationship is no exception in exemplifying goals of the interdependent self. Perhaps a concept that best illustrates this point is the notion of *amae*, introduced and elaborated by Takeo Doi (1973). The concept of *amae* has been frequently used to describe the Japanese mother-child relationship and represents their sense of oneness (Doi, 1973). It is thought to closely resemble the Western concept of dependency. However, there is a slight difference between the two because *amae* represents “the tendency of the self to merge

with the self of others” while dependency characterizes “the tendency of a separate individual to depend on other persons” (Verejken, Riksen-Walraven, & Van Lieshout, 1997, p. 445). Vogel (1963) and Lebra (1976), early researchers of Japanese socialization, observed the physical and psychological closeness between Japanese mother and child, which signified their sense of oneness. In particular, Lebra (1976) described how the interdependent relationship between mother and child was demonstrated by traditional practices such as cobathing, cosleeping, and constantly carrying a child on one’s back.

According to Doi (1973), this closeness and sense of oneness fostered by *amae* are essential for one’s healthy spiritual life in Japan. Consistent with this argument, Hara and Wagatsuma (1974) stated that knowing when, how, and to whom to express *amae* or not to express *amae* is a sign of maturity in Japan, although the Western cultures generally associate maturity with being independent and immaturity with being dependent. Furthermore, Mizuta, Zahn-Waxler, Cole, and Hiruma (1996) empirically showed that children’s *amae* behavior (e.g., desire for bodily closeness) was not simply more common in Japan, but also positively linked to children’s internalizing symptoms only in the U.S., not in Japan. These studies suggest that *amae*, which characterizes the Japanese mother-child relationship, is also a crucial, desirable quality for the development of the interdependent self.

### *Parenting Goals*

In Japan, where the interdependent construal of self stresses social engagement as a central theme (Kitayama, Kirasawa, & Mesquita, 2004), teaching children to maintain harmonious relationships with others is one of the most important socialization goals for Japanese parents (Ujiie, 1997; Yamada, 2004; White & LeVine, 1986). Particularly, many researchers have observed Japanese mothers as being greatly concerned about their children

causing trouble to others (Conroy et al., 1980; Hendry, 1986; Lanham & Garrick, 1996; Rothbaum, et al., 2000; Ujjie, 1997; White & LeVine, 1986). For example, Japanese mothers reported that a lack of social sensitivity would be the most undesirable child characteristic (Olson et al., 2001). In addition, Japanese mothers listed trouble to others as one of the top two criteria they use in deciding to grant their children discretion in making personal decisions (Yamada, 2004).

While trouble to others is a highly negative characteristic, empathy (or *omoiyari* in Japanese) is viewed as extremely important by Japanese parents. *Omoi-yari* is defined by Lebra (1973) as “the ability and willingness to feel what others are feeling, to vicariously experience the pleasure and pain that they are undergoing, and to help them satisfy their wishes” (p. 38). Befu (1986) and Vogel (1963) observed that Japanese parents place a greater emphasis on training consideration for others than U.S. parents. The concept of *omoiyari* is emphasized not only by Japanese parents but also in schools. Tobin, Wu, and Davidson (1989) interviewed preschool teachers and administrators from Japan, China, and the U.S. and asked, “What are the most important things for children to learn in preschool?” (p. 190). 31% of Japanese respondents listed sympathy, empathy, and concern for others as their first choice, in comparison to only 4% of Chinese and 5% of Americans.

Although the Chinese culture is regarded as collectivistic like the Japanese culture, they differ from each other to a certain extent, especially regarding their degrees of emphasis on empathic skills. While the two cultures commonly value successful communication between two people, they also have somewhat contrasting expectations concerning who is responsible for it to take place. In China, it is generally a speaker’s responsibility to send a coherent, clear message and to be well understood. In Japan, on the other hand, successful communication largely relies

on “the empathic and intuitive abilities of the listener” (Tobin et al., 1989, p. 190), and the listener is expected to make sense out of the message being sent (Lebra, 1976; Nagashima, 1973). In other words, it is particularly crucial for a Japanese person to acquire the empathic skills and become sensitive to others’ thoughts, feelings, and views (Nagashima, 1973). This is why teaching of empathy, or *omoiyari*, is considered to be one of the most important parenting goals in Japan.

### *Parenting Styles in Japan*

This last part of the literature review deals with how Baumrind’s three parenting styles (authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive) and psychological control may exist in the context of the Japanese culture. There are a small number of studies that have attempted to describe Japanese parenting in terms of parenting styles. For instance, in his influential book, *Japan: An Anthropological Introduction*, Befu (1971) stated, “Socialization techniques used by Japanese parents tend to involve less authoritarianism and direct punishment” (p. 156). Although he mentions the word authoritarianism, Befu is not specifically referring to Baumrind’s typology of authoritarian parenting. In addition, Befu’s approach is primarily anthropological and does not include quantitative data.

More recently, Lanham and Garrick (1996) stated, “A statistical study by Conroy, Hess, Azuma, and Kashiwagi (1980) confirmed that American mothers are considerably more authoritarian with their children than are the Japanese (p.113). Conroy et al. (1980), however, do not directly mention the word authoritarian in their study. Their main focus was to examine different control strategies by asking mothers to respond to specific hypothetical situations. They found that U.S. mothers are more likely than Japanese mothers to appeal to authority as their control strategies. Although this parenting *practice* of appealing to authority might be

reflective of authoritarian parenting, it is not an equivalent of the authoritarian parenting *style*. As discussed earlier, while parenting practices represent “particular efforts that parents undertake to accomplish specific goal-oriented tasks with children” (Hart, Newell et al., 2003, p. 762), parenting styles are “aggregates or constellations of behaviors that describe parent-child interactions over a wide range of situations” (Mize & Pettit, 1997, p. 312). Based on these conceptualizations, Conroy et al.’s (1980) findings are relevant to parenting practices rather than overall parenting styles of Japanese mothers. Thus, little is still known about overall parenting styles of Japanese parents.

In the following sections, each parenting style is discussed in terms of its specific dimensions. It is important to note that most studies cited focus on particular stylistic dimensions or certain parenting practices observed among Japanese parents. Their findings are informative but should not be hastily interpreted as descriptions of overall parenting styles. Rather, they are detailed description of parenting practices in Japan. No systematic research has examined overall parenting styles in a single investigation.

#### *Authoritative Parenting in Japan*

Based on past research, all three dimensions of authoritative parenting (connection, regulation, and autonomy granting) seem to exist in the context of Japanese culture.

*Connection.* First, the existence of the connection dimension in Japan is supported by Doi’s (1973) well-accepted notion of the Japanese *amae* relationship. As explained earlier, Japanese mothers tend to stress interpersonal intimacy and their close emotional ties with their children (Conroy et al., 1980; Doi, 1973; Lebra, 1976; Ujiie, 1997). On the other hand, this seems to contradict with another research finding that Japanese mothers are less affectionate toward their children than are U.S. mothers (Mizuta, Zahn-Waxler, Cole, & Hiruma, 1996;

Power et al., 1992). As Power et al. (1992) point out, however, emotional expression should not be confused with emotional closeness. Although Japanese mothers may not express their love in overt, explicit ways like American mothers, this should not be interpreted as Japanese mothers being less loving or warm.

It seems important to note here that whereas parental control has been studied with regard to its qualitative as well as quantitative differences (Darling & Steinberg, 1903), the love/connection dimension has mainly been examined in terms of its quantitative differences (i.e., differences in the *degrees* of love shown to children, rather than in the *types* of love). However, it appears important to study different types of parental affection, especially in understanding the ways through which Japanese and U.S. mothers express their love to their children. In their study on cultural differences in the meaning and expression of intimacy, Seki, Matsumoto, and Imahori (2002) observed, “Toward mothers and fathers, Japanese conceptualized intimacy through psychological feelings such as ‘appreciation,’ ‘understanding,’ ‘ease,’ and ‘bonds,’ more than the Americans, whereas the Americans expressed intimacy through manifested concepts such as ‘physical contact’ across all relationships” (p. 317). Although their study examined children’s affection toward their parents and not vice versa, it can be speculated that similar cultural differences will emerge for parents’ expression of intimacy toward their children. While Japanese parents are less emotionally expressive, their strong emotional bonds with their children are manifested in implicit, culturally embedded ways.

One way through which Japanese parents express love to their children is being sensitive and responsive (Hess, Kashiwagi, Azuma, Price, & Dickson, 1980). Miyake, Campos, Kagan, and Bradshaw (1986) observed that Japanese mothers’ relationships with young children were particularly responsive and supportive. In their study of Japanese and German toddlers’

emotional regulation, Friedlmeier, and Trommsdorff (1999) found that Japanese mothers displayed more sensitive behaviors toward their daughters than did German mothers. Moreover, Dennis, Cole, Zahn-Waxler, and Mizuta (2002) observed Japanese and U.S. mothers' interactions with their children during free play and waiting tasks and found that Japanese mothers had more conversations that emphasized shared experiences than did U.S. mothers. These findings show that Japanese mothers tend to express their love by interacting with their children in responsive, sensitive manners.

*Regulation.* The second dimension of authoritative parenting is parental regulation. Whereas Japanese mothers do not typically use power-assertive methods (Lanham & Garrick, 1996), they have been observed to use explaining and reasoning in gaining child compliance (Conroy et al., 1980; Hendry, 1986), in dealing with their children's assertions (Ujiie, 1997), and in situations of conflict and disagreement (Yamada, 2004). Japanese mothers' specific reasoning strategies have been described by several researchers. According to Azuma et al. (1981), U.S. mothers and Japanese mothers generally focus on different topics while talking over problems with their children. Whereas U.S. mothers have a tendency to communicate the problem itself, Japanese mothers tend to emphasize the problem's implications and surrounding situations, such as the experiences and emotional states of others who are involved in the problem (Azuma et al., 1981). This is consistent with another finding that many Japanese mothers attempt to regulate their children's behaviors by discussing the consequences of their misdeeds rather than simply tackling the misbehaviors (Azuma, 1994). In addition, the use of naïve questions was identified by Lewis (1986) as a form of discipline used by Japanese preschool teachers. This technique also seems to be commonly used among Japanese mothers. Indeed, Kobayashi (2001) analyzed Japanese mothers' speech patterns and found that "the repetition of less explicit directive such as

suggestion, hint, and questions” were employed by the mothers as an effective “method of patient persuasion” (p.128).

One anticipated outcome of this reasoning process is children’s internalization of parental norms and standards. Japanese parents tend to favor internal control over external control (Conroy et al., 1980; Hendry, 1986; Hess et al., 1986; Kojima, 1986). By seeking to “awaken in a child awareness of the potentially negative consequences of behavior” (De Vos, 1996, p. 61-62) through reasoning, Japanese mothers promote internalization of parental expectations. In fact, Lewis (1984) points out, “Recent psychological research suggests that children are most likely to internalize rules when they receive the least external pressure in the course of obeying these rules” (p. 72). It has been observed that Japanese mothers on average use fewer rules (Power et al., 1981) and are less strict about enforcing the rules than U.S. mothers (Lewis, 1984). By placing less emphasis on external control, Japanese mothers help their children internalize parental rules and values and thus behave well for their own, self-motivated reasons (Hess et al., 1986; Lanhan & Garrick, 1996).

*Autonomy granting.* Autonomy granting is the third dimension of authoritative parenting. Although some may view autonomy as a conflicting concept with the group-oriented focus of collectivistic cultures, it is evident that Japanese mothers are indeed concerned about fostering their children’s autonomy (Ujiie, 1997; Yamada, 2004; White & LeVine, 1986). In her classic anthropological account, Benedict (1946/1989) called Japanese childhood a “free area,” stating that “the arc of life in Japan is a great shallow U-curve with maximum freedom and indulgence allowed to babies and the old” while “in the United States we stand this curve upside down,” maximizing freedom during the prime of life (p. 254). In fact, compared to U.S. mothers, Japanese mothers expect their children to follow fewer rules (Power et al., 1981). Moreover, in

his study on how Japanese mothers treat their children's negativism, Ujiie (1997) found that a majority of the mothers interviewed felt that children's self-assertion and negativism were not only normal but also essential for their development of autonomy. Japanese children's autonomy is facilitated as long as it can coincide with the maintenance of social harmony (Yamada, 2004).

This Japanese emphasis on child autonomy seems to be rooted in their emphasis on another important concept: instrumental independence (e.g., taking care of self). While Japanese mothers do not emphasize emotional independence, they expect and encourage children's development of self-reliance (Conroy, 1980). In addition, it has been observed that Japanese mothers have a tendency to expect their preschool-age children to achieve instrumental independence at an earlier age than do U.S. mothers (Hess et al., 1980). In order to foster children's instrumental independence, Japanese mothers allow their children to make decisions regarding personal issues like recreational activities, clothes, and friends (Yamada, 2004). These findings can be summarized in the following words of Osterweil and Nagano (1991): "Japanese socialization may be viewed as encouraging emotional dependence while at the same time fostering instrumental independence" (p. 364).

While child autonomy is certainly emphasized in terms of instrumental independence, several researchers further argue that the development of self is also valued in Japan. As pointed out by Miller (2002), "the claim that collectivism entails the subordination of the self assumes an inherent opposition as existing between the desires of the individual and social requirements" (p. 101). Miller (2002) argues that the underlying assumption of the "group vs. individual" dichotomy is fundamentally influenced by the Western worldview and should not be assumed in understanding other cultures. In line with Miller's (2002) argument, White and LeVine (1986) state that in Japanese culture, "no conflict exists between goals of self-fulfillment and goals of

social integration” (p. 57). In addition, Sato (1996) conducted an ethnographic study of a fifth-grade classroom in Tokyo and concluded that individual and group aspects are not opposing, but complementary features of the Japanese teaching-learning process. In other words, “cooperation does not suggest giving up the self, as it may in the West; it implies that working with others is the appropriate way of expressing and enhancing the self” (White & LeVine, 1986, p. 58). Furthermore, Hendry (1986) explains that “co-operation...far from denying the development of personhood, actually implies autonomy” because “self-awareness” is a means for achieving “the understanding of others” and “self-knowledge” is crucial for “maintaining harmonious social relations” (p. 172).

#### *Authoritarian Parenting in Japan*

Whereas all three dimensions of authoritative parenting seem to be present in the Japanese culture, there are inconsistent findings regarding the existence of the three authoritarian parenting dimensions: physical punishment, verbal hostility, and nonreasoning/punitive strategies.

*Physical punishment.* In terms of corporal punishment, many researchers have indicated that it is rarely used in Japan. For example, Shibazaki and Anzai (2005) discuss how Japanese childrearing was viewed and recorded by early Christian missionaries in Japan. One Portuguese missionary, who came to Japan during the late 16<sup>th</sup> century, reported how surprised he was to see parents rarely spanking their children (Shibazaki & Anzai, 2005). In addition, Vogel (1963) observed that Japanese mothers hardly ever hit or spank their children for misbehaving. In more recent decades, Lanham and Garrick (1996) also described how seldom coercion and punishment are used with smaller children in Japan.

Japanese parents' disinclination toward physical punishment has been explained in light of their preference for internal control versus external control. It has been observed that Japanese mothers were less likely than U.S. mothers to employ external control such as physical punishment (Conroy et al., 1980; Kobayashi-Winata, & Power, 1989; Vogel, 1963) but more likely to promote their children's internalization of parental desires through reasoning (Conroy et al., 1980; Hendry, 1986). In addition, Kojima (1986) points out that no external force was used to control learners' behaviors even before the Meiji period (1868-1912) because "children were viewed as autonomously learning beings, very difficult to control completely from the outside" (p. 45).

While these findings depict Japanese parents' general reluctance for physical punishment, several other studies suggest that physical punishment is used in two particular circumstances. The first is when there is direct confrontation toward parental authority. For instance, Yamada (2004) observed that when Japanese mothers were in conflict with their children, they were more likely to use power-assertive techniques including physical punishment than when they were in disagreement with their children. Similarly, it was found that the forceful disciplinary strategies including physical punishment were often reserved by Japanese mothers for the most serious situations when their children openly confronted with their parental authority by being particularly defiant or lying to them (Power, Kobayashi-Winata, & Kelley, 1992).

The second circumstance is when Japanese mothers get too upset to employ rational socialization practices. For example, Vogel (1963) observed mothers who sometimes get angry at their children and engage in spanking, although they do not attempt to justify their blowups and therefore, feel bad afterward. According to Vogel (1963), mothers are "more likely to feel that their anger represents failure on their part than that it teaches the child a lesson" (Vogel,

1963, p. 250). In addition, Ujiie (1997) found that over 70% of the mothers he had interviewed reported the use of power-assertive control, including physical punishment. Many of them explained that their attempts to stay calm and reason with their children failed and that they became too emotional to restrain themselves.

*Verbal hostility.* In addition to physical coercion, there are also conflicting findings for Japanese mothers' verbal hostility, another authoritarian dimension. As discussed earlier, external control is considered less desirable than internal control in Japan, and consequently, Japanese mothers are less likely to employ power-assertive control than U.S. mothers (Lanham & Garrick, 1996). With regard to verbal hostility, Vogel (1963) observed that Japanese mothers seldom yell at or criticize their children. Kojima (1986) also provides an interesting observation based on the writings on childrearing during the middle of the 17<sup>th</sup> century, when childrearing theories and methods first became accessible to the general public in Japan. Most Japanese writers during the time period recommended "mildness in the direct verbal teaching of children" and encouraged adults to avoid "abusive language or the show of anger or impatience" (Kojima, 1986, p. 45). It was feared that such emotionally charged behaviors would eventually result in children's resentment toward parental authority.

By contrast, several more recent studies found that Japanese mothers in fact engage in verbal hostility. According to Kobayashi-Winata and Power (1989), while Japanese parents are less likely than U.S. mothers to use physical punishment and certain other forms of external punishment, they are more likely to repeat commands and scold at their children. Likewise, in Power et al.'s (1992) study, Japanese mothers were found to be more likely to yell at their children than U.S. mothers. Similar to physical punishment, verbal hostility is used by Japanese mothers particularly when they are confronted with their children's negativism and become

emotionally upset (Ujiiie, 1997). When negative emotions are provoked by children, such strong emotions can arouse Japanese mothers into more irrational, less desirable control strategies.

*Non-reasoning/punitive.* With regard to the non-reasoning/punitive dimension of authoritarian parenting, there are also inconsistent findings. As described earlier in the discussion of authoritative parenting in Japan, Japanese parents are generally more likely to use reasoning and persuasion than are U.S. mothers (Conroy et al., 1980; Hendry, 1986; Ujiiie, 1997; Yamada, 2004). On the other hand, there is a parenting practice commonly used among Japanese parents that somewhat resembles non-reasoning. This socialization practice is called *wakaraseru* (getting child to understand) (Azuma, 1994; Lanham & Garrick, 1996; White & LeVine, 1986; Vogel, 1963). Like directiveness, the practice of *wakaraseru* is also founded upon the parent-child *amae* relationship, their sense of oneness. More specifically, the *wakaraseru* practice reflects Japanese mothers' expectations for their children to intuitively understand their thoughts and expectations (Azuma, 1994). In fact, approximately two-thirds of the mothers observed in Ujiiie's (1997) study expected that their children would come to understand the mothers' feelings and anticipations. According to Vogel's (1963) observation, "with a good relationship, [a mother] need only indicate the desired behavior and add with a tone of encouragement, *wakaru ne?* (You understand, don't you?). If the child co-operates, he is said to understand" (p. 245). The internal dynamics of *wakaraseru* differ from that of authoritarian non-reasoning because *wakaraseru* is typically used when coupled with the close parent-child relationship while this is not the case for non-reasoning. Nonetheless, when observed externally, this seems to resemble non-reasoning (due to the lack of explicit verbal communication) and may give the impression that Japanese parents do not actively reason with their children.

*Permissive Parenting in Japan*

Past research has often described Japanese parents as permissive (Azuma, 1986; Benedict, 1946/1989; Bradshaw et al., 1991; Kobayashi, 2001; Lanham & Garrick, 1996; Lewis, 1986; Vogel, 1963; Yamada, 2004). As noted earlier, childhood was described by Benedict (1946/1989) as a “free area” where “maximum freedom and indulgence [is] allowed” (p. 254). Consistent with Benedict’s (1946/1989) early observation, Ujiie (1997) noted that approximately half of the Japanese mothers he observed were permissive toward their children’s assertions and resistance. Likewise, it is observed that Japanese mothers often accept their children’s resistance rather than confronting it (Yamada, 2004). In addition, Osterweil and Nagano (1991) described how Japanese mothers did not mind a certain amount of disobedience, and Bradshaw et al. (1991) found that Japanese mothers were more tolerant of some forms of child protest than American mothers. Moreover, a tendency to tolerate children’s negative behaviors was also observed in Japanese preschool settings (Tobin et al., 1989).

This Japanese permissiveness toward children may be explained by the Japanese traditional view of childhood (Hendry, 1986; Kojima, 1986; Yamamura, 1986). Traditionally, children are thought as virtuous (Lanham & Garrick, 1996), the embodiment of purity (Yamamura, 1986), favors from the gods (Hendry, 1986), and innately good (Kojima, 1986). There was no doctrine of original sin. In contrast to the “innately evil” view of children, which may lead to harsh parenting, the “innately good” view often encourages permissive parenting (Hart, Newell et al., 2000). In fact, a traditional Japanese saying, “the first six years are in the hands of gods,” has several different implications for permissive parenting. The first is that children possess a divine nature (Yamamura, 1986) and should be treated as such with great respect. Secondly, the saying also implies the instability of children’s lives during the first six years, the period of time when they are still not completely settled in the world. Based on this

interpretation, appropriate care and attention need to be given to them so that they will not go back to the other world (Hara & Wagatsuma, 1974; Azuma, 1986). The last implication is that children are pure and their wrongdoings simply mean that they have not learned right from wrong (Lanham & Garrick, 1996). This interpretation is in harmony with another traditional notion that children do not reach the age of understanding until they are seven years old (Hara & Wagatsuma, 1974; Ujiie, 1997). According to this view, children's misbehaviors should be overlooked until they reach the age of understanding. Thus, parents may ignore their young children's misbehaviors to a certain extent.

### *Psychological Control in Japan*

Out of several components of psychological control previously examined by various scholars (e.g., constraining verbal expressions, invalidating feelings, personal attacks on children), shaming and directiveness seem to be two constructs that are most relevant to Japanese parenting. While Japanese parenting has not been examined in terms of Barber's (1996) framework of psychological control, others have described Japanese parents' use of shaming and directiveness as reflective of the Japanese emphasis on interdependent self construal. Therefore, in the following sections, the psychological control constructs of shaming and directiveness will be described in detail.

*Shaming.* Shaming is a parenting practice of regulating children's behavior by making them feel guilty, embarrassed, or ashamed. Many researchers of Japanese parenting have identified this feeling-oriented practice as one of the unique parenting strategies used in Japan (e.g., Conroy et al., 1980; Hess et al., 1980; Lebra, 1976; Osterweil & Nagano, 1991; Zahn-Waxler, Friedman, Cole, Mizuta, & Hiruta, 1996). For instance, Conroy et al. (1980) found that compared to U.S. mothers, Japanese mothers were less likely to employ power assertive

strategies, such as verbal abuse or withdrawal of privileges, or to appeal to their authority in order to control children's behavior. Instead, they were more likely to appeal to children's feelings and rely on personal, internally-oriented appeals. Likewise, Zahn-Waxler et al. (1996) observed that Japanese mothers were more likely than U.S. mothers to use guilt and anxiety induction, stressing the consequences of social disapproval.

More specifically, it has been observed that Japanese mothers have a tendency to utilize their children's empathy (*omoiyari*) skills and control children by focusing their attention to the impacts of their behaviors on (a) the mothers' feelings, (b) those of others, and (c) inanimate objects (Hess et al., 1980). According to Lebra (1976), a Japanese mother often appeals for her child's empathy by presenting herself as a victim of the child's misbehavior. Rather than ridiculing the child directly, the mother may tell the child how others will ridicule, laugh at, and embarrass her for the child's misconduct. This highlights the emotional bond between the mother and child rather than their interpersonal conflict and portrays the picture of the mother being allied with the child against the outside world (Lebra, 1976; Vogel, 1963).

In addition, when Japanese mothers communicate disappointment of their children's behaviors, it carries a powerful message especially in the context of the *amae* culture (Azuma, 1986; Azuma, Kashiwagi, & Hess, 1981). To illustrate this point, Azuma (1986) shares the following example:

Consider the case of a young child who stubbornly refuses to eat a helping of vegetables. After several attempts to make the child eat, Japanese mothers will often say, "All right, then, you don't have to eat it" . . . . The assertion, "You don't have to obey me," was actually a very powerful threat. One mother said that it always worked. It carried the message: "We have been close together. But now that you want to have your own way, I

will untie the bond between us. I will not care what you do. You are not part of me any longer.” This message was effective because the child had assimilated the *amae* culture in which interpersonal dependence is the key. (p. 4).

By saying, “All right, then, you don’t have to eat,” the mother is *not* giving *in*, but implies that she is giving *up* on the child. Vogel (1963) similarly observed that Japanese mothers at times make vague threats of abandoning their children if they are uncooperative. In Japan, where “ostracism is more dreaded than violence” (Benedict, 1947/1989, p. 288), these signs of maternal disappointment frighten children that their bonds to mothers are in jeopardy and thus appeal to their feelings to a great extent.

Moreover, as suggested by Hess et al. (1980), Japanese mothers often stress the impacts of their children’s misbehaviors on others’ feelings. For example, they may suggest, “The farmers who raised the vegetables will be disappointed,” when children refuse to eat vegetables (Azuma, 2001, p. 36). A similar strategy can be used when describing the “feelings” of inanimate objects. For instance, children who do not want to eat carrots may be told, “Poor Mr. Carrot! You ate Mr. Hamburger and Mr. Rice, but you haven’t eaten any of Mr. Carrot. Don’t you think he feels sad!” (Tobin, 1995, p.235) These statements are quite effective in appealing to the feelings of Japanese children, who have been trained to develop the attribute of *omoiyari* (empathy), “the ability and willingness to feel what others are feeling, to vicariously experience the pleasure and pain that they are undergoing, and to help them satisfy their wishes” (Lebra, 1973, p. 38)

While the practice of shaming is also commonly used by other Eastern Asian groups, such as Chinese parents (Fung, 1999; Ho, 1986; Nelson, Hart, Wu, Yang, & Olsen, 2006; Olsen et al., 2002; Tseng & Wu, 1985; Wu et al., 2002), it has been suggested that there is a unique,

historical root for the Japanese concept of shame. For example, Ikegami (2003) provides a historical account of the development of the Japanese concept of shame and how it is linked to the rise and transformation of the samurai elite culture. According to Ikegami (2003), it was critical for samurai to conduct constant, internal evaluations of their manners and performances based on behavioral principles approved by their group. Such internal evaluations led them to maintain a proper sense of dignity and pride. Ikegami (2003) states, “A sense of shame was a criterion of honorific autonomy and trustworthiness of individual samurai as well as the inner source of their self-esteem” (p. 1351). From the Western viewpoint, the use of “others’ eye” as a moral authority may imply individuals being controlled by the external authority of moral judgment (Heller, 2003); however, this was not the case in samurai society. For samurai, the “others’ eye” was part of their core inner-self, instead of an external authority. Therefore, a sense of shame was what granted samurai a sense of control and honorific autonomy.

Although Western research typically regards shaming as harmful for children’s psychological autonomy (e.g. Barber, 1996, 2002), Mesquita and Karasawa (2002) emphasize that shame is in fact harmonious with the goals of the interdependent self. In the U.S., one of the important goals of parenting is to help children develop a healthy concept of the independent self. Consequently, shaming is viewed as a form of parental psychological control, which prohibits children psychological autonomy and is harmful to their individuation (Barber, 1996). In fact, Barber and Harmon (2002) state that psychological control seems to lead to disturbances “in the development of an independent sense of self and identity” (p. 15). On the other hand, it has been suggested that shaming might play a more positive role in Japanese parenting, where “the development of an independent sense of self” is not a traditionally valued goal. Mascolo, Fischer, and Li (2003) argue that shame in East Asian cultures is “not primarily a threat to self-

esteem” as it is in Western cultures (p. 395). Instead, shame is thought to be “a vehicle for social cohesion and the development of self” (Mascolo et al., 2003, p. 395). Similarly, Mesquita and Karasawa (2002) also state that “shame in East Asian cultures is... an emotion of hope, rather than one of ultimate failure” (p. 164).

*Directiveness.* The second psychological control construct examined in this study is directiveness. In Wu et al.’s (2002) study of Chinese parenting, directiveness was defined by “taking a major responsibility in regulating children’s behaviour and academic performance” (p. 483). According to their conceptualization, directiveness is somewhat similar to Chao’s (1994, 2001) concept of training, which was observed among immigrant Chinese, but it also differs because of its focus on “ways that mainland Chinese mothers correct young children’s behaviour” (Wu et al., 2002, p. 483). Chinese mothers have been described as restrictive or controlling (Chiu, 1987; Kriger & Kroes, 1972; Lin & Fu, 1990), as well as having been observed to exercise control over their children by scolding and criticizing (Wu, 1996). Based on these findings, it seems no surprise that Chinese parents score higher on directiveness items than U.S. mothers (Wu et al., 2002).

Descriptions of Japanese parenting, however, pose a paradox (Benedict, 1946/1989; Kobayashi, 2001; Vogel, 1963). Unlike Chinese parents, Japanese parents have been generally described as permissive as explained earlier (Azuma, 1986; Benedict, 1946/1989; Bradshaw, Usui, Miyake, Campos, & Campos, 1991; Lanham & Garrick, 1996; Lewis, 1986; Vogel, 1963; Yamada, 2004). For instance, Japanese mothers have been observed to overlook a certain amount of child disobedience (Osterweil & Nagano, 1991) and to be more tolerant of some forms of child protest than were American mothers (Bradshaw et al., 1991). Despite the fact that Japanese mothers are often characterized as permissive, there are also indications which suggest

that they are directive. For example, Azuma et al. (1981) observed mothers' interaction patterns with their children in free-play settings and found that Japanese mothers were more likely to intervene and direct their children than U.S. mothers. According to Rice (2001), Japanese mothers' devotion and commitment to their children are reflected in a Japanese term, "*kosodate mama*" (childrearing mother). In fact, many *kosodate mama* are so devoted to their children that they may come to view their children as their own personal property (Kumagai, 1995). In addition, Japanese children have been typically described as well-regulated, and polite (Benedict, 1946/1989; Kobayashi, 2001; Vogel, 1963), suggesting that Japanese mothers somehow regulate their children's behavior. In fact, Bradshaw et al. (1991) observed that Japanese children were not markedly less compliant than American children.

Thus, this puzzling coexistence of permissiveness and directiveness in Japanese parenting has presented a paradox for many researchers (e.g. Benedict, 1946/1989; Kobayashi, 2001; Vogel, 1963). While it is unknown whether or not Japanese permissiveness is empirically linked to directiveness, the two seemingly opposing constructs certainly appear to coexist in Japan. The key for solving the paradox is our understanding of the *amae* concept and the interdependent self construal. In the context of the *amae* culture, permissiveness and indulgence go hand-in-hand with directiveness (Azuma, 1986). More specifically, the mother-child *amae* relationship, which reflects their sense of oneness, has two implications for the use of directiveness. The first is that because Japanese mothers view their children as an extension of themselves, the mothers feel that they know what is best for their children (Caudill, 1971) and try to direct their children. The other implication is that children also perceive themselves as an extension of their mothers and develop what Azuma (1982) calls "educability via dependency" (p. 166). According to Azuma (1986), "the feeling of interdependence helps the child assimilate the hopes and values of the

parents, thus enhancing the child's educability" (p. 8). Through the interdependent relationship, Japanese children become sensitive to their mothers' subtle emotions and able to tell what is expected of them without being told explicitly (Azuma, 1982). Furthermore, the *amae* relationship helps the children to internalize the mothers' expectations and automatically go along with their suggestions (Vogel, 1963). In other words, indulgent Japanese mothers are not spoiling their children per se, but they are actually making preparation to subtly direct their children's behaviors by fostering the close *amae* relationship (Hendry, 1986; Hess et al., 1980, Kobayashi, 2001). This subtle strategy is widely used in Japan perhaps because of the Japanese tendency to favor internalization over external control (Conroy et al., 1980; Hendry, 1986; Hess et al., 1986; Kojima, 1986).

### *Hypotheses*

As stated in the introduction, the purpose of this study is to examine whether or not Western parenting styles (authoritative, authoritarian, permissive, and psychological control) can be measured in the context of the Japanese culture. Furthermore, rather than focusing merely on parenting styles, this study attempts to measure parenting practice dimensions that often comprise styles of parent-child interaction (e.g., connection, regulation, physical coercion). As suggested by Darling and Steinberg (1993) and Robinson et al. (1995), it is important to investigate parenting practice dimensions within typologies because they are often uniquely linked to specific child outcomes. Although this investigation does not examine the linkages between parenting dimensions and child outcomes, a better understanding of parenting styles and their dimensions in the Japanese cultural context will provide an important framework for examining associated child development outcomes in future studies.

The objective of this study is especially valuable because no research has been conducted in Japan that defines and unpacks dimensions of authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive parenting, as well as psychological control constructs in a single investigation. It remains to be seen if these constructs can be empirically measured in the context of one another and statistically delineated in ways that are conceptualized in this investigation. Advanced factor analytic techniques will be utilized to help assess the construct validity of these parenting dimensions.

Although they may have cultural-specific meanings and implications, it is hypothesized that parenting styles (authoritative, authoritarian, permissive, and psychological control) and their dimensions (e.g., connection, regulation, physical coercion) can be empirically identified in Japan. As described in our review of the literature, the dimensions of authoritative parenting (connection, regulation, autonomy granting) are evident in the Japanese culture. It has been observed that Japanese parents communicate love through responsiveness (Hess et al., 1986) and often engage in reasoning with children (Conroy et al., 1980). Many Japanese mothers also believe that autonomy and self-awareness are important means for understanding others and knowing how to maintain harmonious interpersonal relationships (Hendry, 1986).

While there are somewhat inconsistent findings regarding the existence of the authoritarian dimensions (physical punishment, verbal hostility, and non-reasoning), there are still some indications that they are present in Japanese parenting. Although it has been said that Japanese parents rarely display power-assertive behaviors such as physical punishment and verbal hostility (Lanham and Garrick, 1996), some scholars (Vogel, 1963; Yamada, 2004) point out that Japanese parents engage in power-assertive behavior in certain circumstances. Moreover, Japanese parents who engage in the reasoning process may not explicitly explain

reasons for rules and consequences because of their expectations for their children to intuitively understand their thoughts and expectations (Vogel, 1963).

In addition, Japanese mothers' permissiveness has been observed by various researchers (e.g., Azume, 1986; Benedict, 1946/1989; Bradshaw et al., 1991), providing evidence for the existence of permissive parenting in Japan. Lastly, it is expected that the two psychological constructs, shaming and directiveness, can be identified in Japan because the literature on Japanese socialization suggests that these dimensional practices are widely used by Japanese parents (Azuma, 1986; Conroy et al., 1980).

### Chapter III

#### Method

##### *Participants*

The participants in this study were 214 Japanese mothers of preschool-age children (101 boys and 113 girls) from several preschools in Kushiro-city, Japan. Kushiro-city is located on the east coast of Hokkaido, the northernmost prefecture and second largest island in Japan. Kushiro-city is famous for its fishing port, with a population of approximately 190,000. In our sample, mothers' ages ranged from 22 to 47 years ( $M = 34.1$  years,  $SD = 4.3$  years). Their average amount of education was 12.6 years ( $SD = 1.6$  years). Family size ranged from one to four children ( $M = 2.0$ ,  $SD = 0.8$ ), and about 88 % of the mothers from the sample were homemakers. Children's ages ranged from 39 to 81 months ( $M = 63.9$  months,  $SD = 8.2$  months).

##### *Procedures*

After informed consent was obtained, questionnaires were given to the mothers along with instructions on how to complete them. In addition to filling out their demographic information, the mothers were asked to rate themselves on the parenting items described below. The questionnaires were collected by researchers about a week later.

##### *Measures*

Parent questionnaires were forward- and back- translated by Japanese linguists who were fluent in both English and Japanese. A Japanese version of the Parenting Styles and Dimensions Questionnaires (PSDQ, Robinson, Mandleco, Olsen, & Hart, 2001) was completed by the mothers. Thirty-four items were selected that appeared to best fit the conceptualizations of

authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive parenting in Japan as described in the literature review.

For authoritative parenting, 8 items represented connection (e.g., responsive to our child's feelings and needs, have warm and intimate times with our child), 5 items represented regulation (e.g., talk it over and reason with our child when he/she misbehaves, explain the consequences of our child's behavior), 5 items represented autonomy granting (e.g., show respect for our child's opinions by encouraging him/her to express them, allow our child to give input into family rules).

For authoritarian parenting, 5 items represented physical coercion (e.g., spank when our child is disobedient, grab our child when being disobedient), 3 items represented verbal hostility (e.g., yell or shout when our child misbehaves, explode in anger towards our child), and 4 items represented non-reasoning/punitive (punish by taking privileges away from our child with little if any explanations, punish our child by putting him/her off somewhere with little explanation).

For permissive parenting, 4 items represented ignoring misbehaviors (e.g., allow our child to interrupt others, allow our child to annoy someone else). Mothers rated themselves on each item by assessing "how often they perceived themselves exhibiting parenting behaviors reflected in each item" using a 5-point scale anchored by 1 (never) and 5 (always).

In addition, items representing shaming and directiveness were selected from a 37-item psychological control questionnaire that was an adaptation of Barber's (1996) measure (Olsen et al., 2002). For psychological control, 6 items represented shaming (e.g., let our child know when he/she has disappointed me, tell our child that he/she should be ashamed when he/she misbehaves) and 6 items represented directiveness (e.g., tell our child how he/she should behave,

try to change our child). Instrument items were accompanied by a 5-point scale anchored by 1 (never) to 5 (always).

## Chapter IV

### Results

The statistical analyses for this study were conducted with the Mplus program. First, a series of two-group (boys and girls) Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) was carried out to test the measurement models of authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive parenting constructs and to establish measurement invariance across child gender. Second, the measurement of two psychological control constructs (shaming and directiveness) was similarly examined with a two-group CFA to identify latent variables that are invariant across boys and girls. Third, latent correlations of authoritative, authoritarian, permissive, and psychological parenting constructs were estimated by combining their measurement models so as to examine the relationships among the parenting constructs in the Japanese cultural context. Finally, gender differences in the means of the latent constructs were compared to examine how Japanese mothers' parenting may vary for boys and girls.

The Mplus program was chosen for these statistical analyses because our data were collected with Likert scales and were not normally distributed. The Mplus program uses polychoric correlations as data input rather than Pearson product-moment correlations and is able to treat skewed Likert scales as ordinal variables through categorical analysis (Muthén & Muthén, 2001). It has been argued that categorical analysis is more appropriate than continuous analysis when dealing with ordinal data because it takes into account the noninterval and nonlinear nature of ordinal data (Yang, Hart, Nelson, Porter, Olsen, & Robinson, 2004). Disregarding the unique nature of ordinal data can lead to distorted findings (Nelson, Hart, Yang et al., 2006). Especially in CFA, treating ordinal data as if it were interval can result in factor loadings that are “underestimated with the magnitude negatively related to number of categories

and degree of skewness and kurtosis (Yang et al., 2004, p. 196). Thus, given the nature of our skewed, ordinal data, categorical analyses were carried out with the Mplus program.

With regard to reliability of measurement, standardized factor loadings of .40 and above were used as indicators of acceptable reliability (Stevens, 1996). Unlike in exploratory factor analysis, coefficient  $\alpha$  is not generally reported in CFA as a measure of reliability because “latent variables are not multiple-item scales and  $\alpha$  values therefore cannot be calculated” (Nelson, Hart, Yang, et al., 2006, p. 560). Regarding model fit, goodness of fit were evaluated by using the following commonly used fit indices: (a) the  $\chi^2$  to degrees of freedom ratio, (b) the Bentler’s Comparative Fit Index (CFI), (values  $> .90$  indicate good fit), (c) the Tucker-Lewis index (values  $> .90$  indicate good fit), and (d) the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) (values  $< .08$  indicate acceptable fit). In addition, chi-square difference tests were used to evaluate the relative fit of competing models.

#### *Measurement Models of Authoritative, Authoritarian, and Permissive Parenting*

##### *Authoritative Parenting*

First, items representing an authoritative parenting style, which includes three latent constructs (connection, regulation, and autonomy granting), were subjected to a series of two-group (boys and girls) CFA. Our aim was to find a model with the best model fit by eliminating items that did not help in meeting at least partial invariance criteria (cf. Byrne, 1989; Tomada & Schneider, 1997). In addition, items with low standardized factor loadings ( $< .40$ , Stevens, 1996) were eliminated.<sup>1</sup> A 14-item, three-factor model of authoritative constructs emerged, which provided a fairly good fit to the data:  $\chi^2 = 105.571$ ,  $df = 74$ ,  $p < .01$ , CFI = .931, TLI = .945, RMSEA = .063.

Measurement invariance of the factor loadings was tested by comparing the unconstrained and constrained measurement models and examining their chi-square differences. A model without metric equality constraints (unconstrained) across boys and girls served as a baseline model. A model constraining the factor loadings to be equal across child genders provided a chi square that did not differ significantly from the baseline model,  $\chi^2_{\text{dif}} = 4.783$ ,  $df_{\text{dif}} = 10$ ,  $p = .9052$ . These results indicate that the items used to measure the authoritative constructs performed equivalently for boys and girls.

Within the three-factor authoritative model, however, the intercorrelation between regulation and autonomy granting was high:  $\phi = .876$  for boys and  $\phi = .918$  for girls. To test whether the two constructs were well distinguished in the model, a two-factor authoritative model combining the items from regulation and autonomy granting onto a single factor was compared to the three-factor baseline model (this chi-square difference test, as well as all the following chi-square difference tests in this study, was conducted for boys and girls together). The goodness of fit increased slightly,  $\chi^2 = 109.258$ ,  $df = 75$ ,  $p < .01$ , CFI = .925, TLI = .941, RMSEA = .065, and did not differ significantly from the three-factor model,  $\chi^2_{\text{dif}} = 9.423$ ,  $df_{\text{dif}} = 4$ ,  $p = .0511$ , indicating that the three-factor model was not a better fit of the data.

Similarly, the intercorrelation between connection and autonomy granting was high for boys ( $\phi = .894$ ), while it was relatively lower for girls ( $\phi = .595$ ). To test whether connection and autonomy granting were well distinguished in the authoritative model, a two-factor model combining the items from connection and autonomy granting onto a single factor was compared to the three-factor baseline model. The goodness of fit decreased,  $\chi^2 = 117.219$ ,  $df = 75$ ,  $p < .01$ , CFI = .907, TLI = .927, RMSEA = .073, and differed significantly from the original three-factor model,  $\chi^2_{\text{dif}} = 18.599$ ,  $df_{\text{dif}} = 5$ ,  $p < .01$ . These results indicate that the three-factor model was a

better fit of the data compared to the two-factor model combining connection and autonomy granting.

### *Authoritarian Parenting*

Second, a similar two-group CFA procedure was followed to identify authoritarian parenting constructs (verbal hostility, physical coercion, non-reasoning/punitive). Items that were not invariant across boys and girls and/or had low factor loadings ( $< .40$ ) were eliminated.<sup>2</sup> Verbal hostility and physical coercion merged into one factor (coercion) instead of two separate authoritarian dimensions. Consequently, a 9-item, two-factor model of authoritarian constructs (coercion and non-reasoning/punitive) emerged and provided a fairly good fit to the data:  $\chi^2 = 63.174$ ,  $df = 41$ ,  $p < .05$ , CFI = .954, TLI = .971, RMSEA = .071.

Measurement invariance of the factor loadings for authoritarian parenting was tested by examining the chi-square differences between the unconstrained and constrained models. The chi-square difference test showed that all the factor loadings were equivalent across child genders,  $\chi^2_{dif} = 6.761$ ,  $df_{dif} = 6$ ,  $p = .3433$ , suggesting that similar constructs of authoritarian parenting were identified for boys and girls.

The intercorrelation between coercion and non-reasoning/punitive within the two-factor authoritarian model was high:  $\phi = .830$  for boys and  $\phi = .745$  for girls. Thus, a one-factor model combining the items from the two dimensions was compared to the two-factor baseline model to see if the two latent constructs were well distinguished. The goodness of fit decreased slightly,  $\chi^2 = 65.672$ ,  $df = 43$ ,  $p < .05$ , CFI = .951, TLI = .970, RMSEA = .073, but did not differ significantly from the two-factor baseline model,  $\chi^2_{dif} = 5.328$ ,  $df_{dif} = 3$ ,  $p = .1484$ . This indicated that the two-factor model was not a significantly better fit of the data and that one-

factor model is a more preferred choice than the two-factor model based on the law of parsimony.

### *Permissive Parenting*

Third, items representing a permissive parenting style were subjected to a series of two-group (boys and girls) CFA. Many permissive items did not help meet partial invariance criteria, and none of the models examined met the reliability criteria of all standardized factor loadings being 40 or above. A closer look at polychoric correlations among permissive items revealed that many permissive items are not strongly correlated and when a few of them are moderately correlated, there is no similar pattern across boys and girls. Therefore, it was not possible to identify an invariant measurement model for permissive parenting with our data.

In addition, means, standards deviations, and ranges were computed for each permissive item examined (see Table 1). The descriptive statistics were computed for each gender group. The results show that three out of the four permissive items (MPPQI45, MPPQI15, and MPPQI36) are extremely skewed and have means of 1.14 or lower for both boys and girls. Although mothers rated themselves using a 5-point scale, the descriptive statistics show that mothers of boys only answered either 1 (never) or 2 (once in awhile) for MPPQI45, MPPQI15, and MPPQI36. Consequently, standard deviations of those items for mothers of boys are also very low (.220 to .338). With such limited variability observed among three out of the four permissive items, it was not feasible to identify a good measurement model for permissive parenting.

### *Combined PSDQ Model*

Finally, we combined the three-factor authoritative model with the two-factor authoritarian model to produce one five-factor authoritative/authoritarian model in order to put

the two conceptually connected parenting styles into one single model and examine them in the context of each other. A 23-item, five-factor model of the authoritative and authoritarian constructs provided a good fit to the data:  $\chi^2 = 135.804$ ,  $df = 107$ ,  $p < .05$ ,  $CFI = .944$ ,  $TLI = .954$ ,  $RMSEA = .050$ . The standardized and unstandardized factor loadings of authoritative and authoritarian parenting constructs are listed in Table 2. The chi-square difference test between the unconstrained and constrained models showed that all the factor loadings are equivalent across boys and girls,  $\chi^2_{dif} = 11.016$ ,  $df_{dif} = 15$ ,  $p = .7515$ .

The intercorrelations among authoritative and authoritarian latent constructs (connection, regulation, autonomy granting, coercion, and non-reasoning/punitive) are presented in Table 3. Due to high intercorrelations among several parenting constructs (connection and autonomy granting, regulation and autonomy granting, and coercion and non-reasoning/punitive), several alternative models were created by combining two highly correlated latent constructs onto one factor while retaining all the other indicators. These alternative four-factor models were sequentially compared with the five-factor baseline model. The goodness of fit statistics were  $\chi^2 = 144.686$ ,  $df = 105$ ,  $p < .01$ ,  $CFI = .923$ ,  $TLI = .935$ ,  $RMSEA = .059$  for the model combining connection and autonomy granting,  $\chi^2 = 142.556$ ,  $df = 107$ ,  $p < .05$ ,  $CFI = .931$ ,  $TLI = .943$ ,  $RMSEA = .056$  for the model combining regulation and autonomy granting, and  $\chi^2 = 140.281$ ,  $df = 107$ ,  $p < .05$ ,  $CFI = .935$ ,  $TLI = .946$ ,  $RMSEA = .054$  for the model combining coercion and non-reasoning/punitive. The chi-square difference tests indicated that the five-factor baseline model fit the data much better than any of the four-factor models. Merging any two of the parenting constructs significantly worsened the model fit with connection and autonomy granting as one construct  $\chi^2_{dif} = 26.853$ ,  $df_{dif} = 7$ ,  $p < .01$ , regulation and autonomy granting as one construct  $\chi^2_{dif} = 21.003$ ,  $df_{dif} = 7$ ,  $p < .01$ , and coercion and non-reasoning/punitive as one

construct  $\chi^2_{\text{dif}} = 18.570$ ,  $df_{\text{dif}} = 7$ ,  $p < .01$ . In sum, the five-factor model provides the best model fit, and the five parenting constructs were well distinguished regardless of their high latent intercorrelations.

#### *Measurement Model of Psychological Control*

As with the authoritative and authoritarian parenting models, a series of two-group (boys and girls) CFA was performed (cf. Byrne, 1989; Tomada & Schneider, 1997) in order to identify a measurement model for psychological control constructs (shaming and directiveness). Items were dropped if they were not invariant across child gender and/or had low standardized factor loadings ( $< .40$ ).<sup>3</sup> A 9-item, two-factor model of psychological control constructs emerged and provided a fairly good fit to the data:  $\chi^2 = 63.902$ ,  $df = 43$ ,  $p < .05$ , CFI = .964, TLI = .975, RMSEA = .067. The standardized loadings for the psychological control model are presented in Table 4.

Measurement invariance of the factor loadings for the psychological control model was tested by comparing a constrained model (a model with factor loading constrained to be equal across boys and girls) to an unconstrained model (a model without equality constraints). The chi-square difference test showed that all the factor loadings are equivalent across child genders,  $\chi^2_{\text{dif}} = 6.542$ ,  $df_{\text{dif}} = 6$ ,  $p = .3650$ , and suggested that the items used to measure the shaming and directiveness constructs performed equivalently for boys and girls.

There was a moderately strong latent intercorrelation between shaming and directiveness (Boys:  $\phi = .689$ ; Girls:  $\phi = .791$ ). To examine whether the shaming and directiveness constructs are well distinguished, a one-factor model combining the items from the two latent constructs onto a single factor was compared to the two-factor baseline model. The goodness of fit decreased,  $\chi^2 = 73.186$ ,  $df = 44$ ,  $p < .01$ , CFI = .950, TLI = .966, RMSEA = .079, and differed

significantly from the two-factor model,  $\chi^2_{\text{dif}} = 9.518$ ,  $df_{\text{dif}} = 3$ ,  $p < .05$ . Thus, despite their high latent intercorrelation, the shaming and directiveness constructs were well distinguished, and the two-factor baseline solution provided a better estimate of the psychological control constructs.

*Relations between Authoritative-Authoritarian and Psychological Control Constructs*

Latent intercorrelations between authoritative-authoritarian and psychological control constructs were estimated by combining the two measurement models: the five-factor authoritative and authoritarian model (see Table 2) and the two-factor psychological control model (see Table 4). The combined seven-factor model provided an acceptable fit to the data:  $\chi^2 = 213.088$ ,  $df = 129$ ,  $p < .01$ , CFI = .853, TLI = .877, RMSEA = .078. The latent intercorrelations are presented in Table 5.

As seen in Table 5, shaming was significantly associated with both coercion (Boys:  $\phi = .479$ ; Girls:  $\phi = .384$ ) and non-reasoning/punitive (Boys:  $\phi = .310$ ; Girls:  $\phi = .302$ ). Similarly, directiveness was significantly related to the two authoritarian constructs, coercion (Boys:  $\phi = .627$ ; Girls:  $\phi = .600$ ) and non-reasoning/punitive (Boys:  $\phi = .579$ ; Girls:  $\phi = .715$ ). However, shaming and directiveness were also associated with certain authoritative dimensions. For boys, directiveness was positively correlated with connection ( $\phi = .237$ ). For girls, shaming was positively associated with regulation ( $\phi = .437$ ) and negatively related to autonomy granting ( $\phi = -.624$ ).

*Latent Mean Comparison*

Table 6 presents the latent means of Japanese mothers' parenting with girls with the latent means of the mothers' parenting with boys constrained. Latent mean comparisons for possible gender differences were possible because all of our factor loadings were invariant across boys and girls (Little, 1997; Widaman & Reise, 1997). Our results indicate no significant

difference between latent means, suggesting that Japanese mothers' parenting do not vary for boys and girls.

## Chapter V

### Discussion

As noted in the introduction, the goal of this study was to examine whether Baumrind's parenting styles (authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive), psychological control (Barber, 1996), and their dimensions can be measured in the context of Japanese parenting. Based on the literature review, it was hypothesized that these parenting constructs are measurable in Japan. To a large extent, our hypotheses were confirmed. In line with expectations, authoritative and authoritarian parenting items formed a 23-item, five-factor model. For psychological control, a 9-item, two-factor model emerged, indicating the constructs of shaming and directiveness are also measurable in Japan. However, we were unable to identify an invariant measurement model for permissive parenting.

Based on latent intercorrelations, many parenting dimensions (e.g., connection and autonomy granting, coercion and non-reasoning/punitive) were highly correlated, but a series of chi-square difference tests showed that most dimensions were well distinguished within our final measurement models, despite their high intercorrelations. Another interesting finding was that shaming and directiveness were associated with dimensions of both authoritative and authoritarian parenting. Furthermore, our latent mean comparisons identified no significant gender difference in Japanese mothers' parenting patterns for boys and girls.

#### *Measurement Models*

##### *Authoritative Parenting*

Our combined PSQD model is composed of three authoritative dimensions (connection, regulation, and autonomy granting) and two authoritarian dimensions (coercion and non-reasoning/punitive). In accordance with our literature review, the connection dimension reflects

Japanese mothers' responsiveness and sensitivity (e.g., give praise when our child is good, show sympathy when our child is hurt or frustrated) and their *amae* relationship with their children (e.g., have warm and intimate times together with our child). While Japanese mothers have been observed to be less physically expressive, their relationship with children is often characterized with their sensitivity and also by physical and emotional closeness to their children (Dennis et al., 2002).

The items composing the regulation dimension (e.g., talk it over and reason with our child when the child misbehaves, help our child to understand the impact of behavior by encouraging him/her to talk about the consequences of hi/her own actions) seem to reflect Japanese mothers' preference for internal control over external control (Hess et al., 1986). Rather than appealing to authority and controlling child behavior externally, Japanese parents tend to value children's internalization of rules and expectations (Conroy et al., 1980). In order to help children internalize important norms and standards, Japanese parents often engage in reasoning and help children understand the implications and consequences of misbehaviors. The items included in the regulation dimension of our authoritative measurement model illustrate Japanese mothers' emphasis on children's internal control.

While the autonomy granting dimension is often described in terms of democratic participation in the Western context (e.g., Robinson et al., 1995), only one item in our model represented the concept of democratic participation (i.e., allow our child to give input into family rules). Other items included in our autonomy granting dimension (e.g., show respect for our child's opinions by encouraging him/her to express them, encourage our child to freely express himself/herself even when disagreeing with parents) seem to represent Japanese children's enhancement of the self. The development of the self is essential for the enrichment of any

group because “co-operation...far from denying the developmental of personhood, actually implies autonomy” since “self-awareness” is a means for achieving “the understanding of others” and “self-knowledge” is crucial for “maintaining harmonious social relations” (Hendry, 1986, p. 172). The autonomy granting dimension observed in Japanese mothers seems to reflect this notion.

### *Authoritarian Parenting*

With regard to authoritarian parenting, physical coercion and verbal hostility merged into one parenting construct: coercion. Both physical punishment (e.g., guide our child by punishment more than by reason, use physical punishment as a way of disciplining our child) and verbal hostility (e.g., yell or shout when our child misbehaves) seem to represent external control, which is normally considered less desirable in Japanese parenting (Conroy et al., 1980). It is probable that the two constructs of physical punishment and verbal hostility are especially closely related in Japan because they are both viewed as external control by Japanese parents, who are more conscious of the distinction between external vs. internal control. In addition, research has shown that it is not uncommon for physical punishment and verbal hostility to be combined into one factor in an authoritarian measurement model. For instance, the two merged together to form one authoritarian construct in studies conducted in China (e.g., Porter et al., 2005) and in Russia (Hart, Nelson, Robinson, Olsen, & McNeilly-Choque, 1998; Hart, Nelson et al., 2000)

The non-reasoning dimension of authoritarian parenting includes items that may be reflective of the Japanese process of *wakaraseru* (getting child to understand) (Vogel, 1963). Items such as “punish by taking privileges away from our child with little if any explanations”

and “use threats as punishment with little or no justification” may imply that mothers are expecting their children to intuitively understand why they are being punished.

### *Permissive Parenting*

As explained in the results section, we were unable to identify a measurement model for permissive parenting. It is interesting how there is such little variation in Japanese mothers’ responses regarding ignoring child misbehavior. Most mothers in this study reported that they never allow their children to interrupt others or annoy someone else. This seems contradictory with the literature review, which suggests that Japanese parents often give in and refrain from exercising control over their children (Azuma, 1986; Kobayashi, 2001; Lanham & Garrick, 1996; Lewis, 1986; Vogel, 1963).

This contradiction may be explained by Mann, Mitsui, Beswick, and Harmoni’s (1994) following observation: “In Japan, social rules are not absolute or universal but are person and situation related, connected to a social order in which there are quite distinct categories of interpersonal relations governing the primary group, a secondary group of friends and associates, a third category of functional, service contracts (including teachers) and a fourth category of strangers” (p. 142). The notion of what is appropriate and what is inappropriate is highly situationally focused (Olson et al., 2001). In fact, Lebra (1976) called this Japanese phenomenon “social relativism.”

Based on this idea of social relativism, it is possible that Japanese mothers have been observed to be permissive in their own interactions with their children, but they do not ignore their children’s misbehaviors when their children are interacting with others. In fact, many studies showed that Japanese mothers are greatly concerned about their children causing trouble to others (Conroy et al., 1980; Hendry, 1986; Lanham & Garrick, 1996; Rothbaum, et al., 2000;

Ujje, 1997; White & LeVine, 1986). When they see their children causing any trouble to others, Japanese mothers may not refrain from exercising control.

### *Psychological Control*

The shaming construct in our psychological control measurement model included many items that highlighted the impact of children's misbehaviors on mothers' feelings (e.g., tell our child that we get embarrassed when he/she does not meet our expectations, let our child know how disappointed we are when he/she misbehaves, let our child know when he/she has disappointed me). Through this feeling-oriented strategy (Conroy et al., 1980; Hess et al., 1986) and by utilizing children's empathy (*omoiyari*) skills, Japanese mothers tend to present themselves as victims of their children's misbehaviors or shortcomings. Our conceptualization of Japanese shaming seems to match the items that compose the shaming construct in our measurement model.

The items included in the directiveness construct seem to reflect the unique sense of oneness (the "*amae*" bond) often observed between Japanese mothers and children. For instance, most items illustrate a mother who overly controls her child's behavior (e.g., want to control whatever our child does, demand that our child does things). One item (try to change how our child feels or thinks about things) goes farther and describes a mother who intrudes her child's psychological experience and disturbs the psychoemotional boundary between the mother and child. These portraits resemble devoted, committed Japanese mothers, who come to perceive their children as an extension of themselves.

### *Relations between Parenting Constructs*

Many dimensions were significantly correlated with each other within each parenting style. For authoritative parenting, autonomy granting was associated with both connection and

regulation. While regulation and autonomy granting may seem somewhat contradictory, Baumrind (1996) points out, “Within the authoritative model, behavioral compliance and psychological autonomy are viewed not as mutually exclusive but rather as interdependent objectives” (p. 405). Showing respect for child autonomy and valuing their points of view are part of authoritative, reasoning-oriented regulation. Similarly, connection and autonomy granting go hand-in-hand because being responsive to children’s needs and feelings is essential for recognizing children’s individuality and psychological independence. Thus, three authoritative dimensions (connection, regulation, and autonomy granting) are complementary from authoritative parents’ viewpoints.

For authoritarian parenting, coercion and non-reasoning were highly correlated. This association is not surprising given that coercive acts (e.g., physical punishment) are often carried out with no explanation or justification. Furthermore, those who engage in physical punishment or verbal hostility and those who do not engage in reasoning seem to share common characteristics. For instance, both groups are not typically concerned with teaching or preparing children (Hasting & Rubin, 1999). In addition, they both place great emphasis on authority (Maccoby & Martin, 1983). Carrying out of punishment can reinforce parental authority, and no question or explanation may be needed when parents’ authority is recognized by their children.

Within the psychological control model, shaming and directiveness were associated with one another. Given that they both reflect the uniqueness of Japanese culture and its self construal, this association is also unsurprising. For example, both shaming and directiveness can be described as feeling-oriented practices. By utilizing children’s empathy (*omoiyari*) skills or the *amae* relationship, Japanese mothers appeal to the children’s feelings and rely on internally-oriented appeals, rather than external control (Conroy et al., 1980). In addition, the practices of

shaming and directiveness both hinge on what Azuma (1982) calls “educability via dependency.” By using shaming, Japanese mothers stress the negative consequences of their children’s behavior, namely causing trouble to others and thus incurring social disapproval. Social disapproval is feared among Japanese children in whom the importance of interdependency has been ingrained. Similarly, the effectiveness of Japanese directiveness is anchored in the close *amae* relationship, a sense of oneness between mother and child. Therefore, Azuma’s (1986) statement that “the feeling of interdependence helps the child assimilate the hopes and values of the parents, thus enhancing the child’s educability” (p. 8) seems to apply to both shaming and directiveness.

In addition, there were interesting associations that emerged between parenting styles. While none of the authoritative and authoritarian parenting dimensions were positively associated with each other, shaming and directiveness were positively correlated with several dimensions of both authoritative and authoritarian parenting. The association between psychological control and authoritarian parenting was expected because psychological control constructs have been described by Baumrind (2005) as “markers of an authoritarian style of control” (p. 67). Other researchers have observed that psychologically controlling means are frequently used by authoritarian parents to deride, demean, or diminish their children (Hart, Newell, & Sine, 2000). Thus, psychological control can be considered an element of authoritarian parenting.

On the other hand, little is known about the conceptual or empirical link between psychological control and authoritative parenting. It is noteworthy that, in this study, Japanese mothers’ directiveness was positively related to connection for boys and their use of shaming was positively associated with authoritative regulation for girls. With regard to directiveness,

many researchers have described how Japanese mothers' use of directiveness largely relies on their close *amae* relationship with their children (Azuma, 1982, 1986; Caudill, 1971; Hendry, 1986; Hess et al., 1980; Kobayashi, 2001; Vogel, 1963). The *amae* relationship, or sense of oneness, helps children to internalize their mothers' expectation and automatically do what the mothers expect them to do. While this may explain the linkage between the connection dimension and directiveness, it is still puzzling why the relationship emerged only for boys. More research is needed to explain why mothers' connection and directiveness are associated only for sons.

There was also a linkage between mothers' reasoning-oriented regulation and their use of shaming for girls. In the Western context, reasoning means helping children understand the reasons for setting rules and the consequences for not meeting them (Baumrind, 1996). Our finding suggests that Japanese mothers may accomplish the same goal by developing a proper sense of shame in their children. Japanese mothers may teach their children that one of the reasons for keeping certain rules is so that their manner and conduct will be aligned with the behavioral principles approved by their group. Because connectedness with others is crucial for the development of the interdependent self (Markus and Kitayama, 1991), shaming (a strategy to help children maintain a harmony with others) may be an important element of the reasoning process.

It is interesting that the linkage between mothers' authoritative regulation and shaming emerge only for girls. Cross and Madson's (1997) notion of gender-related self-construals offers one possible explanation for this result. Based on Markus and Kitayama's (1991) conceptualization of the independent and interdependent selves, Cross and Madson (1997) applies the conceptualization to explain various gender differences within the U.S. society.

According to Cross and Madson (1997), U.S. men tend to uphold the independent self-construal, whereas U.S. women tend to emphasize the importance of creating and maintaining the interdependent self-construal. In terms of general gender differences, women tend to value the “interrelatedness” or “connectedness” with others more than men. Based on Cross and Madson’s (1997) argument, we could also say that within the Japanese society, Japanese girls tend to emphasize interdependence more than Japanese boys do. If this is the perception held by Japanese mothers, the mothers may try to reason more with their daughters in combination with shaming than they do with their sons because they know that their daughter would care more about how they are perceived by others than their sons would. While this is a possible explanation for the linkage between Japanese mothers’ use of shame and reasoning for girls, more research is necessary to provide support for this argument.

#### *Gender Difference*

In this study, no gender difference was found regarding Japanese mothers’ parenting patterns for boys and girls. In other words, Japanese mothers were not significantly more authoritative or authoritarian with their sons than with their daughter, or vice versa. This result is noteworthy especially because it is typically argued that sex-differentiated patterns of discipline and education are still salient in Japan (Olson et al., 2001). For instance, Kashiwagi (1986) noted that whereas boys are expected to be more active and competitive, girls are expected to be more modest and cooperative in Japan. Reflecting these differentiated expectations, it has been observed that Japanese mothers are more likely to use a rule-based appeal with daughters and more likely to appeal to their authority when dealing with sons (Sinha, 1985). One possible explanation for our finding is that the Japanese society is rapidly changing and the differentiated

gender roles described by Kashiwagi in the 1980's are diminishing. However, more research is needed in order to examine this hypothesis.

#### *Limitations and Future Directions*

While this study provides a better understanding of contemporary family socialization in Japan, there are also several limitations. First of all, it should be noted that participants in this study resided in Kushiro-shi, Hokkaido. Their responses may not be representative of mothers in other geographic areas in Japan. Thus, replication studies are needed with samples from other regions including rural areas and larger cities. The homogeneity of Japanese parenting beliefs is often overestimated (White & LeVine, 1986), and many recent scholars are finding more diversity in the context of Japanese early socialization (Holloway, 2000; Kojima, 1996; Yamada, 2004). Specifically, Kumagai (1995) observed that families in urban settings are less traditional in their beliefs than families in rural settings. Therefore, future study needs to consider the issue of diversity within Japanese culture and explore how regional subcultures influence parents' socialization attitudes and practices.

Secondly, self-reported data carries some limitations. In this study, Japanese mothers rated themselves on items relating to their parenting styles and the practice of shaming. Because the Japanese culture encourages meeting collective norms, there is the potential risk that individuals answer the way they think they should answer rather than reporting their parenting behavior truthfully. A spouse-report paradigm has been suggested as an alternative to self-reports because of the self-report bias due to social desirability (Nelson, Hart, Yang et al., 2006). Therefore, future studies should include reports from spouses (e.g., fathers' reports on mothers' parenting) or a multitude of methodological approaches, including observations and teacher reports.

Lastly, it is important to note that the approach we took in this study was primarily etic and does not adequately describe Japanese parenting from the emic perspective. Our goal was to examine whether Western typologies of parenting (authoritative, authoritarian, permissive, and psychological control) and their dimensions are measurable in Japan. The items used in this study were selected from questionnaires that had been developed and commonly used in the U.S. (i.e., PSDQ and Barber's psychological control measures). Thus, there could be items that were not included in this study but would better reflect cultural nuances of Japanese parenting.

For example, Japanese parents have been observed to use teasing (e.g., asking a neighbor to take a child away) (Benedict, 1946/1989; Kobayashi, 2001), threats of supernatural sanction (e.g., telling that ghosts will frighten misbehaving children) (Lanham, 1956), begging (e.g., pleading a child to do as told) (Befu, 1971), and bribery (e.g., giving sweets to a child as a means of appeasing him/her) (Befu, 1971). However, items representing these indigenous socialization practices were not included in this study. Future studies should strive to develop new scales that reflect the Japanese emic views of parenting constructs. Qualitative research method, including open-ended interviews and observations, may help us operationalize parenting constructs as they are understood by native Japanese parents. Furthermore, in order to understand Japanese indigenous parenting constructs from Japanese parents' viewpoint (the emic perspective), we need to develop items to measure Japanese parents' beliefs, perceptions, and motivations behind their parenting practices.

Despite these limitations, this study was one of the first quantitative, systematic studies of parenting styles observed in Japan. According to Berry (1999), there are three major goals for cross-cultural psychology.

First is to *transport and test* our current psychological knowledge and perspectives by using them in other cultures in order to learn if they are valid; second is to *explore and discover* new aspects of the phenomenon being studied in local cultural terms; and third is to *integrate* what has been learned from these first two approaches in order to generate a more nearly universal psychology, one that has pan-human validity. (Berry, 1999, p. 165-166)

Berry (1999)'s quote illustrates that the "imposed etic" (Berry 1969, 1999) is not a meaningless endeavor, but it is rather a necessary first step in conducting cross-cultural research. Our study met Berry's first goal to "*transport and test*" our current knowledge of Western parenting typologies by applying them to the context of the Japanese culture and thus represents a starting point for cross-cultural research in Japanese parenting.

## Notes

1. The following authoritative parenting items were eliminated: MPPQI01 (encourage our child to talk about his/her troubles), MPPQI35 (express affection by hugging, kissing, and holding our child), MPPQI58 (explain the consequences of our child's behavior), and MPPQI55 (take into account child's preferences in making plans for the family).
2. The following authoritarian parenting items were eliminated: MPPQI32 (explode in anger toward our child), MPPQI23 (argues with our child), and MPPQI56 (when our child asks why he/she has to conform, state: because I said so, or I am your parent and I want you to).
3. The following psychological control items were eliminated: MIPR22 (act disappointed when our child misbehaves), and MIPR01 (tell our child how he/she should behave), and MIPR9 (try to change our child).

## References

- Ambert, A. (1997). *Parents, children, and adolescents: Interactive relationships and development in context*. New York: Haworth Press.
- Aunola, K., & Nurmi, J. (2005). The role of parenting styles and in children's problem behavior. *Child Development, 76*, 1144-1159.
- Azuma, H. (1982). Current trend in studies of behavioral development in Japan. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 5*, 153-169.
- Azuma, H. (1986). Why study child development in Japan? In H. Stevenson, H. Azuma, & K. Hakuta (Eds.), *Child development and education in Japan* (pp. 3-12). New York: Freeman.
- Azuma, H. (1994). *Nihonjin no shitsuke to kyouiku: Hattatsu no nichu-bei hikaku ni motozuite [Education and socialization in Japan: A comparison between Japan and the United States]*. Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press.
- Azuma, H. (2001). Moral scripts: A U.S.-Japan comparison. In H. Shimizu & R. A. LeVine (Eds.), *Japanese frames of mind: Cultural perspectives on human development* (pp.29-50). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Azuma, H., Kashiwagi, K., & Hess, R. D. (1981). *Hahaoya no taido to kodomo no chiteki hattatsu [Maternal attitudes and children's cognitive development]*. Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press.
- Barber, B. K. (1996). Parental psychological control: Revisiting a neglected construct. *Child Development, 67*, 3296-3319.
- Barber, B. K., & Harmon, E. L. (2002). Violating the self: Parental psychological control of children and adolescents. In B.K. Barber (Ed.), *Intrusive parenting: How psychological*

- control affects children and adolescents* (pp. 15-52). Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.
- Barber, B. K., & Olsen, J. A. (1997). Socialization in context: Connection, regulation, and autonomy in the family, school, and neighborhood, and with peers. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 12*, 287-315.
- Baumrind, D. (1967). Child care practices anteceding three patterns of preschool behavior. *Genetic Psychology Monographs, 75*, 43-88.
- Baumrind, D. (1971). Current patterns of parental authority. *Developmental Psychology Monographs, Part 2, 4*, 1-103.
- Baumrind, D. (1989). Rearing competent children. In W. Damon (Eds.), *Child development, today, and tomorrow* (pp. 349-378). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Baumrind, D. (1991). The influence of parenting style on adolescent competence and substance use. *Journal of Early Adolescence, 11*, 56-95.
- Baumrind, D. (1996). The discipline controversy revisited. *Family Relations, 45*, 405-414.
- Baumrind, D. (2005). Patterns of parental authority and adolescent autonomy. In J. Smetana (Ed.), *New directions for child development: Changes in parental authority during adolescence* (pp. 61-69). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Befu, H. (1971). *Japan: An anthropological introduction*. Tokyo: Tuttle.
- Befu, H. (1986). The social and cultural background of child development in Japan and the United States. In H. Stevenson, H. Azume, & K. Hakuta (Eds.), *Child development and education in Japan* (pp. 13-27). New York: Freeman.
- Benedict, R. (1989). *The Chrysanthemum and the Sword: Patterns of Japanese culture*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin. (Original work published 1946).

- Berry, J. W. (1969). On cross-cultural comparability. *International Journal of Psychology*, 4, 119-128.
- Berry, J. W. (1989). Imposed etics-emics-derived etics: The operationalisation of compelling idea. *International Journal of Psychology*, 24, 721-735.
- Berry, J. W. (1999). Emics and Etics: A symbiotic conception. *Culture and Psychology*, 5, 165-171.
- Bradshaw, D., Usui, H., Miyake, K., Campos, R. G., & Campos, J. J. (1991). Cross-cultural differences in maternal control communications and child compliance: Japan and the USA. In M. Bullock (Ed.), *The development of intentional action: Cognition, motivation, and interactive processes* (pp. 55-68). Basel, Switzerland: Karger.
- Brody, G. H., Ge, X., Conger, R., Gibbons, F. X., Murry, V. M., Gerrard, M., & Simons, R. L. (2001). The influence of neighborhood disadvantage, collective socialization, and parenting on African American children's affiliation with deviant peers. *Child Development*, 72, 1231-46.
- Byrne, B. M. (1989). *Structural equations with latent variables*. New York: John Wiley.
- Caudill, W. (1971). Tiny dramas: vocal communication between mother and infant in Japanese and American families. In W. Lebra (Ed.), *Mental health research in Asian and the Pacific*, Vol. II. Honolulu: East-West Center Press.
- Chang, L., Schwartz, D., Dodge, K. A., & McBride-Chang, C. (2003). Harsh parenting in relation to child emotion regulation. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 17, 598-606.
- Chao, R. K. (1994). Beyond parental control and authoritarian parenting styles: Understanding Chinese parenting through the cultural notion of training. *Child Development*, 65, 1111-1119.

- Chao, R. K. (1996). Extending research on the consequences of parenting style for Chinese Americans and European Americans. *Child Development, 72*, 1832-1843.
- Chao, R. K. (2000). The parenting of immigrant Chinese and European American mothers: Relations between parenting styles, socialization goals, and parenting practices. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 21*, 233-248.
- Cheah, C. S. L., & Rubin, K. H. (2004). European and Mainland Chinese mothers' responses to aggression and social withdrawal in preschoolers. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 28*, 83-94.
- Chen, X. (1998). The changing Chinese family: Resources, parenting practices, and children's social-emotional problems. In U. P. Gielen & A. L. Comunian (Eds.), *Family and family therapy in international perspective*. Trieste, Italy: Edizioni LINT.
- Chen, X., Wu, H., Chen, H., Wang, L., & Gen, G. (2001). Parenting practices and aggressive behavior in Chinese children. *Parenting: Science and Practice, 1*, 159-184.
- Chiu, L. H. (1987). Child-rearing attitudes of Chinese, Chinese-American, and Anglo-American mothers. *International Journal of Psychology, 22*, 409-419.
- Conroy, M., Hess, R. D., Azuma, H., & Kashiwagi, K. (1980). Maternal strategies for regulating children's behavior: Japanese and American families. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 11*, 153-172.
- Cross, S. E., Madson, L. (1997). Models of the self: self-construals and gender. *Child Development, 73*, 1803-1817.
- Darling, N., & Steinberg, L. (1993). Parenting style as context: An integrative model. *Psychological Bulletin, 113*, 487-496.

- Dennis, T. A., Cole, P. M., Zahn-Waxler, C., & Mizuta, I. (2002). "Self in Context: Autonomy and Relatedness in Japanese and U.S. Mother-Preschooler Dyads." *Child Development*, 73, 1803-1817.
- Devos, G. A. (1996). Psychocultural continuities in Japanese social motivation. In D. W. Shwalb & B. J. Shwalb (Eds.), *Japanese childrearing: Two generations of scholarship* (pp. 44-84). NY: The Guilford Press.
- Doi, T. (1973). *The anatomy of dependence [Amae no kozo]* (J. Bestor, Trans.). Tokyo: Kodansha International.
- Dornbusch, S., Ritter, P., Leiderman, P., Roberts, D., & Fraleigh, M. (1987). The relation of parenting style to adolescent school performance. *Child Development*, 58, 1244-1257.
- Finkenauer, C., Engels, R. C. M. E., & Baumeister, R. F. (2005). Parenting behaviour and adolescent behavioural and emotional problems: The role of self-control. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 29, 58-69.
- Friedlmeier, W., & Trommsdorff, G. (1999). Emotion regulation in early childhood: A cross-cultural comparison between German and Japanese toddlers. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 30, 684-711.
- Fung, H. (1999). Becoming a moral child: The socialization of shame among young Chinese children. *Ethos*, 27, 180-209.
- Galambos, N. L., Barker, E. T., & Almeida D. M. (2003). Parents *do* matter: Trajectories of change in externalizing and internalizing problems in early adolescence. *Child Development*, 74, 578-594.
- Gray, M. R., & Steinberg, L. (1999). Unpacking authoritative parenting: Reassessing a multidimensional construct. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 61, 574-587.

- Hara, H., & Wagatsuma, H. (1974). *Shitsuke [Japanese ways of childrearing]*. Tokyo:Kobundo.
- Harris, M. (1964). *The nature of cultural things*. New York: Random House.
- Harris, M. (1968). *The rise of anthropological theory*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Hart, C. H., Nelson, D. A., Robinson, C. C., Olsen, S. F., & McNeilly-Choque, M. K. (1998). Overt and relational aggression in Russian nursery-school-age children: Parenting style and marital linkages. *Developmental Psychology, 34*, 687-697.
- Hart, C. H., Nelson, D. A., Robinson, C. C., Olsen, S. F., McNeilly-Choque, M. K., & McKee, T. R. (2000). Russian parenting styles and family processes: Linkages with subtypes of victimization and aggression. In K. A. Kerns, J. M. Contreras, & A. M. Neal-Barnett (Eds.), *Family and peers: Linking two social worlds* (pp. 47-84). Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Hart, C. H., Newell, L. D., Olsen, S. F. (2003). Parenting skills and social-communicative competence in childhood. In J. O. Greene & B. R. Burlison (Eds.), *Handbook of communication and social interaction skills* (pp. 753-800). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Hart, C. H., Newell, L. D., & Sine, L. L. (2000). Proclamation-based principles of parenting and supportive scholarship. In D. C. Dollahite (Ed.), *Strengthening our families: An in-depth look at the proclamation on the family* (pp. 100-123). Salt Lake City, UT: Bookcraft.
- Hasting, P. D., & Rubin, K. H. (1999). Predicting mothers' beliefs about preschool-aged children's social behavior: Evidence for maternal attitudes and moderating child effects. *Child Development, 70*, 722-741.
- Headland, T. H., Pike, K. L., & Harris, M. (Eds.) (1990). *Emics and etics: The insider/outsider debate*. CA: Sage Publications.

- Hendry, J. (1986). *Becoming Japanese: The world of the preschool child*. Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press.
- Hess, R. D., Holloway, S., McDevitt, T., Azuma, H., Kashiwagi, K., Nagano, S., Miyake, K., Dickson, W. P., Price, G., & Hanano, G. (1986). Family influences on school readiness and achievement in Japan and the United States: An overview of a longitudinal study. . In H. Stevenson, H. Azume, & K. Hakuta (Eds.), *Child development and education in Japan* (pp. 147-166). New York: Freeman.
- Hess, R. D., Kashiwagi, K., Azuma, H. Price, G. G., & Dickson, W. P. (1980). Maternal expectations for mastery of developmental tasks in Japan and the United States. *International Journal of Psychology, 15*, 259-271.
- Heller, A. (2003). Five Approaches to the Phenomenon of Shame. *Social Research, 70*, 1015-1030.
- Ho, D. Y. F. (1986). Chinese pattern of socialization: A critical review. In M. H. Bond (Ed.), *The psychology of the Chinese people* (pp. 1-37). New York: Oxford Press.
- Holloway, S. D. (2000). *Contested childhood: Diversity and change in Japanese preschools*. New York: Routledge.
- Holloway, S. D., Suzuki, S., Yamamoto, Y., & Behrens, K. Y. (2005). Parenting self-efficacy among Japanese mothers. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies, 36*, 61-76.
- Ikegami, E. (2003). Shame and the samurai: Institutions, trustworthiness, and autonomy in the elite honor culture. *Social Research, 70*, 1351-1378.
- Joshi, M. S., & MacLean M. (1997). Maternal expectations of child development in India, Japan, and England. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 28*, 219-234.

- Kashiwagi, K. (1999). *Josei ni okeru kodomo no kachi: Ima, naze ko wo umu ka* [Value of child for women: Why have a child now?]. *The Japanese Journal of Educational Psychology*, 47, 170-179.
- Kitayama, S., Karasawa, M., & Mesquita, B. (2004). Collective and personal processes in regulating emotions: Emotion and self in Japan and the United States. In P. Philippot & R. S. Feldman (Eds.), *Regulation of Emotion* (pp. 251-273). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Incorporated.
- Kobayashi, S. (2001). Japanese mother-child relationships: Skill acquisition before the preschool years. In H. Shimizu & R. A. LeVine (Eds.), *Japanese frames of mind: Cultural perspectives on human development* (111-140). UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Kobayashi-Winata, H., & Power, T. G. (1989). Child rearing and compliance: Japanese and American families in Houston. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 20, 333-356.
- Kotloff, L. J. (1993). Fostering cooperative group spirit and individuality: Examples from a Japanese preschool. *Young Children*, 48, 17-23.
- Kotloff, L. J. (1998). "...And Tomoko wrote this song for us." In T. Rohlen & G. LeTendre (Eds.), *Teaching and learning in Japan* (pp. 98-118). UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Kojima, H. (1986). Child rearing concepts as a belief-value system of the society and the individual. In H. Stevenson, H. Azume, & K. Hakuta (Eds.), *Child development and education in Japan* (pp. 39-54). New York: Freeman.
- Kojima, H. (1996). Japanese childrearing advice in its cultural, social, and economic contexts. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 19, 373-391.
- Kruger, S. F., & Kross, W. H. (1972). Child-rearing attitudes of Chinese, Jewish, and Protestant mothers. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 86, 205-210.

- Kumagai, F. (1995). Families in Japan: Beliefs and realities. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 26, 135-163.
- Lanham, B. B. (1956). Aspects of child care in Japan: Preliminary report. In D. Haring (Ed.), *Parenting character and cultural milieu* (pp. 565-583). Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.
- Lanham, B. B., & Garrick, R. J. (1996). Adult to child in Japan: Interaction and relations. In D. Shwalb & B. Shwalb (Eds.), *Japanese childrearing: Two generations of scholarship* (pp. 97-124). New York: Guilford.
- Lau, S., & Cheung, P. C. (1987). Relations between Chinese adolescents' perception of parental control and organization and their perception of parental warmth. *Developmental Psychology*, 23, 726-729.
- Lebra, T. S. (1971). The social mechanism of guilt and shame: The Japanese case. *Anthropological Quarterly*, 44, 241-255.
- Lewis, C. C. (1984). Cooperation and control in Japanese nursery schools. *Comparative Education Review*, 28, 69-84.
- Lewis, C. C. (1986). Children's social development in Japan: Research directions. In H. Stevenson, H. Azume, & K. Hakuta (Eds.), *Child development and education in Japan* (pp. 186-200). New York: Freeman.
- Lewis, C. C. (1995). *Educating hearts and minds: Reflections of Japanese preschool and elementary education*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Lewis, C. C. (1996). The contribution of Betty Lanham: A neglected legacy. In D. W. Shwalb & B. J. Shwalb (Eds.), *Japanese childrearing: Two generations of scholarship* (pp. 125-138). NT: The Guilford Press.

- Lin, C. C., & Fu, V. R. (1990). A comparison of child-rearing practices among Chinese, immigrant Chinese, and Caucasian-American parents. *Child Development, 61*, 429-433.
- Little, T. D. (1997). Mean and covariance structures (MACS) analysis of cross-cultural data: Practical and theoretical issues. *Multivariate Behavioral Research, 32*, 53-76.
- Maccoby, E. E., & Martin, J. A. (1983). Socialisation in the context of family: Parent-child interaction. In P. H. Mussen (Series Ed.) & E. M. Hetherington (Vol. Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology: Vol. 4. Socialisation, personality, and social development* (pp. 1-102). New York: Wiley.
- Machida, S. (1996). Maternal and cultural socialization for schooling: Lessons learned and prospects ahead. In D. W. Shwalb & B. J. Shwalb (Eds.), *Japanese childrearing: Two generations of scholarship* (pp. 241-259). NY: The Guilford Press.
- Mann, L., Mitsui, H., Beswick, F., & Harmoni, R. V. (1994). A study of Japanese and Australian children's respect for others. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 25*, 133-145.
- Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review, 98*, 224-253.
- Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1994). The cultural construction of self and emotion: Implication for social behavior. In S. Kitayama & H. R. Markus (Eds.), *Emotion and culture: Empirical studies of mutual influence* (pp. 89-130). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Mascolo, M. F., Fischer, K. W., & Li, J. (2003). Dynamic development of component systems in emotions: Pride, shame, and guilt in China and the United States. In R. J. Davidson, K. R. Schere, & H. H. Goldsmith (Eds.), *Handbook of affective sciences* (pp. 375-408). New York? Oxford University Press.

- Mesquita, B., & Karasawa, M. (2004). Self-conscious emotions as dynamic cultural processes. *Psychological Inquiry, 15*, 161-166.
- Miller, J. G. (2002). Bringing culture to basic psychological theory—Beyond individualism and collectivism: Comment on Oyseman et al. (2002). *Psychological Bulletin, 128*, 97-109.
- Miyake, K., Campos, J. J., Kagan, J., & Bradshaw, D. L. (1986). Issues in socioemotional development. In H. Stevenson, H. Azuma, & K. Hakuta (Eds.), *Child development and education in Japan* (pp. 239-261). New York: Freeman.
- Mize, J., & Pettit, G. S. (1997). Mothers' social coaching, mother-child relationship style and children's peer competence: Is the medium the message? *Child Development, 68*, 291-311.
- Mizuka, I., Zahn-Waxler, C., Cole, P. M., & Hiruma, N. (1996). A cross-cultural study of preschoolers' attachment: Security and sensitivity in Japanese and US dyads. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 19*, 141-159.
- Muthén, L. K., & Mutén, B. O. (2001). *Mplus user's guide* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Los Angeles: Muthén & Mutén.
- Nagashima, N. (1973). A reserved world: Or is it?—The Japanese way of communication and their attitudes towards alien cultures. In R. Horton & R. Finegan (Eds.), *Models of thoughts*. London: Faber & Faber.
- Nelson, D. A., & Crick, N. R. (2002). Parental psychological control: Implications for childhood physical and relational aggression. In B.K. Barber (Ed.), *Intrusive parenting: How psychological control affects children and adolescents* (pp. 161-189). Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.

- Nelson, L. J., Hart, C. H., Wu, B., Yang, C., & Olsen, S. F. (2006). Relations between Chinese mothers' parenting practices and social withdrawal in early childhood. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*.
- Nelson, D. A., Hart, C. H., Yang, C., Olsen, J. A., & Jin, S. (2006). Aversive parenting in China: Associations with child physical and relational aggression. *Child Development*, 77, 554-572.
- Nelson, D. A., Nelson, L. J., Hart, C. H., Yang, C., & Jin, S. (2006). Parenting and peer group behavior in cultural context. In X. Chen, D. French, & B. Schneider (Eds.), *Peer relations in cultural context*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Olsen, S. F., Yang, C., Hart, C. H., Robinson, C. C., Wu, P., Nelson, D. A., et al. (2002). Mothers' psychological control and preschool children's behavioral outcomes in China, Russia, and the United States. In B.K. Barber (Ed.), *Intrusive parenting: How psychological control affects children and adolescents* (pp. 235-262). Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.
- Olson, S. L., Kashiwagi, K., & Crystal, D. (2001). Concepts of adaptive and maladaptive child behavior: A comparison of U.S. and Japanese mothers of preschool-age children. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 32, 43-57.
- Osterweil, Z., & Nagano, K. N. (1991). Maternal view on autonomy: Japan and Israel. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 22, 362-375.
- Osterwel, Z. & Nagano-Nakamura, K. (1992). Maternal views on aggression: Japan and Israel. *Aggressive Behavior*, 18, 263-270.
- Peak, L. (1991). *Learning to go to school in Japan: The transition from home to preschool life*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

- Pettit, G. S., Bates, J. e., & Dodge, K. A. (1997). Supportive parenting, ecological context, and children's adjustment: A seven-year study. *Child Development, 68*, 908-923.
- Pettit, G. S., & Laird, R. D. (2002). Psychological control and monitoring in early adolescence: The role of parental involvement and earlier child adjustment. In B.K. Barber (Ed.), *Intrusive parenting: How psychological control affects children and adolescents* (pp. 97-123). Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.
- Pettit, G. S., Laird, R. D., Dodge, K. A., Bates, J. E., & Criss, M. M. (2001). Antecedents and behavior-problem outcomes of parental monitoring and psychological control. *Child Development, 72*, 583-598.
- Pike, K. L. (1967). *Language in relation to a unified theory of the structure of human behavior* (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed.). The Hague: Mouton.
- Porter, C. L., Hart, C. H., Yang, C., Robinson, C. C., Olsen, S. F., Zeng, Q., Olsen, J. A., & Jin, S. (2005). A comparative study of child temperament and parenting in Beijing, China and the western United States. *International Journal of Behavioral Deveopment, 29*, 541-551.
- Power, T. G., Kobayashi-Winata, H., & Kelley, M. L. (1992). Childrearing patterns in Japan and the United States: A cluster analytic study. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 15*, 185-205.
- Rice, Y. N. (2001). The maternal role in Japan: Cultural values and socioeconomic conditions. In H. Shimizu & R. A. LeVine (Eds.), *Japanese frames of mind: Cultural perspectives on human development* (85-110). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

- Robinson, C. C., Mandleco, B., Olsen, S. F., & Hart, C. H. (1995). Authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive parenting practices: Development of a new measure. *Psychological Reports, 77*, 819-830.
- Rothbaum, F., Pott, M., Azuma, H., Miyake, K., & Weisz, J. (2000). The development of close relationships in Japan and the United States: Paths of symbiotic harmony and generative tension. *Child Development, 71*, 1121-1142.
- Rusell, A., Hart, C. H., Robinson, C. C., & Olsen, S. F. (2003). Children's sociable and aggressive behavior with peers: A comparison of the U.S. and Australia, and contributions of temperament and parenting styles. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 27*, 74-86.
- Sato, N. (1995). Honoring the individual. In T. Rohlen & G. LeTendre (eds.), *Teaching and learning in Japan* (pp. 119-153). Cambridge: England: Cambridge University Press.
- Schaefer, E. S. (1959). A circumflex model for maternal behavior. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 59*, 226-235.
- Seki, K., Matsumoto, D., & Imahori, T. T. (2002). The conceptualization and expression of intimacy in Japan and the United States. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 33*, 303-319.
- Shibazaki, M., & Anzai, T. (2005). *Rekishi kara miru nihon no kosodate: kosodate to kosodate shien no korekara wo kangaeru tame ni [Japanese child rearing from the historical viewpoint: For the future of child rearing and child rearing support]*. Tokyo: Fureberu-sha.
- Shigaki, I. S. (1983). Child care practices in Japan and the United States: How do they reflect cultural values in young children? *Young Children, 38*, 13-24.

- Shimizu, H. & LeVine, R. A. (2001). *Japanese frames of mind: Cultural perspectives on human development*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Shwalb, D. W., Kawai, H., Shoji, J., & Tsunetsugu, K. (1995). The place of advice: Japanese parents' sources of information about childrearing and child health. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 16*, 629-644.
- Shwalb, D. W., & Shwalb, B. J. (1996). Introduction: Looking back. In D. W. Shwalb & B. J. Shwalb (Eds.), *Japanese childrearing: Two generations of scholarship* (pp. 1-8). NY: The Guilford Press.
- Sinha, S. R. (1985). Maternal strategies for regulating children's behavior. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 16*, 27-40.
- Sorkhabi, N. (2005). Applicability of Baumrind's parent typology to collective cultures: Analysis of cultural explanations of parent socialization effects. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 29*, 552-563.
- Steinberg, L., Dornbusch, S., & Brown, B. B. (1992). Ethnic differences in adolescent achievement: An ecological perspective. *American Psychologist, 47*, 723-729.
- Stevens, J. (1996). *Applied multivariate statistics for the social sciences*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Stewart, S. M., Bond, M. H., Kennard, B. D., Ho, L. M., & Zaman, R. M. (2002). Does the Chinese construct of guan export to the West? *International Journal of Psychology, 37*, 74-82.
- Stewart, S. M., Bond, M. H., Zaman, R. M., McBride-Change, C., Rao, N., Ho, L. M., & Fielding, R. (1999). Functioning parenting in Pakistan. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 23*, 747-770.

- Stewart, S. M., Rao, N., Bond, M. H., McBride-Chang, C., Fielding, R., & Kennard, B. D. (1998). Chinese dimensions of parenting: Broadening Western predictors and outcomes. *International Journal of Psychology, 33*, 345-358.
- Symonds, P. M. (1939). *The psychology of parent-child relationships*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Tobin, J. (1995). The irony of self-expression. *American Journal of Education, 103*, 233-258.
- Tobin, J. J., Wu, D. Y. H., & Davidson, D. H. (1989). *Preschool in three cultures: Japan, China, and the United States*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Tomada, G., & Schneider, B. H. (1997). Relational aggression, gender, and peer acceptance: Invariance across culture, stability over time, and concordance among informants. *Developmental Psychology, 33*, 601-609.
- Triandis, H. C. (1989). The self and social behavior in different cultural contexts. *Psychological Review, 96*, 506-520.
- Tseng, W. S., & Wu, D. Y. H. (1985). Introduction: The characteristics of Chinese culture. In W. S. Tseng and D. Y. H. Wu (Eds.), *Chinese cultural and mental health* (pp. 3-13). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.
- Ujiie, T. (1997). How do Japanese mothers treat children's negativism? *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 18*, 467-483.
- Vereijken, C.M.J.L., Riksen-Walraven, J.M.A., & Van Lieshout, C.F.M. (1997). Mother-infant relationships in Japan: Attachment, dependency, and amae. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 28*, 442-462.
- Vogel, E. F. (1963). *Japan's new middle class: The salary man and his family in a Tokyo Suburb*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

- White, M. I. (2002). *Perfectly Japanese: Making families in an era of upheaval*. CA: University of California Press.
- White, M. I., & LeVine, R. A. (1986). What is an *ii ko* (good child)? In H. Stevenson, H. Azume, & K. Hakuta (Eds.), *Child development and education in Japan* (pp. 55-62). New York: Freeman.
- Widaman, K. F., & Reise, S. P. (1997). Exploring the measurement invariance of psychological instruments: Applications in the substance use domain. In K. J. Bryant, M. Windle, & S. G. West (Eds.), *The science of prevention* (pp. 281-324). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association Press.
- Wu, D. Y. H. (1996). Parental control: Psychocultural interpretations of Chinese patterns of socialization. In S. Lau (Ed.), *Growing up the Chinese way: Chinese child and adolescent development*. Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press.
- Wu, P., Robinson, C. C., Yang, C., Hart, C. H., Olsen, S. F., Porter, C. L., Jin, S., Wo, J., & Wu, X. (2002). Similarities and differences in mothers' parenting of preschoolers in China and the United States. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 26*, 481-491.
- Xu, Y., Farver, J. M., Zhang, Z., Zeng, Q., Yu, L., & Cai, B. (2005). Mainland Chinese parenting styles and parent-child interaction. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 29*, 524-531.
- Yamada, H. (2004). Japanese mothers' views of young children's areas of personal discretion. *Child Development, 75*, 164-179.
- Yamamura, Y. (1986). The child in Japanese society. In H. Stevenson, H. Azume, & K. Hakuta (Eds.), *Child development and education in Japan* (pp. 28-28). New York: Freeman.

Yang, C., Hart, C. H., Nelson, D. A., Porter, C. L., Olsen, S. F., Robinson, C. C., & Jin, S. (2004). Fathering in a Beijing, Chinese sample: Associations with boys' and girls' negative emotionality and aggression. In R. D. Day & M. E. Lamb (Eds.), *Conceptualizing and measuring father involvement* (pp. 185-215). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

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

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics of Permissive Parenting Items

Item No.	Contents	Boys			Girls		
		Mean	SD	Range	Mean	SD	range
MPPQI45	Allow child to interrupt others	1.05	.220	1-2	1.06	.307	1-3
MPPQI15	Allow child to annoy someone else	1.01	.100	1-2	1.12	.563	1-4
MPPQI36	Ignore child's misbehavior	1.13	.338	1-2	1.14	.398	1-3
MPPQI08	Withholds scolding and/or criticism even when child acts contrary to our wishes	2.78	1.171	1-5	2.62	1.080	1-5

Table 2. 5-Factor Structure of Japanese Mothers' Authoritative &amp; Authoritarian Styles

Item No.	Contents	Standardized Factor Loadings		Unstandardized Factor Loadings
		Boys	Girls	
<b>Connection</b>				
MPPQ105	Give praise when child is good	.555	.509	1.000
MPPQ109	Show sympathy when child is hurt or frustrated	.590	.633	1.063
MPPQ112	Give comfort and understanding when child is upset	.587	.702	1.058
MPPQ121	Responsive to child's feelings or needs	.400	.502	.720
MPPQ127	Tell child that we appreciate what the child tries or accomplishes	.513	.463	.924
MPPQ146	Have warm and intimate times together with child	.566	.584	1.020
<b>Regulation</b>				
MPPQ125	Give child reasons why rules should be obeyed	.621	.572	1.000
MPPQ129	Help child to understand the impact of behavior by encouraging child to talk about the consequences of his/her own actions	.459	.357	.739
MPPQ142	Talk it over and reason with child when the child misbehaves	.623	.491	1.002
MPPQ153	Explain to child how we feel about the child's good and bad behavior	.517	.431	.831
<b>Autonomy Granting</b>				
MPPQ122	Allow child to give input into family rules	.445	.468	1.000
MPPQ139	Apologize to child when making a mistake in parenting	.519	.633	1.165
MPPQ148	Encourage child to freely express himself/herself even when disagreeing with parents	.648	.600	1.455
MPPQ151	Show respect for child's opinions by encouraging child to express them	.648	.705	1.456
<b>Coercion</b>				
MPPQ102	Guide child by punishment more than by reason	.645	.691	1.000
MPPQ106	Spank when our child is disobedient	.722	.590	1.120
MPPQ119	Grab child when being disobedient	.653	.739	1.013
MPPQ137	Use physical punishment as a way of disciplining our child	.750	.721	1.163
MPPQ143	Slap child when the child misbehaves	.731	.683	1.133
MPPQ113	Yell or shout when child misbehaves	.519	.497	.805
<b>Non-Reasoning/Punitive</b>				
MPPQ110	Punish by taking privileges away from child with little if any explanations	.723	.694	1.000
MPPQ128	Punish by putting child off somewhere alone with little if any explanations	.578	.537	.800
MPPQ154	Use threats as punishment with little or no justification	.774	.635	1.071

Goodness of fit:  $\chi^2 = 135.804$ ,  $df = 107$ ,  $p < .05$ , CFI = .944, TLI = .954, RMSEA = .050

Test of invariance:  $\chi^2_{dif} = 11.016$ ,  $df_{dif} = 15$ ,  $p = .7515$

Table 3. Latent Intercorrelations of Authoritative &amp; Authoritarian Constructs

	Boys	Connection	Regulation	Autonomy Granting	Coercion	Non-Reasoning
Girls						
Connection			.629*	.897*	.055	-.147
Regulation		.743*		.873*	-.025	-.025
Autonomy Granting		.600*	.922*		-.296*	-.380*
Coercion		-.200	-.099	-.446*		.844*
Non-Reasoning		-.571*	-.290	-.496*	.750*	

Note: \* $p < .05$

Table 4. 2-Factor Structure of Japanese Mothers' Psychological Control

Item No.	Contents	Standardized Factor Loadings		Unstandardized Factor Loadings
		Boys	Girls	
	<b>Shaming</b>			
MIPR25	Tell child that we get embarrassed when he/she does not meet our expectations	.869	.821	1.000
MIPR35	Let child know how disappointed we are when he/she misbehaves	.810	.632	.933
MIPR26	Make child feel guilty when our child does not meet our expectations	.833	.731	.960
MIPR24	Tell child that he/she should be ashamed when he/she misbehaves	.540	.550	.622
MIPR06	Let child know when he/she has disappointed me	.564	.424	.649
		$\phi = .689^*$	$\phi = .791^*$	
	<b>Directiveness</b>			
MIPR07	Try to change how our child feels or thinks about things	.666	.525	1.000
MIPR28	Tell our child what to do	.609	.475	.915
MPP1I59	Demand that child does things	.521	.499	.782
MIPR21	Want to control whatever our child does	.486	.465	.727

Goodness of fit:  $\chi^2 = 63.902$ ,  $df = 43$ ,  $p < .05$ , CFI = .964, TLI = .975, RMSEA = .067

Test of invariance:  $\chi^2_{dif} = 6.542$ ,  $df_{dif} = 6$ ,  $p = .3650$

Table 5. Latent Intercorrelations between Authoritative/Authoritarian and Psychological Control Constructs

		Connection	Regulation	Autonomy Granting	Coercion	Non-reasoning
Shaming	Boys	.173	.179	.201	.479*	.310*
	Girls	.049	.437*	-.112	.384*	.302*
Directiveness	Boys	.237*	.046	-.110	.627*	.579*
	Girls	-.351*	-.225	-.624*	.600*	.715*

Note: \* $p < .05$

Table 6. Latent Mean Comparisons of Parenting Constructs across Child Genders

	Girls' latent means with boys latent means constrained	
	Mean	t
Connection	.034	.343
Regulation	.002	.021
Autonomy Granting	-.003	-.038
Coercion	-.071	-.754
Non-reasoning/Punitive	-.108	-.578
Shaming	.010	.078
Directiveness	.108	.999

Note: There was no significant difference between latent means.