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This study examined adolescents' perceptions of parental influences on adolescent self-esteem and academic achievement among adolescents in mainland China, Volgograd Russia, and the mid-western United States (i.e., European Americans). These analyses were conducted on extant data from a larger cross-national study of parent-adolescent relationships and adolescent social competence. The sizes of the three samples used in the present analyses varied from 385 to 480. Subjects were recruited using a convenience strategy; however, four public schools within large urban areas in each country were targeted to decrease differences across the cultural groups. Overall, the relationships between parental behaviors and adolescent self-esteem and academic achievement varied across Chinese, European American, and Russian adolescents. Moreover, the relationships examined were moderated by gender of adolescent and gender of parent. Parental support and autonomy were positive predictors of self-esteem among mainland Chinese and European Americans, whereas conformity to parents was the only significant predictor (i.e., negative) of self-esteem among Russian adolescents. The extent that parents monitored their adolescent's activities through firm behavioral control strategies was a consistent predictor of academic achievement across all three cultural groups.

The findings of this study point to the importance of conceptualizing the constructs, individualism and collectivism, as two separate continua of behavior, with
each having the potential to influence family relationships regardless of the dominant
macro-level social-orientation (e.g., individualism or collectivism). That is, many of the
findings from this study were contrary to what would be expected following an
individualism-collectivism perspective where these two constructs are viewed as polar
opposites on one continuum.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

The family has traditionally served as the primary socialization agent for fostering psychosocial competence in children and adolescents (Peterson & Hann, 2000). Even within diverse cultural groups (e.g., Asian American, Chinese, and European American), researchers report that parental behaviors and styles influence psychosocial competence such as self-esteem and academic achievement among adolescents (Allen, Hauser, Bell, & O’Conner, 1994; Cheung & Lau, 1985; Dornbusch, Ritter, Leiderman, Roberts, & Fraleigh, 1987; Lamborn, Mounts, Steinberg, & Dornbusch, 1991; Lau & Cheung, 1987). However, research also indicates that the patterns (i.e., direction and strength) of these relationships vary across cultural groups (Chao, 1994, 1996; Dornbusch et al., 1987; Lamborn et al., 1991). Although cross-cultural studies have compared the relationships between parental support and control attempts and child and adolescent social competence among ethnic minority groups in the US (e.g., Dornbusch et al., 1987; Lamborn et al., 1991), few studies have examined these cultural differences across countries or national cultural groups.

Cultural influences have been described as cultural syndromes, which are defined as patterns of shared beliefs, attitudes, norms, and values that influence patterns of
interaction (Triandis, 1995). A common cultural descriptor used for assessing the differing socialization patterns across cultural groups is individualism-collectivism (I-C) (Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Triandis, 1989, 1995). According to this macro-level theoretical perspective, parents in cultures described as individualistic focus on fostering independence and autonomy in their children which is seen as leading to high self-confidence and competence (Triandis, 1995). Parents in cultures described as collectivistic focus on fostering interdependence and conformity in their children which is seen as leading to highly desired outcomes such as promoting group harmony and academic achievement (Asakawa & Csikszentmihalyi, 1998; Chao, 1996; Triandis, 1995). Moreover, these differing social orientations are thought to result in different parent-child interactions, family relationships, as well as self-conceptions (Chao, 1996, 1994; Kagitecibasi, 1996; Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Triandis, 1989). In other words, cultural influences (a) shape the interaction between parents and children that serve to foster social competence and (b) influence what behaviors and outcomes are considered to be socially competent (Triandis, 1995). For parents in collectivistic cultures, indicators that their offspring are succeeding (i.e., social competence) include getting along with others (i.e., group harmony), conforming to the group (i.e., family and society), and being well behaved (Chao, 1996; Lam, 1997; Meredith, Abbott, & Zhu, 1989; Triandis, 1995). For parents in individualistic cultures, indicators that their offspring are succeeding include demonstrations of independence and autonomy (Chao, 1996; Peterson, Bush, & Supple, 1999; Triandis, 1995). In contrast, parents in collectivistic societies have been reported to discourage such personality characteristics as autonomy, independence,
creativity, and as strictly prohibiting hostility, aggression, and impulsive behavior (Ho, 1986; Lam, 1997; Meredith et al., 1989; Triandis, 1995).

These collectivistic socialization practices are thought to facilitate more interdependent conceptions of self in contrast to more individualistic or independent self-concepts fostered by the socialization practices of parents in individualistic societies (Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Tafarodi & Swann, 1996; Triandis, 1995). Moreover, specific domains of the self-concept have been found to be more salient in some cultures than in others, with collectivistic cultures endorsing more socially oriented self-concept domains, and individualistic societies fostering more autonomy-based aspects of the self (Tafarodi & Swann, 1996; Triandis, 1989; Triandis, Bontempo, Villareal, Asai, & Lucca, 1988; Watkins et al., 1998). As children and adolescents internalize cultural values encouraged by parents, these relational variables (e.g., conformity & interdependence) are likely to foster the development of self-esteem and academic achievement among collectivistic cultural groups (Lam, 1997; Lau, 1996; Stewart, Bond, Deeds, Westrick, & Wong, 1999). For example, researchers examining the superior academic performance of Asian-Americans in comparison to European-American adolescents have found differing patterns of parent-adolescent relations (Asakawa & Csikszentmihalyi, 1998; Chao, 1996; Dornbusch et al., 1987; Lamborn et al., 1991; Stewart et al., 1999). These findings suggest that collectivistic cultural expectations influence parental practices which, in turn, may emphasize a higher academic achievement orientation among some cultural groups (Asakawa & Csikszentmihalyi, 1998; Chao, 1996).
In spite of the diversity in socialization processes across cultural groups, parents in all cultures share a common goal in childrearing in that they want their child to become a socially competent adult (Chen, Greenberger, Lester, Dong, & Guo, 1998). A challenge for researchers examining these relationships is to avoid the "social address" model whereby relationships between socialization practices and child-adolescent outcomes are directly compared across cultural groups (Stevenson-Hinde, 1998). For example, not simply taking a model developed among Western cultures and comparing this to non-Western cultural groups without measuring/considering cultural influences/process. Following a simple "social address" model does not allow researchers to assess the influence of culture at the family relationship level. Because the internalization of cultural values are assumed to be the cause of observed cultural differences on child and adolescent outcomes, examining the adherence to culturally valued behaviors and interactions is one method of examining the influence of culture on parent-child/adolescent relationships (Asakawa & Csikszentmihalyi, 1998; Stewart et al., 1999).

Statement of Purpose

The purpose of this study was to examine adolescents' perceptions of how mothers and fathers influence the development of social competence in adolescents (i.e., self-esteem and academic achievement) within three cultural groups (i.e., Chinese, European Americans, and Russians) through the use of specific dimensions of parenting behavior (i.e., support, behavioral control and psychological control). This study extends previous cross-cultural studies by also measuring the extent of adherence to culturally
influenced (i.e., socialized) values (i.e., collectivistic and/or individualistic influences) as they are manifest within the parent-adolescent relationship (i.e., autonomy from parents and conformity to parents). In addition, the participants in this study reside in one of three societies found to have contrasting levels of individualism and collectivism. Mainland Chinese and European Americans, for example, represent a major contrast in the level of individualism and collectivism at the societal level, with distinctively different socialization goals and practices at the family relationship level (Chen et al., 1998; Triandis, 1995). Russia has also been described as being more collectivistic in comparison to US (Stephan & Abalakina-Paap, 1996) and British samples (Tower et al., 1997). On the other hand, Russia has been undergoing drastic societal level changes in recent years, moving away from traditional collectivistic social norms (i.e., those influenced by communism) to more individualistic social norms (e.g., democracy and capitalism) (Jose et al., 1998; Shlapentokh, 1991). In other words, this study examines the impact of culture on the parent-adolescent relationship (i.e., autonomy from parents and conformity to parents) by examining the mediating and/or indirect influences of these presumed distinct cultural influences on the relationships between parenting behaviors and adolescent self-esteem and academic achievement. Although many studies have examined the direct influences of parenting on adolescent self-esteem and academic achievement, none have examined these relationships while also considered the influence of autonomy from parents and conformity to parents. Moreover, there are no existing studies examining these relationships within Chinese and Russian samples.
The cross-national nature of this study allows for cultural comparisons without the potential confounds influenced by acculturation. Studies of parent-adolescent relationships among ethnic minority groups in the US may suffer confounding results from influences of acculturation and minority status. This study also advances current research by using instruments that have been found to demonstrate high levels of validity and reliability within both collectivistic and individualistic cultural groups (e.g., Bush, Bean, Bartle-Haring, & Peterson, 1999; Bush, Bean, Bartle-Haring, Peterson, & Wilson, 2000; Peterson, Bush, & Supple, 1999; Supple, Peterson, & Bush, 1998).

Theoretical Framework

Family Socialization

During social interaction, mothers and fathers convey values and expectations to their children and adolescents which their offspring use as standards for defining and choosing appropriate goals and behaviors (e.g., parental support fosters academic achievement). In turn, these interactions with parents, along with the behaviors and goals influenced by these interactions, serve as the content from which the adolescents evaluate themselves (i.e., producing positive or negative self-esteem). Therefore, children and adolescents’ experiences during the socialization process serve as important influences on the development of social competence (e.g., self-esteem and academic achievement) of the young (Allen et al., 1994; Barber, Olsen, & Shagel, 1992; Gecas & Schwalbe, 1983; Gecas & Seff, 1990; Harter, 1993, 1995; Peterson & Hann, 2000). That is, across diverse cultural groups, the family is an important social context for the development of adolescent self-esteem and academic achievement (Allen et al., 1994; Barber et al., 1992;
Cheung & Lau, 1985; Demo et al., 1987; Dornbusch et al., 1987; Gecas & Schwalbe, 1983, 1986; Gecas & Seff, 1990; Lau & Cheung, 1987; Scott, Scott, & McCabe, 1991; Steinberg et al., 1991). Moreover, numerous studies on parent-adolescent relationships among European American and culturally diverse US samples, indicate that parenting styles and behaviors that communicate support, firm control, and allow for the development of psychological autonomy are positive predictors of social competence among youth (Barber, 1997; Baumrind, 1971, 1991; Dornbusch et al., 1987; Maccoby & Martin, 1983; Peterson & Hann, 2000; Scott et al., 1991; Stafford & Bayer, 1993). These styles or specific parental behaviors have been associated with higher levels of self-esteem and academic achievement, at least among middle-class European-American adolescents (Dornbusch et al., 1987; Gecas & Seff, 1990; Linver & Silverberg, 1997; Maccoby & Martin, 1983; Openshaw et al., 1983, 1984; Rollins & Thomas, 1979).

In contrast, parental behaviors and styles characterized as harsh, punitive, psychologically controlling, and permissive, are viewed as fostering problematic outcomes for adolescents. For example, these types of parental behaviors have been associated with lower levels of self-esteem among European-American and Hong Kong Chinese adolescents (Cheung & Lau, 1985; Lau & Cheung, 1987; Linver & Silverberg, 1997). Moreover, psychologically controlling parenting behaviors have also been associated with lower school performance among European-American adolescents (Dornbusch, 1987).
Parenting Styles

Researchers have developed several methods of examining how parents either foster or inhibit desired outcomes (e.g., high self-esteem and academic achievement) in children and adolescents (Peterson & Hann, 2000). One of these approaches, parenting styles, refers to constellations of childrearing behaviors that operate in combination to influence behaviors and attitudes in the young (Baumrind, 1967, 1991; Dornbusch et al., 1987; Maccoby & Martin, 1983; Steinberg, Dornbusch, & Brown, 1992). The most prominent researcher in the parenting styles literature is Diana Baumrind (1967, 1971, 1978, 1991); she has conceptualized several childrearing typologies. Although changing somewhat over time, Baumrind’s most commonly identified typology includes the three categories: authoritarian, authoritative, and permissive parenting.

Authoritarian parenting style. This style appears to be associated with the most problematic psychosocial outcomes among children and adolescents (Baumrind, 1991; Peterson & Hann, 2000, Stafford & Bayer, 1993). This style consists of parenting behaviors characterized as punitive, demanding, overly strict, and uncompromising. Authoritarian parenting also consists of lower levels of support, communication, and reasoning (Baumrind, 1978, 1991; Peterson & Hann, 2000). Parents who fit into this category are described as using harsh punishment in an arbitrary manner to gain compliance, without tolerating much input from the young. A common objective is to shape and control the behavior and attitudes of adolescents in accordance with an absolute set of standards. Authoritarian parents value obedience from adolescents, with punitive or arbitrary measures being used to ensure compliance. Researchers examining
US samples have reported that parents whose parenting practices fall into the authoritarian style tend to foster lower self-esteem and school performance in children and adolescents (Buri, Louiselle, Miskanis, & Mueller, 1988; CooperSmith, 1967; Dornbusch et al., 1987; Lamborn, Mounts, Steinberg, & Dornbusch, 1991).

**Permissive parenting style.** Baumrind (1978, 1991) describes the permissive parenting style as being tolerant and accepting of children’s impulsive behavior. She describes these parents as using little punishment and avoiding the implementation of firm controls or restrictions. Parenting behaviors composing this typology include high levels of acceptance and autonomy granting, along with low levels of discipline and behavioral control. The impact of permissive parenting on the development of adolescents includes both negative and positive outcomes. Some of the desirable outcomes of permissive parenting include increased autonomy and school achievement (Baumrind, 1991; Dornbusch et al., 1987). Problematic outcomes of this style include conduct problems and substance use (Baumrind, 1991). Both of these adverse outcomes result from deficient monitoring and diminished control that characterizes permissive parents (Baumrind, 1991; Maccoby & Martin, 1983; Dornbusch et al., 1987).

**Authoritative parenting style.** This style of parenting is characterized by high levels of support, warmth, clearly defined rules, effective communication (promoting psychological autonomy), and high levels of behavioral control (Baumrind, 1991; Steinberg, Lamborn, Dornbusch, & Darling, 1992). Research with US samples has found authoritative parenting to predict desirable psychosocial outcomes among children and adolescents, at least among middle-class European-American adolescents (Baumrind,
1991; Dornbusch et al., 1987; Steinberg, Lamborn, Dornbusch, & Darling, 1992). For example, authoritative parenting has been associated with high levels of self-esteem, school performance, social skills, and fewer problems with antisocial behaviors and substance abuse (Baumrind, 1966, 1978, 1991; Dornbusch et al., 1987; Maccoby & Martin, 1983; Steinberg, Dornbusch, & Brown, 1992; Steinberg, Lamborn, Dornbusch, & Darling, 1992).

**Parenting Behaviors**

An alternative strategy to the use of global conceptions of parenting, such as parenting styles, is to focus on specific dimensions of parental behaviors (Barber, 1997; Bean, Crane, & Barber, 1999; Linver & Silverberg, 1997; Peterson & Hann, 2000). Because parenting styles are composed of combinations of parenting behaviors, it is difficult to determine how specific dimensions of parenting are predictive of particular developmental outcomes among children and adolescents (Barber, 1997; Bean et al., 1999; Herman, Dornbusch, Herron, & Herting, 1997; Linver & Silverberg, 1997).

In contrast, the examination of specific dimensions of parenting behavior allows researchers to isolate relationships between specific parenting behaviors and child and adolescent outcomes (Barber, 1997; Bean et al., 1999; Linver & Silverberg, 1997; Peterson & Hann, 2000). That is, this strategy permits researchers to establish whether a specific dimension of parenting is the primary predictor of particular psychosocial outcomes among children and adolescents (Barber, 1997; Bean et al., 1999; Linver & Silverberg, 1997; Peterson & Hann, 2000).
Therefore, an important objective of research that focuses on individual dimensions of parenting behavior is to examine specific aspects of parenting styles to more precisely define the primary predictors of various negative and positive psychosocial outcomes. Researchers following this approach may be able to more precisely identify which dimensions of parental behavior are contributing to specific child and adolescent outcomes (e.g., externalizing versus internalizing disorders). Studies examining the relationships between specific parental behaviors and adolescent outcomes among samples of European Americans, Asian Americans, Chinese in Hong Kong and Singapore, and other non-Western cultural groups have found significant positive relationships between parental support, behavioral control, psychological autonomy (i.e., the reverse of psychological control) and (a) adolescent self-esteem and (b) academic achievement (Allen et al., 1994; Barber et al., 1992; Cheung & Lau, 1985; Herman et al., 1997; Linver & Silverberg, 1997; Lau & Cheung, 1987; Sim, 2000).

Although no studies have examined these relationships among mainland Chinese, significant negative relationships have been reported between parental support and parental behavioral control and (a) adolescent depression and (b) adolescent antisocial behavior among mainland Chinese and Asian Americans (Chen, Greenberger, Lester, Dong, & Guo, 1998; Greenberger & Chen, 1996).

Another important concern regarding global conceptualizations of parenting, such as Baumrind’s parenting styles typology, is the lack of explanatory power among ethnic minorities and/or non-Western cultural groups. Several studies have concluded that the parenting style typologies are not as predictive of similar outcomes across ethnic groups
(Dornbusch et al., 1987; Steinberg et al., 1991; Steinberg et al., 1992). For example, Dornbusch et al. reported that authoritative parenting was a positive predictor of academic achievement among European Americans, but was not significantly related to the academic achievement of Asian Americans. Authoritarian parenting was the only parenting style significantly related (negatively) to the academic achievement of Asian Americans. Findings such as these have led some researchers to prematurely conclude that Asian-American parents are authoritarian. However, despite these findings, Asian Americans in this sample had significantly higher academic achievement in comparison to adolescents from the other ethnic groups. A more recent conclusion by Steinberg et al. (1992) points to the differential contribution and importance of peer support across ethnic groups to explain this paradox. Steinberg et al. suggest that among Asian Americans, peer support for academic achievement offsets the negative influence of authoritarian parenting.

Other scholars assert that parenting style typologies do not capture the aspects of Asian (i.e., Chinese) parenting such as the notion of child-training and the methods used by Asian parents to convey love and caring to their children (Chao, 1994). That is, cultural influences among Asian-American parents and other non-Western cultural groups perhaps are not captured, and therefore overlooked, in the conceptualization of the parenting style typology (Chao, 1994; Lam, 1997). Therefore, by focusing on the relationships between the three main dimensions of parenting (i.e., support, behavioral control and psychological control) and (a) adolescent self-esteem and (b) academic
achievement, a more accurate model of socialization among ethnically diverse families can be developed (Barber, 1998; Herman et al., 1997).

**Parental support.** Specific parenting behaviors that express support include verbal expressions of love and caring as well as physical affection in the form of hugs and kisses (Peterson & Hann, 2000). Parental support includes affection, warmth, nurturance, companionship, and responsiveness (Barber, 1997; Peterson & Hann, 2000; Peterson & Rollins, 1987; Rollins & Thomas, 1979). In other words, supportive behaviors express confidence, love, acceptance, and feelings of value for the young (Barber et al., 1992; Barber, 1997; Peterson & Hann, 2000; Peterson & Rollins, 1987; Rollins & Thomas, 1979). Parental support is especially useful for fostering close relationships between parents and adolescents (Peterson & Hann, 2000). Supportive childrearing behaviors are positive predictors of social competence among children and adolescents (Barber, 1997; Baumrind, 1978, 1991). Studies examining the relationship between parental support and adolescent self-esteem and/or academic achievement among European Americans and Chinese in Hong Kong and Singapore have reported positive relationships (Cheung & Lau, 1985; Gecas & Schwalbe, 1986; Harter, 1993, 1995; Hoelter & Harper, 1987; Lau & Cheung, 1987; Linver & Silverberg, 1997; Sim, 2000; Stewart, Bond, Deeds, Westrick, & Wong, 1999). Although no studies have examined the relationship between parental support and adolescent self-esteem and/or academic achievement in mainland China, parental support has been found to negatively predict antisocial behavior and depression among adolescents in mainland China (Chen et al., 1998; Greenberger & Chen, 1996).
Parental behavioral control. Methods of firm parental control such as parents’ efforts aimed at supervising adolescents are defined as behavioral control. In other words, parental behavioral control consists of clearly communicated rules and consistent discipline during the monitoring of youth activities (Baumrind, 1971; Peterson & Hann, 2000; Peterson & Rollins, 1987).

During adolescence, youth continue to require parental supervision as a means of fostering social competence, but also to guard against any drift toward delinquent behavior. Parenting behavior characterized as permissive, or low in behavioral control, has been found to predict such adverse outcomes as more frequent drug use and delinquent behavior (Baumrind, 1991; Brown, Mounts, Lamborn, & Steinberg, 1993; Dornbusch et al., 1987). Parents use behavioral control attempts to communicate and enforce a clear set of standards for children and adolescents. When used in a non-arbitrary manner, adolescents will have clear sets of standards against which to evaluate themselves and, thereby, foster the development of social competence (Barber, 1996, 1997; Baumrind, 1991; Peterson & Hann, 2000). Positive feelings about oneself are best facilitated when the rules are clear as opposed to when rules are either unclear or arbitrarily imposed (Peterson & Hann, 2000). In addition, parents who monitor the activities of their adolescents are more likely to facilitate adolescent academic achievement (Askawa & Csikszentmihalyi, 1998; Chao, 1994; Linver & Silverberg, 1997; Steinberg et al., 1992; Stewart et al., 1998).

Parental psychological control. Excessive, arbitrary, and coercive parental behaviors that inhibit the development of psychological autonomy among children and
adolescents are referred to as psychological control (Barber, 1997; Peterson, Rollins & Thomas, 1985). Psychologically controlling parental behaviors fail to communicate clear expectations, and therefore, children and adolescents are not provided with a rationale against which to evaluate themselves. These arbitrary control attempts serve to devalue adolescent’s sense of self, with lower self-evaluations developing as parents communicate rejection and a lack of respect for the young (Openshaw & Thomas, 1996). Recent studies among US samples have supported the view that psychological control is a negative predictor of self-esteem and academic achievement in the young (Openshaw & Thomas, 1986; Bean et al., 1999; Linver & Silverberg, 1997). Preliminary findings from a cross-cultural study of adolescents in the US, Colombia, Gaza, South Africa, India, and Australia indicate that parental psychological control is a significant positive predictor of internalizing problems (Barber, 1998). In addition, studies of Russian preschoolers indicate that maternal psychological control is significantly related to increased externalizing problems (Olsen et al., 2000). The relationship between parental psychological control and child and adolescent outcomes among Asians is not as clear. In a recent cross-cultural study, for example, Leung, Lau, and Lam (1998) found that some aspects of parental psychological control, defined as general authoritarianism (strict obedience towards parents), positively predicted academic achievement among Hong Kong Chinese, but was unrelated to grades among European-American and Australian adolescents. However, aspects of parental psychological control defined as academic authoritarianism (over demanding and punitive parenting as related to
academic activities), negatively predicted academic achievement among all three cultural groups.

**Cultural Influences: Autonomy and Conformity**

The likelihood that socialization influences will differ across cultures is often conceptualized at macro-levels of social organization (i.e., societies) such as through the constructs of individualism versus collectivism (Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Triandis, 1995). Although all societies probably place some emphasis on individualistic and collectivistic values, it is also likely that cultures vary in the relative degree that each of these general social orientations is fostered (Kagitcibasi, 1994, Triandis, 1994). From this perspective, individuals who are socialized within collectivistic societies receive greater encouragement toward conformity to their parents, family, and larger social groups. That is, children and adolescents are socialized towards interdependence in their personal attributes and social relationships (Lam, 1997; Triandis, 1995). In contrast, persons within individualistic societies are encouraged to become autonomous in reference to personal attributes and social relationships (Triandis, 1995). These differing social orientations are thought to result in different family relationships, parent-child interactions, self-conceptions, and academic achievement (Asakawa & Csikszentmihalyi, 1998; Chao, 1996; Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Triandis, 1995, 1989).

A frequent assumption is that East Asian societies (e.g., China) are considered to be highly “collectivistic” in social orientation, whereas Western societies (e.g., the US) are considered to be highly “individualistic” in their general social orientation (Triandis, 1995). Eastern European societies (e.g., Russia) are considered to be somewhere in
between depending on various social conditions such as level of industrialization, urbanization, and political climate (Hofstede, 1980; Shlapentokh, 1991; Tower et al., 1997; Triandis, 1989; 1995). In collectivistic societies, social traits such as interdependence, group loyalty, strong family bonds, interpersonal conformity, and connections with others are encouraged (Lam, 1997; Triandis, 1995). In contrast, individualistic societies are described as emphasizing social traits such as independence, autonomy, assertiveness, individual creativity, and individual risk-taking (Triandis, 1989; Triandis, Bontempo, Villareal, Asai, & Lucca, 1988). Such contrasts in general social orientations (i.e., societal prescriptions for social conduct) between these three cultural groups (i.e., European Americans, Mainland Chinese, and Russians), therefore, indicate that socialization influences at family relationship levels may differ from one society to another (Lam, 1997; Tafarodi, & Swann, 1996; Triandis, 1995). This suggests, in turn, that societies whose general social values are different from Western individualistic societies may also encourage a different pattern of relationships between parenting behaviors and child/adolescent outcomes (Kagitcibasi, 1996).

The present study examines the mediating and indirect influences of two dimensions of the parent-adolescent relationship that represent the influence of individualism and collectivism. Conformity to parents’ expectations represents the influence of collectivism within the parent-adolescent relationship, whereas autonomy from parents represents the influence of an individualistic social orientation at the family relationship level of analyses. Both of these variables are expected to predict adolescent self-esteem and academic achievement among Chinese, Russian, and European-
American adolescents, although in somewhat different patterns within each cultural group.

Studies within diverse cultural groups have found that parents (i.e., through parenting behaviors and styles) influence the development of adolescent self-esteem and academic achievement (Dornbusch et al., 1987; Cheung & Lau, 1985; Scott et al., 1991; Steinberg et al., 1992). In addition, during the socialization process, parents facilitate (i.e., through the use of parenting behaviors) the internalization of conformity to parents and autonomy from parents (Peterson et al., 1985; Peterson, Bush, & Supple, 1999). In turn, autonomy from parents and conformity to parents influence adolescent development (Allen, Hauser, Bell, & O’Connor, 1994; Cheung & Lau, 1985; Peterson et al., 1985; Peterson et al., 1999). More specifically, research among samples of adolescents in the US and Hong Kong has revealed positive relationships between autonomy from parents and adolescent self-esteem (Allen et al., 1994; Cheung & Lau, 1985; Litovsky & Dusek, 1985). In addition, findings from studies of culturally diverse US samples (i.e., including Asian-Americans) suggest that parents who allow for the development of autonomy among adolescents facilitate academic achievement (Asakawa & Csikszentmihalyi, 1998; Herman et al., 1997). The relationships between conformity to parents and adolescent self-esteem and academic achievement, however, are more speculative. That is, very little research has examined these relationships. However, theoretical work following the individualism-collectivism perspective suggests that conformity to parents is highly valued among collectivistic cultural groups and serves to facilitate child and adolescent psychosocial competence (Lam, 1997; Triandis, 1995).
Conformity to parents. Adolescents' adherence to parental expectations, values, and beliefs is an aspect of relationship interdependence between adolescents and parents (Peterson, Rollins & Thomas, 1985). Following this view of relationship interdependence, moderate levels of conformity to parents are considered to be neither excessive nor intrusive (Grotevant & Cooper, 1986; Peterson, Bush, & Supple, 1999). Moreover, manifestations of collectivism within the parent-adolescent relationship, such as conformity to parents, represent a secure base or primary bond from which a healthy sense of self can emerge (Peterson et al., 1999; Silverberg & Gondoli, 1996).

Researchers commonly assert that a moderate degree of adolescent conformity to parents is necessary within families in any culture in order for effective cooperation and social relationships to occur (Henry, Wilson, & Peterson, 1989; Peterson, Rollins, & Thomas, 1985; Thomas, Gecas, Weigert, & Rooney, 1974; Youniss & Smollar, 1985).

Research suggests that adolescents in more collectivistic cultures (e.g., China and Russia) demonstrate greater conformity to parental expectations in comparison to adolescents from more individualistic cultures such as the US (Roer-Strier & Rivilis, 1998; Thomas & Weigert, 1971; Zang & Thomas, 1994). Moreover, studies have found that adolescent conformity to parental expectations is a socialization outcome that parents from collectivistic societies assign high value (Bronfenbrenner, 1970; Triandis, 1995; Okagaki & Sternberg, 1993). This suggests that, in turn, within collectivistic cultures, aspects of youthful self-concept development may be more strongly rooted in conformity to parents than cultures characterized as individualistic. In addition, successful academic achievement, which is a highly valued outcome among parents from
some collectivistic groups (e.g., East Asian), is likely to be facilitated by the same parenting practices that encourage conformity (Asakawa & Csikszentmihalyi, 1998; Leung et al., 1998).

**Autonomy from parents.** The extent to which adolescents are separated or autonomous from parents is indicated through the extent to which parents have granted them autonomy within important psychosocial areas of their lives. That is, the extent to which adolescents are allowed to make their own decisions and engage in activities without excessive control are indicators of how autonomous adolescents are in reference to their parents (Peterson et al., 1999). Autonomy from parents is an aspect of individualistic orientations as manifested within the parent-adolescent relationship (Bush, in press).

Studies examining adolescent autonomy from parents cross-culturally report that Chinese parents (Feldman & Quatman, 1988) and Russian parents (Roer-Strier & Riviis, 1998) have later expectations for when their adolescents should acquire behavioral and psychological autonomy compared to Western adolescents. Researchers who have surveyed samples of adolescents from Western societies consistently have reported positive relationships between autonomy and adolescent self-esteem (Allen, Hauser, Bell, & O'Connor, 1994; Litovsky & Dusek, 1985). Moreover, although contrary to what would be expected following the individualism and collectivism perspective, positive relationships between autonomy from parents and self-esteem have been reported for Chinese adolescents from Hong Kong (Cheung & Lau, 1985; Lau & Cheung, 1987). Although autonomy may be valued in both Eastern and Western societies (Cheung &
Lau, 1985; Lau & Cheung, 1987; Yau & Smetana, 1996), theoretical ideas rooted in the individualism versus collectivism distinction between cultures would suggest that autonomy plays a greater role in individualistic cultures (e.g., the US) than in collectivistic cultures (e.g., mainland China) (Lam, 1997; Triandis et al., 1988; Triandis, 1989; Triandis et al., 1990).

Following the individualism-collectivism perspective, autonomy from parents should also be related to higher school performance among European-American adolescents, whereas autonomy from parents should not be positively related to school performance among collectivistic cultural groups. However, results from a study examining parental influences on the psychosocial competence of an ethnically diverse US sample indicate that parenting behaviors facilitating adolescent psychological autonomy were positive predictors of academic achievement across each cultural group (Herman et al., 1997). Moreover, findings from a recent cross-cultural study of European Americans and Asian Americans have indicated that Asian-American parents provided both a structured home environment and support for adolescent's autonomy in relation to academic activities (Asakawa & Csíkszentmihalyi, 1998). However, this measure of autonomy was directly related to academic activities, whereas more general measures of autonomy from parents, such as the one used in this study, may not have the same relationship.

In summary, theoretical and empirical work on family socialization indicates that the three parental behaviors to be investigated in this study (i.e., support, behavioral control, and psychological control) are direct predictors of adolescent social competence.
(Barber, 1997, 1998; Barber & Olsen, 1997; Baumrind, 1991; Herman et al., 1997; Steinberg et al., 1991). However, no cross-national studies have examined the relationships between these parenting behaviors and (a) adolescent self-esteem and (b) academic achievement among mainland Chinese and Russian adolescents. Theoretical literature based on the individualism and collectivism perspective suggests that parenting practices and desired adolescent outcomes will vary across countries (i.e., individualistic versus collectivistic social orientations) with conformity to parents being facilitated within collectivistic cultures and autonomy from parents being socialized among individualistic cultural groups (i.e., European-Americans). In addition, theoretical and empirical literature suggests that conformity to parents and autonomy from parents influence adolescent self-esteem and academic achievement. However, no previous studies have examined the relationships between parenting behaviors and adolescent self-esteem and academic achievement while also considering the influences of autonomy from parents and conformity to parents on these relationships. Therefore, this study attempts to fill this current gap in the literature by examining the impact of maternal and paternal behaviors on these aspects of adolescent psychosocial competence among mainland Chinese, Russian, and European Americans while also investigating the intervening influence of culture (i.e., autonomy and conformity) on the parent-adolescent relationship.

**Research Questions**

Because of the lack of research on the hypothesized relationships (i.e., especially among the Chinese and Russian samples), this study is more exploratory in nature, and
specific hypotheses have not been generated. Instead four main research questions were examined (See Figure 1).

(1) What are the direct and indirect relationships between the three dimensions of parenting behavior, autonomy from parents, and adolescent self-esteem? That is, does the intervening variable of autonomy from parents serve as a link (i.e., mediator) between the dimensions of parenting behavior and adolescent self-esteem, and what are the effects on the direct relationships (i.e., between the parenting behaviors and adolescent self-esteem) when the intervening variable (i.e., autonomy from parents) is included?

(2) What are the direct and indirect relationships between the three dimensions of parenting behavior, autonomy from parents, and adolescent academic achievement? That is, does the intervening variable of autonomy from parents serve as a link (i.e., mediator) between the dimensions of parenting behavior and adolescent academic achievement, and what are the effects on the direct relationships (i.e., between the parenting behaviors and adolescent academic achievement) when the intervening variable (i.e., autonomy from parents) is included?

(3) What are the direct and indirect relationships between the three dimensions of parenting behavior, conformity to parents, and adolescent self-esteem? That is, does the intervening variable of conformity to parents serve as a link (i.e., mediator) between the dimensions of parenting behavior and adolescent self-esteem, and what are the effects on the direct relationships (i.e., between the parenting behaviors and adolescent self-esteem) when the intervening variable (i.e., conformity to parents) is included?
Figure 1.1: Hypothesized relationships between parenting, autonomy, conformity, self-esteem and academic achievement
(4) What are the direct and indirect relationships between the three dimensions of parenting behavior, conformity to parents, and adolescent academic achievement? That is, does the intervening variable of conformity to parents serve as a link (i.e., mediator) between the dimensions of parenting behavior and adolescent academic achievement, and what are the effects on the direct relationships (i.e., between the parenting behaviors and adolescent self-esteem) when the intervening variable (conformity to parents) is included?

Previous research suggests that differences may exist in the patterns of influence between mothers and fathers on developmental outcomes of boys and girls (Bartle et al., 1989; Block, 1983; Demo, Small, & Savin-Williams, 1987). In addition, previous empirical and theoretical work also suggests that the relationships examined here may vary across cultural groups (Chao, 1994; Lam, 1997; Peterson, 1995; Triandis, 1995). Therefore, gender (i.e., gender of parent and gender of adolescent) and cultural group (i.e., Chinese, European-American, and Russian) were included as moderating variables in the examination of the four research questions. That is, the patterns of direct and indirect relationships in the four research questions stated above were also examined for differences and similarities by (a) gender of adolescent; (b) gender of parent; and (c) cultural group. Following this, the analyses were conducted separately by each gender dyad (e.g., fathers-daughters) for each cultural group, resulting in four subsamples within each of the three cultural groups, for a total of twelve (i.e., culture by gender) subsamples.
Definition of Variables

Parental Support

Dimensions of parenting behavior characterized as supportive include affection, warmth, nurturance, companionship, and responsiveness (Barber, 1997; Peterson & Hann, 2000). Parental supportive behaviors have been reported to facilitate the development of adolescent self-esteem and/or academic achievement among European Americans and Chinese in Hong Kong and Singapore (Cheung & Lau, 1985; Dornbusch et al., 1987; Gecas & Schwalbe, 1986; Harter, 1993; Sim, 2000; Stewart et al., 1999).

Parental Behavioral Control

Parental behavioral control refers to parents' methods of firm control aimed towards monitoring the behaviors and activities of youth (Baumrind, 1971; Peterson & Hann, 2000; Peterson & Rollins, 1987). That is, dimensions of parenting behaviors characterized as behavioral control consist of clearly communicated rules and consistent discipline during the monitoring of adolescent activities (Barber, 1996, 1997; Peterson & Hann, 2000). Parental behavioral control has been found to predict adolescent academic achievement among ethnically diverse US samples (Herman et al., 1997). Moreover, parents are more likely to facilitate positive self-evaluations among adolescents when clear role expectations are conveyed by parents (Barber, 1996; Peterson & Hann, 2000).

Parental Psychological Control

Dimensions of parental behaviors characterized as excessive, arbitrary, and coercive inhibit the development of psychological autonomy among adolescents (Barber, 1997; Peterson, Rollins, & Thomas, 1985). These psychologically controlling parental
behaviors are negatively related to adolescent self-esteem and academic achievement (Openshaw & Thomas, 1986; Bean et al., 1999; Herman et al., 1997; Linver & Silverberg, 1997).

Autonomy from Parents

The extent to which parents allow adolescents to make their own decisions and engage in activities without excessive control are indicators of how autonomous adolescents are in reference to their parents (Peterson et al., 1999). Autonomy from parents has been found to be positively related to adolescent self-esteem among European-American adolescents (Allen et al., 1994; Litovsky & Dusek, 1985) and Chinese adolescents in Hong Kong (Cheung & Lau, 1985; Lau & Cheung, 1987). Moreover, parenting behaviors facilitating adolescent autonomy have been found to be positive predictors of academic achievement within an ethnically diverse US sample of adolescents (Herman et al., 1997).

Conformity to Parents

Conformity to parents refers to adolescents' perceptions of adherence to parental expectations, values, and beliefs (Peterson et al., 1985). Empirical and theoretical literature suggest that a moderate degree of adolescent conformity to parents is necessary within families across cultures in order for effective cooperation and social relationships (Henry et al., 1989; Peterson et al., 1985; Thomas et al., 1974; Youniss & Smollar, 1985).
Adolescent Self-Esteem

Self-esteem refers to the evaluative component of the self, that is, the extent that one views himself/herself as worthy and virtuous (Rosenberg, 1965). During interaction with family members, adolescents develop a sense of self in which either a positive or negative self-image or self-esteem is developed (Gecas & Schwab, 1983, 1986). As some adolescents interact with parents, they develop a sense of approval over their abilities and view themselves as worthy of positive regard (i.e., positive self-esteem). When adolescents develop concepts of themselves as worthy individuals they are viewed as having an internal psychological resource that plays a key role in socially competent behavior (Rollins & Thomas, 1979). That is, having a sense of self as being worthy serves both as a resource for interactions with others and as an important aspect of social competence (Rollins & Thomas, 1979). Adolescents who fail to receive a sense of approval during interaction with parents are more likely to develop a negative self-esteem or low self regard (Gecas & Schwab, 1986).

Adolescent Academic Achievement

For the purpose of this study, academic achievement refers to: (a) adolescents' effort exerted in school; (b) importance of education to the adolescent; (c) the extent that adolescents are satisfied with school; and (d) adolescents actual performance (i.e., grades) at school (Supple & Peterson, 1997).
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

There have been no previous studies examining autonomy and conformity as mediators between parenting and adolescent self-esteem and academic achievement among Russian and/or mainland Chinese. Moreover, no previous studies were found that have examined parenting influences on adolescent self-esteem among Russians and Mainland Chinese, nor studies examining parental influences on academic achievement among Russians. Therefore, the sparse literature on the socialization within families in Russia and mainland China is reviewed.

Self-concept and self-esteem are considered central components of child and adolescent development (Coopersmith, 1976; Harter, 1993). However, results from cross-cultural studies suggest that self-concept development is more interdependent among collectivistic cultural groups in comparison to individualistic cultural groups (Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Triandis, 1989; 1995). Findings such as these suggest potential methodological issues for measurement of self-concept and self-esteem among non-Western cultural groups. Therefore, the literature on self-construal across cultures, the impact on self-esteem development, and the measurement of self-esteem among non-Western cultural groups are reviewed. Following this, studies examining the
relationships between parenting and self-esteem development among non-Western cultural groups are reviewed. Literature on academic achievement among adolescents, and parental influences on academic achievement among non-Western cultural groups are then reviewed.

Socialization in Russian Families

Russia has undergone several economic and political changes in recent years. These changes have had a tremendous negative impact on the family (Artamonova, 1996; Ermollenko, 1996; Gurko, 1997; Kharlamov & Kobzar, 1993; Rybinskii, 1995). Several social indicators have been observed, including declining fertility rate, increased poverty, and the increasing instability of marriage (Gurko, 1997; Rybinskii, 1995). Most scholars investigating the current state of Russian families point to the dramatic political and economic changes as the major factors impinging upon the family (Artamonova, 1996; Kharlamov & Kobzar, 1993; Rybinskii, 1995; Scheer & Unger, 1998). The societal level changes have taken away the securities that Russian families depended on during the Soviet era e.g., the guaranteed right to work and free medical care, transportation, and housing (Artamonova, 1996).

With the disintegration of the family and larger societal level changes, educators and researchers suggest that the socialization of children and adolescents has been weakened (Artamonova, 1996; Ermollenko, 1996; Kharlamov & Kobzar, 1993; Rybinskii, 1995). The rates of adolescents leaving school early, delinquency, depression, substance abuse, and young adult unemployment have all increased in post-Soviet times (Artamonova, 1996; Ermollenko, 1996; Rybinskii, 1995; Scheer & Unger, 1998).
Some researchers assert that the socioeconomic problems are the main reason for socialization problems within the family. Rybinskii (1995) reviews findings from recent studies on the state of childhood in Russia and concludes that the majority of families (77%) spend at least half their income on their children. These findings indicate that parents are fulfilling their socializing roles to the best of their ability within severe economic restraints. The unstable economy and low wages are requiring parents to work long hours in order to provide for their families, leading to limited interaction between parents and their children, especially in single parent families (Gurko, 1997; Rybinskii, 1995).

An alternative view is that these negative outcomes among adolescents are in part because of the decreased emphasis on socialization in the schools (Fradkin & Plokhova, 1996; Kharlamov & Kobzar, 1993). From this perspective, parents suddenly have been given the huge responsibility of raising their children without the structure and discipline, that was provided by the schools in Soviet times (Fradkin & Plokhova, 1996; Kharlamov & Kobzar, 1993). During the Soviet Era, the government promoted childrearing methods designed to foster behavior and attitudes in the young that would benefit the society (Bronfenbrenner, 1970; Ispa, 1995). The family was not considered the primary socializing agent of young; rather this was the function of government-run schools and youth collectives (Althausen, 1996; Bronfenbrenner, 1970; Hogan, Maddock, Antov, & Matskovsky, 1994). Moreover, the style of childrearing practices that Russian young experienced substantially differed across the two contexts (Bronfenbrenner, 1970).
The school setting children and adolescents experienced followed the harshness of living in a strict government-run society (Ispa, 1995). The atmosphere at schools created by the formal government-run structure along with the lack of parental influence resulted in an environment characterized by restrictiveness and emotional distance (Bronfenbrenner, 1970; Ispa, 1995). In contrast, the family environment was characterized as overprotective, indulgent (Althausen, 1996), permissive, and warm (Ispa, 1995).

In a recent article examining parent-adolescent relationships in Russia during these changing times, Gurko (1997) concludes that there is a great need for empirical study of childrearing and parenthood in modern day Russia. She describes previous studies in these areas as focusing on “a-social families” because of the belief that these families deviated from the supposed homogeneous majority of families that adhered to Soviet ideals. Gurko found adolescents to be more autonomous (i.e., compared to what was expected in Soviet times) and parents to be somewhat permissive, allowing for adolescents to share in decision making.

Few empirical studies (i.e., published in English) exist that have directly examined relationships between adolescent outcomes and parental behavior among Russian families (Gurko, 1997; Scheer & Unger, 1998). Considering the lack of recent empirical work to guide studies in this area, the individualism and collectivism perspective may prove useful. These macro-level variables have been found to vary substantially across cultures, especially those of varying political ideologies (Hofstede, 1980; Triandis, 1989). Russia’s history of communism, in which the goals and the good
of the state were put before those of the individual, correlate highly with collectivist ideology (Stephan & Abalakina-Papp, 1996; Tower, Kelly, & Richards, 1997). Moreover, a recent study reported that Russians emphasize maintaining group harmony and the pursuit of the collective goal, and they scored significantly higher on measures of collectivism in comparison to a Western sample (Tower et al., 1997).

Socialization in Chinese Families

Mainland Chinese society has experienced many political and economic changes in the last fifty years that have impacted the socialization of its family members (Stevenson, Chen & Lee, 1992). Communism became the political structure in the late 1940s, and influenced families in many ways. Formalized religion was discouraged in China, taking away social resources for moral education and the socialization of children. Consequently, families suddenly were faced with the task of providing these services to their offspring without formalized support and guidance. Along with political changes came great economic changes and poverty for most Chinese families. The great economic stress experienced by families encouraged an increased emphasis on collectivism because families needed to work together and cooperate to survive (Stevenson et al., 1992).

The political structure of communism also has contributed to influencing collectivistic attributes among mainland Chinese. However, the welcoming of Western investment in mainland China over the past decade has brought individualistic influences not only in the economic arena, but values and interaction within parent-adolescent relationships have also been characterized as more Western (Chen & Lan, 1998).
Both Western and Eastern scholars have investigated the different cultural, psychological, and social contexts of Western and Eastern societies in attempts to explain differences in the socialization patterns of Chinese parents (Berndt, Cheung, Lau, Heu, & Lew, 1993; Feldman, Rosenthal, Mont-Reynaud, Leung, & Lau, 1991; Lau, Lew, Hau, Cheung, & Berndt, 1990; Stevenson et al., 1992). Only a few studies, however, have examined how parents have influenced mainland Chinese adolescent's social competencies (i.e., self-esteem or academic achievement), or mental health outcomes (Chen & Lan, 1998; Shek, 1996). The limited number of studies that have examined the influences of parenting practices on adolescent development tend to conceptualize parenting behaviors as broadly defined categories of parental warmth, and parental control (Berndt et al., 1993; Lau et al., 1990).

Parent-child relationships in China are commonly believed to be strongly influenced by a collectivist orientation rooted in Confucius ideology, and thus these relationships vary substantially from those in Western individualistic cultures (Triandis, 1995; Yang, 1981; 1986). That is, China commonly is classified as a society that emphasizes collectivistic values, whereas western societies, such as the United States, are classified as emphasizing individualistic values (Triandis, McCusker, & Hui, 1990; Yang, 1981; 1986). Chinese socialization and formal education systems stress discipline, morality, ethics, and collectivism (Jiao, Ji, & Jing, 1986). For Chinese parents, social competence in the young often means getting along with others, diminished emphasis on individuality or autonomy, and being well behaved (Meredith, Abbott, & Zhu, 1989). Chinese youth are socialized to view themselves as serving societal rather
than individual goals (Jiao et al., 1986; Meredith et al., 1989). Adolescents in Chinese cultures are expected to conform to socialistic ideology, practice self-reliance, become self-sacrificing, and respect collectivistic or group decisions (Wei, 1983). Moreover, Chinese parents typically have been reported to discourage such personality characteristics as independence and creativity, and they are viewed as strictly prohibiting aggression, and impulsive behavior (Ho, 1986; Meredith et al., 1989).

Traditional descriptions of parenting in Chinese cultures portray families as consisting of kind (i.e., warm) mothers and strict (i.e., controlling) fathers (Berndt et al., 1993; Lau et al., 1990). Reviews of research on Chinese parenting within Hong Kong, other non-mainland Chinese societies, and in mainland China have portrayed parents as adhering to these traditional roles that are supportive of collectivist orientations (Lau et al., 1990; Ho, 1981, 1989; Triandis, 1989). For example, adults in mainland China retrospectively described mothers as warmer and less controlling than fathers (Lau et al., 1990). In contrast, recent research on adolescents in Hong Kong indicates that both mothers and fathers are warm and controlling (Yau & Smetana, 1996).

Self-Esteem

Self-esteem is considered a central component of child and adolescent development (Coopersmith, 1967; Gecas & Burke, 1995; Gecas & Sheff, 1990; Harter, 1993; Owens, 1994). Self-esteem during adolescence often is viewed as an important resource for preventing undesired psychosocial outcomes among adolescents. For example, youth with lower self-esteem are viewed as being more susceptible to psychopathology, social problems, dropping out of school, and poor school performance.
Adolescents with low self-esteem are more likely to experience these undesirable outcomes because of their increased vulnerability to negative influences (Mecca, Smelser, Vasconcellos, 1989; Owens, 1992; Rumberger, 1987). In contrast, youth with high or positive self-esteem are more likely to excel in school and are less vulnerable for delinquent involvements and psychopathology (Covington, 1992; Mecca et al., 1989; Owens, 1994). Consequently, gaining positive self-esteem is central to the psychological health and normative development of adolescents (Gecas & Sheff, 1990; Harter 1993, Owens, 1994).

Although definitions vary somewhat among studies, the basic consensus within the literature on self constructs has been to define self-concept as descriptive aspects and self-esteem as evaluative aspects of a person’s sense of self (Burnett, 1994; Harter, 1993, 1983; Marsh & Shavelson, 1985; Rosenberg, 1979; Shavelson, Huber & Stanton, 1976). More specifically, the descriptive aspect designates the self as an object that a person perceives, whereas the evaluative aspect refers to attitudes or feelings that individuals have towards the perceived self.

This study focuses on the measure of global self-esteem among adolescents. As the evaluative component of self-concept, self-esteem is an intregal part of one’s sense of self. Global self-esteem is viewed as an individual’s positive or negative attitude toward themselves (Rosenberg, 1965, 1979). Adolescents with high global self-esteem view themselves as being good, worthy, or virtuous (Gecas & Schwalbe, 1986; Harter, 1993, 1995; Rosenberg, 1965; 1979). In contrast, one’s perceived weakness predominates for those adolescents with low global self-esteem, and these youth view themselves as

Scholars examining self-system variables cross-culturally consistently have found differences at the cultural level (Kagitcibasi, 1984, 1990, 1996; Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Triandis, 1989, 1995; Watkins et al., 1998). These differences are found in the importance of others to one’s sense of self, with the development of “self” being more separate, distinct, and independent of others in Western (individualistic) cultures. In contrast, self-construal within Eastern (collectivistic) cultures is described as being in relation to others or interdependent (Kagitcibasi, 1984, 1990, 1996; Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Triandis, 1989, 1995). The main theoretical perspective guiding this body of research has been the individualism-collectivism perspective (e.g., Triandis, 1989, 1995).

The individualism-collectivism perspective emphasizes the contrasts between the subordination of personal goals to those of the group, such as family and or society (collectivism), and the priority of personal goals over in-group goals (individualism) (Triandis, 1995). Societies such as East Asia (e.g., mainland China) and Eastern Europe (e.g., Russia) are considered collectivistic, whereas Western societies (e.g., the US) are considered to be individualistic (Shlapentokh, 1991; Triandis, 1989, 1995; Tower, Kelly, & Richards, 1997). Cultures characterized as collectivistic emphasize connectedness, interdependence, and define “self” as an aspect of in-groups (e.g., family, social groups, society). On the other hand, cultures characterized as individualistic emphasize autonomy and independence; thus self-construal is characterized as more autonomous from others (e.g., family, society and other social groups). Although macro level influences on social orientation, such as individualism-collectivism, have typically been
conceptualized as a bipolar dimension, recent work has recognized the variability within cultures and the likelihood that each of these dimensions (collectivism and individualism) co-exist within a given culture (Kagitcibasi, 1996, 1994; Triandis, 1995, 1994).

Triandis and colleagues distinguish between three aspects of the self: (a) the private; (b) the public; and (c) the collective (Triandis, 1989, 1994, 1995; Triandis et al., 1988, 1990). The private self is described as developing from cognitions involving traits, states, or behaviors of the person. In other words, the private self is an assessment of the self by the self. The public self is described as developing from cognitions concerning the generalized other's view of the self and corresponds to an assessment of the self by the generalized other. The collective self is described as developing from cognitions concerning a view of the self that is rooted in some collective such as the family, society, or other social group. The collective self corresponds to an assessment of the self in reference to a specific social group. Triandis and colleagues have found that each of these three forms of self-construal exist among collectivistic and individualistic cultures, but that within collectivistic cultures, the public and collective self is sampled more frequently, whereas the sampling of the private self is less frequent. In contrast, among individualistic cultural groups, the private self is sampled more frequently and the collective and public self is less frequently sampled.

The general social orientation of the culture (i.e., collectivism or individualism) is seen as impacting socialization practices (e.g., parents' childrearing), which, in turn, are seen as influencing self-construal (Triandis, 1989, 1995; Kagitcibasi, 1990, 1994, 1996).
Parents in collectivistic cultures foster a more "interdependent" or "relational" self-construal by emphasizing obedience and interdependence through authoritarian parenting styles (Kagitcibasi, 1996). In other words, the socialization process in collectivistic cultures fosters conformity and interdependence through subordination of individual interests and goals in favor of the goals and interests of the family through parenting practices that discourage independence, creativity, assertiveness and individuality (Kagitcibasi, 1996; Triandis, 1989, 1995). In contrast, parents in individualistic cultures foster a more "independent" or "private" self-construal through the use of authoritative parenting styles which emphasize independence, autonomy, assertiveness, and individuality (Kagitcibasi, 1984; 1996; Triandis, 1995, 1989).

The evidence that self-construal varies among collectivistic and individualistic cultures have led researchers to examine the theoretical and empirical implications for the differential development of self-system variables among Western and non-Western cultural groups. Following the perspective that self-construal differs from cultural influences, it is important to reexamine the validity of constructs and instruments assessing self-system variables that have been largely developed among non-Western cultural groups.

Researchers examining cross-cultural self-concept development have reported differences in the importance or salience of self-concept domains across cultures. For example, family and social relationship domains of self-concept are more salient among collectivistic cultural groups compared to individualistic cultural groups (Bochner, 1994; Watkins et al., 1998). In addition, Pang (1981) concluded that physical attractiveness
was more important to the self-concept of European Americans as compared to Asian Americans.

Hamid and Cheng (1995) found that the self-esteem of Chinese college students was more influenced by collectivistic attributes. That is, Chinese with higher self-esteem also scored higher on collectivistic attributes. These authors propose that these collectivistic attributes are incorporated into the self-evaluation schemata of Chinese. Self-evaluation schemata refer to cognitive resources that organize specific attributes (i.e., self-concept dimensions) and serve as referent points to the process of self-esteem development.

Tafarodi and colleagues propose a “cultural trade off hypothesis” in which self-esteem is conceptualized two-dimensionally, with one aspect (self-liking) being facilitated more so by collectivistic social orientations and the other dimension (self-competence) being facilitated by individualistic social orientations (Tafarodi, Lang & Smith, 1999; Tafarodi & Swann, 1995, 1996; Tafarodi & Walters, 1999). Characteristics of individualistic cultures such as independence, assertiveness, and the priority given to the self over the social group are seen as facilitating “self-competence” (i.e., positive awareness of oneself as competent). In contrast, characteristics of collectivistic cultural groups such as the subordination of self-goals and self-interests to the interests and goals of the group (or accommodation to the social group), connectedness, and interdependence are seen as facilitating “self-liking” (i.e., social self-worth).

Tafarodi and colleagues assert that “self-liking” is facilitated more in collectivist social environments through the reflected actions and appraisals of others about one’s
private sense of social-worth (Tafarodi, Lang & Smith, 1999; Tafarodi & Swann, 1995, 1996; Tafarodi & Walters, 1999). In other words, self-liking requires references to socially transmitted values that define personal social-worth. Collectivistic cultures, which emphasize maintaining harmony and following group norms and expectations, are likely to receive opportunities and conformation on their social worth. On the hand, self-liking is less likely to be facilitated by individualistic social orientations that place less emphasis on maintaining group harmony and a sense of self in relation to others. In contrast, the emphasis within individualistic cultures on independence, assertiveness, and priority of the self over others is seen as being more conducive to facilitating “self-competence.” Tafarodi and colleagues (Tafarodi, Lang, & Smith, 1999; Tafarodi & Swann, 1995, 1996; Tafarodi & Walters, 1999) have investigated and found support for this hypothesis among several collectivistic and individualistic cultures.

Following the evidence that self-construal varies across cultural groups, the validity and cross-ethnic measurement equivalence of constructs assessing self-system variables is an important point for researchers to consider (Knight, Virdin, Ocampo, & Roosa, 1994). It is important to operationalize self-concept multidimensionally when examining self-concept cross-culturally and then utilize aspects of self-concept that are important to the cultural groups of interest (Lam, 1997; Watkins et al., 1998). For example, family and social relationships consistently have been found to be important aspects of self-concept among collectivistic cultural groups (Lam, 1997; Tafarodi & Swann, 1996, 1995; Triandis, 1995, 1989; Watkins et al., 1998).
In regard to global or general self-esteem, however, few studies have examined the theoretical and empirical meaning of this construct across cultures. Knight et al. (1994) examined the cross-ethnic measurement equivalence of the six-item global self-worth scale from Harter’s (1985) Self-Perception Profile For Children (SPPC) among Hispanic and European-American children. Their results were mixed, and the authors concluded that additional research is needed in assessing the cross-ethnic measurement equivalence of such measures. One recent study examined the dimensionality and cross-ethnic measurement equivalence of the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (Rosenberg, 1979, 1965) among European-American, Indian, mainland Chinese, and Russian adolescents (Bush, Bean, Bartle-Haring, Peterson, & Wilson, 2000). Preliminary findings from this cross-cultural study indicate that the five positive valence items of this scale were factorially invariant across the four cultural groups (Bush et al., 2000). These results suggest that these five items (used in the present study) represent the same construct — global positive self-esteem among Chinese, European American, Russian, and Indian adolescents (i.e., the same construct is being measured within each cultural group).

Parenting and self-esteem. Very few studies have examined socialization influences on child and adolescent outcomes in mainland China or Russia. Moreover, few existing studies have examined parenting influences as predictors of global self-esteem among mainland Chinese adolescents or Russian adolescents. The reasons behind this lack of empirical study of family socialization processes and child and adolescent outcomes within these two cultural groups are similar. Until recently, both China and the former USSR were communist countries leery of social science research
that may have painted a dismal or negative picture of family life in these countries. With the fall of the USSR in the early 1990s, and the welcoming of Western businesses and influences in mainland China during the past decade, these views have changed. Following these changes, avenues for both Eastern and Western scholars to examine previously forbidden topics such as child and adolescent socialization within the family have opened up (Chen & Lan, 1998; Gurko, 1997). Because these changes are very recent, few empirical studies on parent-adolescent relationships currently exist from samples in the former USSR (Gurko, 1997; Shlapentokh, 1991) and mainland China (Bush, in press; Chen & Lan, 1998). Therefore, to derive research questions for this study, examinations of these relationships among Chinese and Russians in other geographical locations (e.g., Hong Kong, Singapore, Taiwan, Asian Americans, and Russian immigrants in Israel) were relied upon. In addition, previously presented and published analyses from the larger study from which the data for this particular study were drawn, along with the theoretical literature (e.g., family socialization and the individualism and collectivism perspectives) guided the research questions and interpretation of the findings.

Self-esteem and parenting in collectivistic cultures. Despite theoretical and philosophical traditions that emphasize collectivistic norms, the existing research among Chinese samples suggests patterns that are surprisingly similar to those found within the individualistic traditions of Western cultures. Research on global self-esteem among Chinese adolescents (i.e., in Hong Kong) has identified parental functional control, (i.e., firm control) independence granting, (Cheung & Lau, 1985; Lau & Cheung, 1987) and
support/acceptance, (Chan & Lee, 1993; Cheung, & Lau, 1985; Lau & Cheung, 1987; Scott et al., 1991) as positive parental predictors. Dysfunctional parental control (i.e., excessive control) and rejection on the other hand have been identified as negative predictors of self-esteem (Chan & Lee, 1993; Cheung & Lau, 1985; Lau & Cheung, 1987).

Two studies, using samples of Hong Kong adolescents, conceptualized and assessed parental control as two separate variables in relationship to global self-esteem (Cheung & Lau; Lau & Cheung, 1987). Functional control or organization (i.e., firm control) is defined as clear rules established by parents that provide structure and order within the parent-adolescent relationship. Parental organization is viewed, therefore, as conveying care or concern and as preserving coordination and consistency within Chinese families. In contrast, dysfunctional control (i.e., excessive control) occurs when parents use behavior that is too restrictive, dominating, or interfering in nature.

Cheung and Lau’s (1985) study investigated the relationship between family relations, school relations, and self-esteem among Chinese adolescents in Hong Kong. Results from their study indicated that family variables were more strongly related to self-esteem than school variables. Specifically, higher self-esteem was a positive correlate of (a) greater family cohesion and support that family members provided one another; (b) greater independence, assertiveness, and self-sufficiency of family members; (c) greater participation by teenagers in social and recreational activities; (d) clearer structure and organization of family responsibilities and activities provided by parents (i.e., functional control); and (e) greater moral and religious emphasis placed on family
values. In contrast, lower self-esteem was associated with higher expressed family conflict, anger, aggression, and greater parental control characterized by restrictive rules (i.e., dysfunctional control).

In a follow-up study, Lau and Cheung (1987) assessed the relationship between Chinese adolescents’ perception of parental dysfunctional control (i.e., excessive control), parental organization (i.e., functional or firm control), and the perception of parental warmth. These results supported their earlier work (Cheung & Lau, 1985) as well as studies of adolescents from the US by indicating that self-esteem was a positive correlate of parental organization (i.e., firm control) and independence granting (Allen et al., Bartle et al., 1989). Further confirmation of this “Western” pattern was the negative relationship between the self-esteem of Chinese adolescents and dysfunctional parental control (i.e., excessive control) - - a characteristic of authoritarian parenting.

Results from these early studies (i.e., Cheung & Lau, 1985; Lau & Cheung, 1987) stand in sharp contrast to the body of literature indicating that patterns of socialization in Chinese families are likely to emphasize collectivistic values (Berndt et al., 1993; Ho, 1986; Stevenson et al., 1992; Triandis, 1995). These results also are contrary to previous research conducted in South Korea, a country that also has a collectivistic social orientation similar to that believed to be the case in China (Chun & MacDermid, 1997; Rohner & Pettengill, 1985).

For example, Chun and MacDermid (1997) examined data from a sample of South Korean adolescents and found that adolescent individuation from parents was a negative predictor of both male and female adolescents’ self-esteem. These results were
explained in terms of South Korea’s social orientation - a society that is primarily collectivistic in its central values. Specifically, adolescents who experienced greater intergenerational fusion (or a collectivistic orientation) with their parents were found to report higher self-esteem. In contrast, adolescents who were less connected with (i.e., more individualistic in reference to) parents reported lower self-esteem. This finding may perhaps indicate that these South Korean adolescents (i.e., those with lower self-esteem) did not perceive themselves as fulfilling cultural expectations for strong social relationships with their families. Consequently, this study provides support for the conventional “collectivistic” view of Asian culture, but contrasts with recent research on Chinese adolescents in Hong Kong (e.g., Cheung & Lau, 1985; Lau & Cheung, 1987). Moreover, these findings differ from what typically is expected in US society, in which psychological separation from one’s family is often thought to predict functional development and adjustment (Allison & Sabatelli, 1990, Bartle et al., 1989).

An important point to emphasize, therefore, is that most studies focusing on the self-esteem of Chinese adolescents have been conducted with samples of adolescents from Hong Kong. This metropolitan area, as a result of British colonization and control until recently, is a more “Westernized” area of China and probably shares some unique values with the US rather than mainland China (Cheung & Lau, 1985). Hong Kong youth increasingly are described as being both more interested in and actually becoming more independent and individualistic in reference to their parents (Yau & Smetana, 1996). Finally, the examination of these issues in mainland China has been hampered by the fact that little data exists on family life within The People’s Republic of China.
Academic Achievement

Because of the increasingly complex and competitive nature of modern industrialized societies, academic achievement is perhaps more important than ever before to adolescent psychosocial competence. As technological advances are made, fewer jobs will be available for less educated people. The jobs that are available for those who do not complete high school usually do not pay enough for people to support themselves without government assistance. These less educated people also may become dependent on social welfare systems by being unable to provide for their own basic subsistence needs (e.g., housing, food, and health care). Moreover, these less educated people may also resort to crime and either end up in the criminal justice system, and/or pose a hazard or burden to others in their communities. Therefore it is important for researchers to identify the predictors of adolescent academic achievement and develop prevention programs to target those at risk for poor academic achievement.

Academic achievement and parenting. Studies have consistently shown the importance of families, and more specifically, parents in facilitating academic achievement among children and adolescents (e.g., Dornbusch et al., 1987; Steinberg et al., 1992, 1991). Steinberg, Dornbusch, and Brown, (1992) refer to parental warmth (i.e., support), behavioral regulation (i.e., behavioral control), and psychological autonomy granting (i.e., the reverse of psychological control) as the three central dimensions of parenting, however indexed, that consistently predict higher levels of adolescent psychosocial competence (e.g., academic achievement). These three dimensions parallel early dimensions of parenting identified by Schaefer (1959, 1965)
and Baumrind (1967, 1991). Therefore, the three dimensions of maternal and paternal parenting examined in this study have a long history of being identified as significant predictors of adolescent academic achievement (e.g., Barber, 1997; Barber, Olsen, & Shagel, 1992; Baumrind, 1967, 1978, 1991; Dornbusch et al., 1987; Steinberg et al., 1991; Maccoby & Martin, 1983). However, the findings across diverse ethnic groups are not as clear (Steinberg et al., 1992).

*Academic achievement, parenting, and culture.* Researchers have pointed to the importance of investigating ethnic differences in academic achievement and patterns of socialization that may lead to this (Steinberg et al., 1992). Numerous empirical investigations consistently have reported differences in adolescents academic achievement across cultural groups (Steinberg, Dornbusch, & Brown, 1992; Stewart et al., 1999). More specifically, adolescents from Asian cultural groups have been found to have higher levels of academic performance when compared to other cultural groups (i.e., adolescents from Western or individualistic cultural groups); however few studies have compared Asians to other more collectivistic cultural groups (e.g., Russians).

Numerous studies have examined variables hypothesized to influence academic achievement including family and parenting influences which have been found to be strong influences across cultural groups (Chao, 1996; Dornbusch et al., 1987). However, the patterns of relationships between parenting styles/behaviors and adolescent academic achievement varies across cultural groups (Asakawa & Csikszentmihalyi, 1998; Chao, 1996; Dornbusch et al., 1987; Steinberg, Dornbusch, & Brown, 1992). In other words, the strength, direction, and/or significant relationships between specific parental
behaviors/styles and academic achievement have been found to vary across cultural
groups.

Most of the studies examining parenting influences across cultural groups have
relied upon samples of immigrant groups, such as Asian Americans, Hispanic Americans,
and African Americans. However, more recently cross-cultural comparison studies have
been conducted with national groups such as comparing Chinese in Hong Kong with
European Americans, allowing for the examination of cultural influences without the
confounds of minority status and acculturation.

Dornbusch, Ritter, Leiderman, Roberts and Fraleigh (1987) conducted a large
scale study examining the influences of parenting styles on the psychosocial competence
(including academic achievement) among a large ethnically diverse US sample. These
authors found that authoritative parenting (i.e., high of levels of responsiveness or
support and demandingness or behavioral control) positively predicted adolescent
academic achievement among European-American adolescents, but was unrelated to the
academic achievement for Asian-American adolescents. Moreover, Asian Americans
had significantly higher levels of academic achievement (i.e., self-reported grades)
compared to adolescents in the other ethnic groups. Dornbusch et al. (1987) surveyed
approximately 8,000 adolescents of diverse ethnic backgrounds (i.e., African American,
Asian American, Hispanic American, & European American). They developed a 25-item
instrument consisting of three subscales to tap each one of Baumrind’s (1971) three
parenting styles (i.e., authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive). They operationalized
each parenting style as a continuous variable and examined the relationship of each
parenting style to adolescent academic achievement across this diverse sample. Parenting style was assessed in reference to mothers and fathers, and was not examined separately for gender of parent. Their results supported Baumrind’s work in that adolescents in authoritative homes were more academically successful (i.e., except for Asian Americans). In addition, Dornbusch et al. concluded that Baumrind’s parenting typologies did not apply well to Asian Americans. For example, authoritarian parenting was the only parenting style that was significantly related (in a negative direction) to academic achievement among Asian Americans, although Asian Americans also had the highest grades in the sample. Dornbusch et al. also concluded that the benefits of authoritative parenting in relation to adolescent school performance were stronger for European Americans and Hispanics in comparison to Asian Americans and African Americans. Therefore, a paradox was present, in that despite the superior performance of Asian Americans in comparison to adolescents in the other three ethnic groups, they lived in homes characterized by an authoritarian parenting styles which was negatively related to academic achievement among adolescents in other ethnic groups (Dornbusch et al., 1987).

In a subsequent study by this group to explore this paradox, Steinberg, Mounts, Lamborn, and Dornbush (1991) examined the benefits of authoritative parenting compared to non-authoritative parenting across 16 ecological niches defined by SES, family structure, and ethnicity. The sample consisted of the same four ethnic groups, although the parenting styles were measured and operationalized differently. Steinberg et al. expanded their previous work on Baumrind’s typologies by including a measure of
psychological autonomy as an indicator of authoritative parenting, in addition to a scale measuring strictness/supervision (i.e., behavioral control) and a scale measuring acceptance and involvement (i.e., support). Authoritative parenting was defined as those who scored above the sample median on all three measures, with one score below the median on any of the three measures resulting in a being defined as non-authoritative. Steinberg et al. found that across each of the 16 ecological niches, an authoritative parenting style was related to less problem behaviors of adolescents and higher academic achievement and self-reliance. In addition, they concluded that the benefits of authoritative parenting was stronger or more apparent among European adolescents, middle-class adolescents, and adolescents in intact families. Similar to the findings of Dornbusch et al. (1987), authoritative parenting was less beneficial for academic achievement among African Americans and Asian Americans.

Evidence from these aforementioned studies indicate that although the parenting style typologies may be useful in explaining academic achievement within ethnic groups, they do not account for the between group differences (Asakawa & Csikszentmihalyi, 1998; Chao, 1994, 1996; Leung, Lau, & Lam, 1998). In a follow up study, Steinberg, Dornbusch, and Brown (1992) suggest that parenting styles are important influences on the academic performance of European-American and Hispanic-American adolescents. However, Steinberg et al. (1992) suggests that for Asian-American adolescents, peer support is a more powerful predictor of academic achievement than parenting styles. That is, these authors suggest that peer support among Asian Americans may offset the negative effects of the authoritarian parenting style.
Other researchers challenge Steinberg and colleague's (1992) assertion and emphasize that the concepts of parenting styles are not adequate to interpret the difference in academic performance between Asian Americans and European Americans (Chao, 1994; Lam, 1997). Ruth Chao (1994), for example, argues that although the concept of authoritarian parenting describes some aspects of Chinese parenting, it does not capture several important features such as caring, loving, and the notion of child-training that underlie Chinese parenting. That is, Chinese parents believe that children should be trained intensively so that they will exhibit appropriate behavior and achieve well in school, and that it is the parents' responsibility and duty to train their children. Following this, it is important to consider cross-cultural differences in perceptions of parental control (Chao, 1994, 1996; Triandis, 1995). For example, among Asian parents behavioral control, or monitoring the activities and behaviors of their child/adolescent, may actually convey to their offspring that their parents love and care about them, much the same way that parental warmth and support function among more individualistic cultural groups.

In a subsequent study, Chao (1996) conducted qualitative interviews examining Chinese-American and European-American parental beliefs about the role of parenting in children’s academic achievement. Fifty European-American and 48 Chinese-American mothers of preschoolers were interviewed. Distinctively different themes emerged regarding beliefs about the parental role in facilitating school performance among children across the two cultural groups. Chinese mothers were found to be more directive in facilitating academic achievement in their children, whereas European-American
parents took a less directive approach and emphasized that facilitating self-esteem and social skills in their children would lead to academic success (Chao, 1996). More specifically, (a) high parental expectations; (b) high parental involvement; (c) children’s respect for the family; (d) the strong emphasis on education in Chinese culture; and (e) the idea that Chinese parents stress both positive and negative outcomes of education attainment to their children were all common themes that emerged across the majority of the interviews with Chinese mothers. For European-American mothers, (a) emphasizing the idea that learning is fun and exciting; (b) placing importance on facilitating children’s self-esteem; (c) showing interest and involvement with the child in general; (d) consistent and well structured home environment; (e) avoiding burnout in young children by not pushing academics; and (f) valuing reading and education in the home all emerged as common themes.

An interesting finding that emerged from Chao’s work (1996) was the European-American mothers focus on fostering independence. That is, despite the interview questions specifically asking about the parental role in facilitating academic achievement, European-American mothers mentioned the importance of fostering individualistic traits such as self-esteem and creativity and de-emphasized stressing education too much for fear that it would lead to “burn-out.” In contrast, Chinese Americans emphasized the importance of parents in facilitating academic achievement and in socializing the importance of education and family to their children. These patterns follow the individualism and collectivism perspective and emphasize the importance not only of the differing parental socialization patterns across cultural groups,
but also the differing emphasis on desired child outcomes across cultural groups. The findings from Chao’s study suggest that collectivistic parents are more oriented to facilitate academic achievement compared to individualistic parents, and that parents from individualistic cultures place a high value on facilitating self-esteem development among their children and orient their parenting accordingly.

A recent cross-cultural study examined the relationships between parenting styles and academic achievement among Hong Kong Chinese, European-American, and Australian adolescents in order to find a better fitting model of parenting styles among Asians (Leung, Lau, & Lam, 1998). Leung and colleagues re-conceptualized Baumrind’s parenting styles used by Dornbusch and colleagues into four types based on the authoritarian and authoritative parenting styles. The combined sample consisted of 382 adolescents from the three cultures. Authoritarian parenting and authoritative parenting were each divided into two categories - - one emphasizing a general parenting style and the other emphasizing the original theme of the parenting style in reference to academic performance.

Leung et al. (1998) found that general authoritarianism, defined as strict obedience towards parents, positively predicted academic achievement among Hong Kong Chinese, but was unrelated to grades among European-American and Australian adolescents. On the otherhand, academic authoritarianism, defined as fastidious, over demanding, and punitive parenting, was negatively related to academic achievement among all three ethnic groups. As expected, general authoritativeness, defined as an egalitarian relationship between parents and children based on openness and exploration
of ideas, was a significant positive predictor of academic achievement among European-American and Australian adolescents, but was not significantly related to Chinese adolescent academic achievement. Academic authoritativeness, defined as a supportive and helpful style of parenting in regard to the school performance of adolescents, was not significantly related to academic achievement in any of the samples.

This study by Leung et al. (1998) points out the importance of separating different aspects of parental control across cultures and supports similar research findings among European American samples (e.g., Barber, 1996). That is, previous research using global constructs to represent parenting styles combined aspects of parental psychological control and behavioral control (e.g., Steinberg et al., 1991). However, when separately examined, psychological control is negatively related to academic achievement of adolescents across both individualistic and collectivistic cultural groups (Leung et al., 1998), whereas behavioral control (e.g., structure, rules and monitoring) is positively related to the academic achievement of Chinese children (Leung et al., 1998). Therefore, the conclusion that Asian parents are authoritarian is a major oversimplification (Chao, 1994, 1996; Leung et al., 1998). Moreover, perceptions of parental control by both parents and children vary across individualistic and collectivistic cultural groups (Chao, 1996; Leung et al., 1998), and researchers need to take these differing perceptions into consideration. Parental authoritarianism is less accepted among children and adolescents from individualistic cultures, but because of the socialization of collectivistic values and the subsequent internalization of these values, Asian children are more accepting of aspects of parental authoritarianism (i.e., expectations for conformity and obedience)
(Leung et al., 1998). Thus, the emphasis on education by Asian parents, along with the receptivity to parental control by Asian adolescents, work together to enhance school performance (Leung et al., 1998).

Another recent study examining the differential influences on academic achievement between Asian-American and European-American adolescents concluded that there are different values (e.g., conformity and high value for education) that are socialized by differing patterns of childrearing practices leading to academic achievement across the two cultural groups (Asakawa & Csikszentmihalyi, 1998). Although the sample of Asian Americans was small (n=34), the authors took a phenomenological approach, examining the experience of adolescents as related to academics and parental practices. Results indicated that Asian-American parents provided both a structured home environment and support for adolescent’s autonomy in relation to academic activities. For example, Asian-American parents were more likely than European-American parents to discuss college preparation for their children and provide general monitoring, but were less likely to assign household chores, decide what classes their adolescents were to take, and check their homework. These parenting practices, in turn, facilitated the internalization of cultural values (e.g., high values for education, conformity, and family harmony) which influenced Asian-American academic performance. Asakawa and Csikszentmihalyi (1998) describe Asian-American parenting among their sample as a cross between authoritarian and permissive. That is, Asian-American parents are authoritarian in that they have strict rules and structure that children and adolescents are expected to follow; however, once these rules are conveyed
(i.e., values are internalized), parents leave the children alone to achieve their collective goals (i.e., the child’s academic achievement which brings honor and maintains harmony to the entire family).

**Purpose of Study**

The purpose of this study was to examine the direct and indirect relationships between parental support, parental behavioral control, and parental psychological control, and the self-esteem and academic achievement of European-American, Chinese, and Russian adolescents. The direct relationships between each of these three dimensions of parenting behavior and adolescent self-esteem and academic achievement were examined while considering the effects of two intervening variables (i.e., autonomy from parents and conformity to parents), each representing cultural influences within the parent-adolescent relationship. That is, the hypothesized model (See Figure 1) allowed for the examination of: (a) the direct relationships between the predictor variables (i.e., dimensions of parenting behaviors) and the outcome variables (i.e., adolescent self-esteem and academic achievement); (b) the direct relationships between the predictor variables and the intervening variables (i.e., autonomy from parents and conformity to parents); (c) the direct relationships between the intervening variables and the outcome variables; and (d) the mediating and/or indirect relationships between predictor variables that influence one or both outcome variables through influencing one or both intervening variables. More specifically, four main research questions were examined:

1. What are the direct and indirect relationships between the three dimensions of parenting behavior, autonomy from parents, and adolescent self-esteem?
(2) What are the direct and indirect relationships between the three dimensions of parenting behavior, autonomy from parents, and adolescent academic achievement?

(3) What are the direct and indirect relationships between the three dimensions of parenting behavior, conformity to parents, and adolescent self-esteem?

(4) What are the direct and indirect relationships between the three dimensions of parenting behavior, conformity to parents, and adolescent academic achievement?

In addition gender of parent and gender of adolescent were included as moderating variables in the examination of the four research questions based on previous research which has indicated that differences may exist in the patterns of influence between mothers and fathers on developmental outcomes of boys and girls (Bartle et al., 1989; Block, 1983; Demo, Small, & Savin-Williams, 1987). The patterns of direct and indirect relationships in the four research questions were also examined for (a) differences and similarities by gender of adolescent and (b) gender of parent. Moreover, previous empirical and theoretical work also suggests that the relationships examined here may vary across cultural groups (Chao, 1994; Lam, 1997; Peterson, 1995; Triandis, 1995). Therefore, cultural group (i.e., European-American, Chinese, and Russian) was also included as a potential moderator of the relationships examined in the four research questions.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Procedures

The analyses used to examine the research questions for this study were conducted on data gathered from a larger cross-national study conducted at specific sites within several countries. More specifically, the questionnaire used for this study has been administered to samples of adolescents in Chile, China, the Czech Republic, Mexico, India, Russia, and the US, with sample sizes varying from 480 to 582 per country (Peterson et al., 1999). To assure item comparability among the non-English speaking samples, back translation was used in which the survey was first translated from English to the native language (e.g., Chinese) and then back again to English (c.f., Cheng & Hamid, 1995).

The human subjects review board (i.e., IRB) at the sponsoring University (i.e., Arizona State University) approved the survey instrument and procedures. The procedures for ensuring confidentiality specified by the IRB were followed for the treatment of the responses (i.e., completed surveys and consent forms) from participating adolescents in each country. Identical procedures and surveys were used in each country, with the exception of a few minor differences in some demographic questions. For
example, the demographic question assessing ethnic group membership was changed for each country, based on the primary ethnic groups living in the particular country and region.

Each of the samples for this cross-national study was selected using a convenience strategy. Although random sampling was not possible, the sociodemographic characteristics (age, gender, and parental education) of the participants within each cultural sample varied sufficiently to be a reasonably representative sample of adolescents from large urban areas within each country. Although social class is a somewhat problematic concept in the People’s Republic of China and in the former USSR, a concerted effort was made to sample adolescents whose parents demonstrated a wide-range of socioeconomic backgrounds (SES) as measured by their parents’ education. For example, within each cultural group, parents’ education varied from less than a high school education to those who had completed college and graduate school. However, because of the differing educational, economic, and political systems, comparisons of parental education levels across countries can be misleading. For example, the political and economic systems in China and Russia may play a more important role in determining one’s salary, prestige, and subsequent living conditions than the type or level of education. Moreover, in each of the sampled countries, similar public schools (i.e., state funded) in large urban areas were used. As a means of controlling for school effects and increasing the diversity of each national sample, at least four schools were sampled within each country. For practical reasons, surveying adolescents with a questionnaire format was used to acquire an adequate sample size.
Contacting adolescents through the schools they attended was a convenient and cost-effective means of assessing a diverse population within a common location.

In terms of the data from the three countries analyzed for this study (i.e., China, Russia, and the US), six hundred questionnaires were distributed in the classrooms of participating secondary schools in each country. Response rates for each of the three countries analyzed here were similar and all quite high, ranging from 83% among the Chinese sample to 98% among the Russian sample. Research assistants and teachers, who were trained in accordance with a standardized protocol, administered the survey in classrooms to the participating students. Respondents were instructed to independently complete the questionnaires and to provide responses that corresponded most closely to their experience. During administration of the survey, research assistants and teachers were instructed to provide assistance to participants by remaining in the classroom and answering questions of clarification about the meaning of the items.

Sample

US sample. Participants in the US sample consisted of 556 adolescents selected from six public high schools in the Mid-Western part of the United States (See Table 3.1). Because the number of ethnic minorities (e.g., African-American, Asian-American and Hispanic-American) was not large enough for comparisons across cultural groups, adolescents reporting ethnicity other than Caucasian (i.e., European-American) were dropped from this phase of the study. The remaining 419 European-American adolescents comprised the US sample. Respondents ranged in age from 13 to 18, with a sample mean age of 15.52. The gender of these participants was fairly evenly distributed
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Items: Number Scale</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>European-American Girls:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adolescent age</td>
<td>15.49</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother's Education</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father's Education</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal Support</td>
<td>14.09</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternal Support</td>
<td>12.81</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal Behavioral Con.</td>
<td>19.04</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternal Behavioral Con.</td>
<td>17.17</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal Psych. Control</td>
<td>12.56</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternal Psych. Control</td>
<td>12.99</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy From Mothers</td>
<td>33.08</td>
<td>5.61</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy From Fathers</td>
<td>32.46</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformity to Mothers</td>
<td>17.04</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8-32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformity to Fathers</td>
<td>16.54</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8-32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>15.66</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Achievement</td>
<td>16.17</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>European-American Boys:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adolescent age</td>
<td>15.54</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother's Education</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father's Education</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal Support</td>
<td>13.60</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternal Support</td>
<td>13.07</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal Behavioral Con.</td>
<td>17.53</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternal Behavioral Con.</td>
<td>17.05</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal Psych. Control</td>
<td>13.26</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternal Psych. Control</td>
<td>13.50</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy From Mothers</td>
<td>33.26</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy From Fathers</td>
<td>32.65</td>
<td>6.22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformity to Mothers</td>
<td>17.93</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8-32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformity to Fathers</td>
<td>18.26</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8-32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>16.33</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Achievement</td>
<td>15.33</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5-20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1: Descriptive Statistics for European-American Sample
(i.e., 211 females and 208 males). The parents of these adolescents demonstrated a wide range of socioeconomic backgrounds as measured by parents’ education, varying from parents who had less than a high school education to those who had completed college and graduate school. For father’s education, adolescents reported that 21% completed professional or technical training, and 30% had attended or completed college, whereas 18% of mothers had completed professional or technical training, and 35% had attended or completed college.

**Chinese sample.** Participants consisted of 480 adolescents selected from six state-funded high schools in Beijing, China, ranging in age from 13 to 18 years, with a sample mean age of 15.42 (See Table 3.2). The gender of these participants was fairly evenly distributed (242 females and 238 males). Parents’ education varied from less than a high school education to those who had completed college and graduate school. Adolescents reported that over 40% of fathers attended or completed college, whereas only 26% of mothers had attended or completed college.

**Russian sample.** Participants consisted of 582 adolescents selected from four state-funded public schools in Volgograd, Russia ranging in age from 11 to 17 years. For the comparison purposes of the current study, a subsample of 395 adolescents aged 13 and higher were selected for the present analyses (See Table 3.3). Respondents ranged in age from 13 to 17 years with a sample mean age of 15.18. The gender of these participants consisted of slightly more females (i.e., 234 females and only 161 males). In terms of family social class, the sample was fairly average with adolescents reporting that parental education varied from less than a high school education to those who had 
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chinese Girls</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Items: Number Scale</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adolescent age</td>
<td>15.57</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother’s Education</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father’s Education</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal Support</td>
<td>8.08</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternal Support</td>
<td>7.08</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal Behavioral Con.</td>
<td>11.92</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternal Behavioral Con.</td>
<td>10.77</td>
<td>5.82</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal Psych. Control</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternal Psych. Control</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy From Mothers</td>
<td>20.06</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy From Fathers</td>
<td>20.35</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformity to Mothers</td>
<td>15.35</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformity to Fathers</td>
<td>15.51</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>14.98</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Achievement</td>
<td>14.42</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chinese Boys</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Items: Number Scale</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adolescent age</td>
<td>15.36</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother’s Education</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father’s Education</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal Support</td>
<td>8.03</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternal Support</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal Behavioral Con.</td>
<td>11.03</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternal Behavioral Con.</td>
<td>10.44</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal Psych. Control</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternal Psych. Control</td>
<td>6.45</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy From Mothers</td>
<td>20.24</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy From Fathers</td>
<td>20.52</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformity to Mothers</td>
<td>15.64</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformity to Fathers</td>
<td>15.71</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>14.84</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Achievement</td>
<td>14.27</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.2: Descriptive Statistics for Chinese Sample
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Russian Girls</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Items: Number Scale</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adolescent age</td>
<td>15.10</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother’s Education</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father’s Education</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal Support</td>
<td>12.29</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternal Support</td>
<td>11.54</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal Behavioral Con.</td>
<td>17.06</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternal Behavioral Con.</td>
<td>14.96</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal Psych. Control</td>
<td>19.11</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternal Psych. Control</td>
<td>18.24</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy From Mothers</td>
<td>20.53</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy From Fathers</td>
<td>20.91</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformity to Mothers</td>
<td>14.17</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8-32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformity to Fathers</td>
<td>13.85</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8-32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>15.61</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Achievement</td>
<td>13.58</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5-20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Russian Boys</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Items: Number Scale</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adolescent age</td>
<td>15.26</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother’s Education</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father’s Education</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal Support</td>
<td>12.18</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternal Support</td>
<td>11.49</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal Behavioral Con.</td>
<td>16.66</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternal Behavioral Con.</td>
<td>15.43</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal Psych. Control</td>
<td>20.51</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternal Psych. Control</td>
<td>20.13</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy From Mothers</td>
<td>21.08</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy From Fathers</td>
<td>21.35</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformity to Mothers</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8-32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformity to Fathers</td>
<td>14.98</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8-32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>15.20</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Achievement</td>
<td>13.59</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5-20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.3: Descriptive Statistics for Russian Sample
completed college and graduate school. More specifically, adolescents reported that 45% of fathers had attended or completed technical school or college, whereas, 54% of mothers had attended or completed technical school or college.

Measurement

The questionnaire for the larger project consisted of items that assessed characteristics of the relationship between the participating adolescent and their family members. The overall survey asked adolescents to report on both their father and their mother separately (when appropriate). Demographic questions included age, birth order, gender, parental education, and parental occupation (See Tables 3.1 – 3.3). The survey was designed to assess a variety of family relationship, parent-adolescent, and social psychological variables; these included the following: (a) parental support; (b) parental behavioral control; (c) parental psychological control; (d) adolescents’ conformity to parental expectations; (e) adolescents’ perceptions of autonomy from parents; (f) adolescent self-esteem; (g) adolescent academic achievement; (h) age of adolescent; and (e) adolescents’ reports of the highest level of education attained by their parents as an indicator of socioeconomic status. This method of utilizing educational attainment as a measurement for social class has been found to be a reliable predictor of social class (Miller, 1991).

**Self-Esteem.** Adolescents’ global self-esteem was assessed using eight items from the ten-item Rosenberg self-esteem scale (Rosenberg, 1965, 1979). This scale measures one’s self-worth or positive evaluation of self (Rosenberg, 1965) and has been used in numerous studies with adolescents including collectivistic cultural groups (e.g., Chinese and Russian) and has been reported to be valid and reliable (e.g., Bush, Supple,
& Peterson, 1998; Bush et al., 2000). The eight selected items used in the larger survey were those that demonstrated the highest loadings on a previously conducted factor analysis (Peterson, Rollins, & Thomas, 1985). The participants responded to the items in terms of a four-point Likert scale which varies from “strongly agree” (4) to “strongly disagree” (1). Some of the items provided positive assessments of self-issues (“I feel I have a number of good qualities”), whereas others were measures of self-derogation (“I certainly feel useless at times”). The three items measuring self-derogation, in turn, were dropped from the present analyses because of recent results indicating that these items (i.e., self-derogation) form a conceptually distinct dimension from the positive items (Bush et al., 2000; Owens, 1993, 1994). The remaining five positive items demonstrated adequate reliability with Cronbach alpha’s of .85, .70, and .71 for the US, Chinese, and Russian samples, respectively. See Appendix A.

**Academic achievement.** Adolescents’ reports of their academic performance was assessed by five self-report items, including one item that asked respondents to indicate which response best represented their grades over the last year. Responses varied from “mostly A’s” (5) to mostly F’s” (1). Previous cross-cultural research has found that adolescents’ self-reported grades correlate highly with their actual grades (e.g., Dornbusch et al., 1987). The remaining four items measured the extent that adolescents performed well in school (e.g., my assignments are usually completed on time) and the extent that adolescents liked and exerted effort in their schoolwork (e.g., “I try hard in school”). The participants responded to the last four items in terms of a four-point Likert scale which varied from “strongly agree” (4) to “strongly disagree” (1). This scale has
been found to be valid and reliable among US and Chinese samples (Supple et al., 1998). Moreover, this scale demonstrated adequate reliability within each of the three samples with Cronbach’s alpha’s ranging from .74 to .88 across US, Chinese, and Russian samples. See Appendix B.

**Autonomy.** Adolescents’ reports of autonomy from mothers and fathers was measured by a scale of 10 items based on previous research dealing with the growth of adolescent self-direction in reference to parents (Peterson, Bush & Supple, 1999; Sessa & Steinberg, 1991). This particular scale has demonstrated good reliability and validity within US (Peterson, Bush, & Supple, 1999), Chinese (Peterson, Cobas, & Czaplewski, 1998) and Russian (Kupanoff, Peterson, & Bush, 2000) samples of adolescents. The participants responded to the items in terms of a four-point Likert scale which varies from “Strongly Agree” (4) to “Strongly Disagree” (1). These items measure the extent to which mothers and fathers allow adolescents to make their own decisions and engage in activities without excessive intrusion regarding choices about friendships, life-style preferences, clothing selection, educational goals, and career plans. Adolescents responded to each of these items in reference to their relationships with both their mothers and fathers. A sample item from this scale is: "This parent allows me to choose my own friends without interfering too much.” For autonomy from mothers and fathers, Cronbach alphas ranged from .83 to .88 across the US, Chinese, and Russian samples. See Appendix C.

**Conformity.** Adolescents’ reports of conformity to mothers and fathers were assessed by an eight-item version of a scale of items used in previous research studies
(Peterson, Rollins, & Thomas, 1985; Thomas, Gecas, Weigert, & Rooney, 1974). The participants responded to the items in terms of a four-point Likert scale which varies from “strongly agree” (4) to “strongly disagree” (1). The items composing this instrument measured whether adolescents conformed to parental values, beliefs, and expectations about leisure time activities, friends, dating, education, and careers. A sample item is: “if this parent wanted me to go around with a particular group of friends, then I would do what this parent wants me to do.” Adolescents responded to each of these items in terms their relationships with both their mothers and fathers. This particular scale has demonstrated good reliability and validity within US (Henry, Wilson & Peterson, 1989), Chinese (Peterson, Cobas, & Czapelewski, 1998; Peterson, Bush, Supple, Bodeman, & Day, 1998) and Russian (Peterson et al., 1999; Kupanoff, Peterson & Bush, 2000) samples of adolescents. For conformity to parents, Cronbach alphas ranged from .77 to .85 across the US, Chinese, and Russian samples. See Appendix D.

Parental behaviors. The parental behaviors examined in this study were assessed with the Parent Behavior Measure (PBM), a 34-item self-report instrument used in previous studies that measures adolescents’ perceptions of several supportive and controlling dimensions of behavior that mothers and fathers use with adolescents (Henry, Wilson, & Peterson, 1989; Henry & Peterson, 1995; Peterson et al., 1985; Peterson, Bush, & Supple, 1999). Specific dimensions assessed included parental support, induction (i.e., reasoning), monitoring, punitiveness, and love withdrawal. For this particular analysis, items from the punitive and love withdrawal subscales were combined as a measure of psychological control (Bush, Bean, Bartle-Haring & Peterson,
The items composing the scales of the PBM were derived from previously existing instruments and were selected based on having the highest loadings on identified factors in previous factor analytic studies (Peterson, Rollins, & Thomas, 1985). Many of the PBM items were taken from the 80-item Rollins and Thomas Parent Behavior Inventory (Peterson et al., 1985) that, in turn, was a distillation of the best items from the 192-item Schaefer’s Parent Behavior Inventory (Schaefer, 1959, 1965; Peterson, Rollins, & Thomas, 1985). Items that measured parental support originated from a scale constructed based on a factor analytic study that examined the Heilbrun (1964, 1973) and Cornell (Bronfenbrenner, 1961; Devereaux, Bronfenbrenner, & Rodgers, 1969; Ellis, Thomas, & Rollins, 1976) measures of parental support. The items measuring induction were developed based on the original conceptualizations of Hoffman (1970, 1980), whereas items on monitoring were developed based on the work of several previous researchers (Barber, Olsen, & Shagle, 1994; Small, 1990). Participants responded to the items composing the PBM in terms of a four-point Likert scale which varied from “strongly agree” (4) to “strongly disagree” (1). See Appendix E.

Perceptions of parental support were measured by four items regarding the degree that mothers and fathers were perceived by adolescents as being accepting, warm, approving, and nurturant. Parental psychological control was assessed by six items measuring the perception that mothers and fathers use excessive and coercive control attempts (i.e., from the love withdrawal and punitiveness scales). Parental behavioral control was measured by six items that were intended to capture to what extent mothers and fathers were perceived as supervising the ways that adolescents spend their free time,
money, and relate to their friends (i.e., from the monitoring scale). The Cronbach alphas for these parental behaviors ranged from .71 to .87 within the three cultural groups. The instrument used here has been found to demonstrate good reliability and validity among Chinese (Supple, Peterson & Bush, 1998), Russian (Bush et al., 1999; Kupanoff et al., 2000), and US (Peterson, Rollins & Thomas, 1985; Peterson, Bush, & Supple, 1999) samples.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The structural equation modeling program LISREL 8.0 (Joreskog & Sorbom, 1993) was used to conduct observed variable analyses of the hypothesized model (See Figure 1) using a covariance matrix. The relationships among the latent variables (i.e., parental support, behavioral-control, psychological control, autonomy, conformity, and adolescent academic achievement and self-esteem) within each of the three cultures (i.e., European-American, Chinese, and Russian) and gender groups (i.e., gender of adolescent and gender of parent) were examined.

First, the degree of consistency between the hypothesized model and the observed sample data was assessed by examining the fit indices for the model within each gender of adolescent, gender of parent, and cultural group. The second step was examination of the gamma coefficients which provide an indication of the direct relationships between the exogenous variables (i.e., parental support, parental behavioral control, and parental psychological control) and the endogenous variables (i.e., adolescent self-esteem and adolescent academic achievement). Thirdly, the beta coefficients were examined for indications of direct relationships between the intervening endogenous variables (i.e., autonomy from parents and conformity to parents) and the endogenous variables of
adolescent academic achievement and adolescent self-esteem. In turn, significant
relationships among variables in gamma were then compared with significant
relationships in beta, for indications of potential mediating relationships, and/or indirect
relationships. The completely standardized solution for the gamma and beta coefficients
was used to provide a better interpretation of the size of the loadings in comparison to
other estimates. That is, the beta and gamma coefficients from the completely
standardized solution are calculated on the same scale (e.g., similar to a standardized beta
weights in multiple regression), and thus can be compared to other estimates (Bartle-
Haring & Gavazzi, 1996). Lastly, the squared multiple correlations of the endogenous
variables were examined for indications of the amount of variance accounted for in the
endogenous variables (i.e., self-esteem and academic-achievement) and the intervening
variables (i.e., autonomy, conformity) by the exogenous variables (parental support,
parental behavioral-control, and parental psychological-control).

Structural equation modeling tests mediation by simultaneously estimating the
direct paths (e.g., the relationship between the exogenous variable of maternal support
and the endogenous variable of adolescent self-esteem) and indirect paths (e.g., the effect
of maternal support on autonomy and the effect of autonomy on adolescent self-esteem).
That is, each path is estimated after the effects of all other paths are accounted for. A
second analysis controlling for (i.e., deleting) the direct relationship between the
exogenous and endogenous variable is then conducted in the cases where potential
mediation (i.e., significant relationships between the mediating variable and the
endogenous variable) are present.
These methods were used in the present study to test for mediation. In each model that contained significant relationships between one or both of the intervening variables (i.e., autonomy and/or conformity) and one or both of the endogenous variables (i.e., adolescent self-esteem and/or academic achievement), a second analysis to test for mediation was conducted. The second analyses on the mediation model was identical to the hypothesized model with the exception that the direct paths between the exogenous variables (i.e., parental support, parental behavioral control, and parental psychological control) and the endogenous variables (i.e., adolescent self-esteem and academic achievement) were deleted within the mediation model. The results from the mediation model were then compared to the results from the hypothesized model using a chi-square difference test. A significant change in fit between the two models indicates that full mediation is not present within the model. That is, the significant change in fit suggests that the direct paths between the exogenous variables and the endogenous variables are important in the model, and cannot simply be folded into the mediation model. In contrast, if no significant change in fit occurs when the hypothesized model and the mediation model are compared, mediation is present, as the direct paths are not important to the particular model. That is, when the direct paths are taken out of the model (i.e., the mediation model), the fit of the model does not significantly change.

As previously discussed, the differing meaning and influence of SES (i.e., parental education) across the diverse cultural groups examined here make it difficult to control for SES in the full model when making cross-cultural comparisons. Moreover, previous literature suggests that SES is related to self-esteem (e.g., Rosenberg & Pearlin,
1978; Wiltfang & Scarbecz, 1990) and academic achievement (Entwisle & Alexander, 1995; Majoribanks & Kwok, 1998). Therefore, the disturbance terms in both the endogenous variables (i.e., adolescent self-esteem and academic achievement) were correlated together.

European-American Sample

European-American Girls/Maternal Model

Examination of the fit indices within the mother-daughter dyad among European Americans indicated that the chi-square statistic was non-significant ($\chi^2(1) = .0018; \ p=.9$), indicating a good fit of the model to the data within this subsample. Additional verification of fit was assessed by examining (a) the value of the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA), in which recommended values of .1 or below represent a good fit, and (b) the goodness of fit index (GFI), in which values .9 minimum represent an acceptable fit (Steiger, 1990). For this maternal subsample of European-American girls, the values of the RMSEA (.0) and the GFI (1.0) were both well within the recommended levels. These findings indicate that the hypothesized model appears to be a good fit to the data from the European-American girls/maternal subsample (See Figure 4.1).

Examination of the gamma coefficients for the European-American girls/maternal model indicated several significant direct relationships between the exogenous variables and the endogenous variables (See Figure 4.1). Maternal support was a significant positive predictor of autonomy from mothers ($\gamma = .49, \ p<.05$) and conformity to mothers
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Figure 4.1: European-American Models
(γ = .19, p<.05), whereas maternal support was not significantly predictive of the self-esteem or academic achievement of European-American girls.

For the direct relationships between maternal behavioral control and the endogenous variables, behavioral control was a significant positive predictor of academic achievement (γ = .35, p<.05) and conformity to mothers (γ = .14, p<.05). In contrast, maternal behavioral control did not significantly predict adolescent self-esteem or autonomy from mothers among European-American girls.

For the direct relationships between maternal psychological control and the endogenous variables, psychological control was a significant negative predictor of autonomy from mothers (γ = -.15, p<.05), and a significant positive predictor of conformity to mothers (γ = .16, p<.05). In contrast, maternal psychological control was not significantly predictive of adolescent self-esteem or adolescent academic achievement among European-American girls (See Figure 4.1).

Examination of the beta coefficients indicated only one significant direct relationship between the intervening variables and the endogenous variables existed (See Figure 4.1). More specifically, autonomy from mothers was a positive predictor of adolescent self-esteem (β = .24, p<.05), but was not significantly related to adolescent academic achievement. Moreover, conformity to mothers did not significantly predict either of the two endogenous variables (i.e., adolescent self-esteem and adolescent academic achievement) within the European-American girls/maternal model.

Following these results, autonomy from mothers was found to be a potential mediator of several relationships (i.e., between maternal support and adolescent self-
esteem and maternal psychological control and adolescent self-esteem) within this culture and gender subsample. Following guidelines for establishing mediation as described above, a second analysis was conducted for the hypothesized model, controlling for the direct relationships between the exogenous variables (e.g., maternal support) the endogenous variables (e.g., adolescent self-esteem). That is, an analysis was conducted on a mediation model, which was identical to the hypothesized model with the exception of deleting the direct paths between the exogenous variables (i.e., maternal support, maternal behavioral control, and maternal psychological control) and the endogenous variables (i.e., adolescent self-esteem and academic achievement) within the mediation model. The results from the mediation model were compared to the results from the hypothesized model for indications of differences in fit between the two models, with no significant changes in fit representing mediation within the model. Comparing the mediation model ($\chi^2(7) = 35.55; p=.001$) to the full model ($\chi^2(1) = .0018; p=.9$) for the European-American mother-daughter dyad resulted in a significant loss of fit ($\chi^2$ difference of 35.54 with 6 df, $p<.001$). These results indicated that there was not significant mediation within the European-American mother-daughter dyad. That is, with the direct relationships between the exogenous variables (i.e., parenting behaviors) and the endogenous variables (i.e., adolescent academic achievement and self-esteem) controlled for, the model lost fit, indicating that the direct paths are important within this culture by gender dyad.
European-American Girls/Paternal Model

Examination of the fit indices among the European-American girls/paternal model indicated that the chi-square statistic was non-significant ($X^2(1) = 1.89; p=.17$), denoting an adequate fit to these data. In addition, the values of the RMSEA (.06) and the GFI (1.0) were well within the recommended levels, further suggesting that the hypothesized model was a good fit to the data for the European-American girls/paternal subsample.

Examination of the gamma coefficients among the European-American girls/paternal model indicated several significant direct relationships between the exogenous variables and the endogenous variables (See Figure 4.1). More specifically, paternal support was a significant positive predictor of adolescent autonomy from fathers ($\gamma = .51$, $p<.05$) and conformity to fathers ($\gamma = .19$, $p<.05$). In contrast, paternal support was not a significant predictor of adolescent self-esteem or adolescent academic achievement among European-American girls.

For the direct relationships between paternal behavioral control and the endogenous variables, behavioral control was a significant positive predictor of adolescent academic achievement ($\gamma = .18$, $p<.05$) and conformity to fathers ($\gamma = .25$, $p<.05$). In contrast, paternal behavioral control was not a significant predictor of adolescent self-esteem or adolescent autonomy from fathers among European-American girls.

For the direct relationships between paternal psychological control and the endogenous variables, psychological control was a significant negative predictor of autonomy from fathers ($\gamma = -.25$, $p<.05$). However paternal psychological control was not
significantly related to adolescent self-esteem, academic achievement, or conformity to fathers among European-American girls.

Examination of the beta coefficients among the European-American girls/paternal model indicated only one significant direct relationship between the intervening variables and the endogenous variables (See Figure 4.1). That is, autonomy from fathers was a positive predictor of adolescent self-esteem ($\beta = .22$, $p<.05$), but was not significantly related to adolescent academic achievement among European-American girls. Moreover, conformity to fathers was not a significant predictor of adolescent self-esteem or adolescent academic achievement.

Following these results, autonomy from fathers was found to be a potential mediator of several relationships between paternal parenting behaviors and adolescent self-esteem within the European-American girls/paternal model. Therefore, a second analyses for a mediation model was conducted for the hypothesized model controlling for (i.e., deleting) the direct paths between the exogenous variables (i.e., maternal support, maternal behavioral control, and maternal psychological control) and the endogenous variables. Comparing the mediation model ($\chi^2(7) = 12.25; p=.09$) to the full model ($\chi^2(1) = 1.89; p=.17$) for the European-American girls/paternal sample resulted in no significant loss of fit ($\chi^2$ difference of 10.36 with 6 $df$, $p<.25$). These results indicated that there was significant mediation within this culture by gender dyad (See Figure 4.1). That is, with the direct relationships between the exogenous variables (i.e., parenting behaviors) and the endogenous variables (i.e., adolescent academic achievement and self-esteem) controlled for, the model did not lose fit, indicating that the direct paths are not as
important for European-American girls in reference to their fathers.

Several mediating relationships were indicated. Although paternal support did not directly predict adolescent self-esteem significantly ($\gamma = .07$, $p<.33$), paternal support predicted adolescent self-esteem through the mediation of autonomy from fathers. That is, paternal support positively predicted autonomy from fathers ($\gamma = .51$, $p<.05$); in turn, autonomy from fathers positively predicted adolescent self-esteem ($\beta = .22$, $p<.05$). In addition, paternal psychological control also influenced adolescent self-esteem through the mediation of autonomy from fathers. More specifically, paternal psychological control did not significantly predict adolescent self-esteem ($\gamma = -.07$, $p<.14$). However, paternal psychological control was a significant negative predictor of autonomy from fathers ($\gamma = -.25$, $p<.05$); in turn, autonomy from fathers was a positive predictor of adolescent self-esteem ($\beta = .22$, $p<.05$).

**European-American Boys/Maternal Model**

Examination of the fit indices in the European-American boys/maternal model indicated that the chi-square statistic was non-significant ($X^2(1) = 3.33; p = .068$) at the .05 alpha level. In addition, the RMSEA (.10) was within recommend level of .1 for indication of a good fit, and the GFI (1.0) was above the acceptable limit of .9. Therefore, the hypothesized model appears to be an adequate fit to the data from the European-American boys/maternal subsample.

Examination of the gamma coefficients among the European-American boys/maternal model indicated several significant direct relationships between the exogenous variables and the endogenous variables (See Figure 4.1). Maternal support
was a significant positive predictor of adolescent self-esteem ($\gamma = .33$, $p<.05$), adolescent academic achievement ($\gamma = .21$, $p<.05$), autonomy from mothers ($\gamma = .43$, $p<.05$), and conformity to mothers ($\gamma = .20$, $p<.05$) among the European-American boys' subsample.

For the direct relationships between maternal behavioral control and the endogenous variables, behavioral control was a significant positive predictor of adolescent academic achievement ($\gamma = .24$, $p<.05$) and conformity to mothers ($\gamma = .20$, $p<.05$). In contrast, maternal behavioral control was not a significant predictor of adolescent self-esteem or autonomy from mothers among European-American boys.

For the direct relationships between maternal psychological control and the endogenous variables, psychological control was a significant negative predictor of autonomy from mothers ($\gamma = -.15$, $p<.05$) and a significant positive predictor of conformity to mothers ($\gamma = .31$, $p<.05$). In contrast, maternal psychological control was not a significant predictor of adolescent self-esteem or adolescent academic achievement among European-American boys.

Examination of the beta coefficients among the European-American boys/maternal model indicated that no significant direct relationship existed between either of the intervening-exogenous variables (i.e., autonomy from mother and conformity to mothers) and adolescent self-esteem or adolescent academic achievement (See Figure 4.1). Therefore, no mediating relationships existed for the model within this cultural and gender dyad subsample.
European-American Boys/Paternal Model

Examination of the fit indices among the European-American boys/paternal model indicated that the chi-square statistic was non-significant ($\chi^2(1) = .362; p=.06$) at the .05 alpha level. In addition, the value of the RMSEA (.11) was just slightly above the recommended limit of .1. However, the value of the GFI (1.0) was well above the recommend minimum of .9. Taken together, examination of these indices of fit indicates that the hypothesized model appears to be an adequate fit to the data for the European-American boys/paternal subsample.

Examination of the gamma coefficients among the European-American boys/paternal model indicated several significant direct relationships between the exogenous variables and the endogenous variables (See Figure 4.1). More specifically, paternal support was a significant positive predictor of adolescent self-esteem ($\gamma = .22, p<.05$), autonomy from fathers ($\gamma = .38, p<.05$) and conformity to fathers ($\gamma = .19, p<.05$). However, paternal support did not significantly predict academic achievement among European-American boys.

For the direct relationships between paternal behavioral control and the endogenous variables, behavioral control was a significant positive predictor of adolescent self-esteem ($\gamma = .18, p<.05$) academic achievement ($\gamma = .28, p<.05$) and conformity to fathers ($\gamma = .26, p<.05$). In contrast, paternal behavioral control was not a significant predictor of autonomy from fathers among European-American boys.

For the direct relationships between paternal psychological control and the endogenous variables, psychological control was a significant negative predictor of
autonomy from fathers ($\gamma = -.19$, $p<.05$) and a significant positive predictor of conformity to fathers ($\gamma = .29$, $p<.05$). In contrast, paternal psychological control was not a significant predictor of adolescent self-esteem or adolescent academic achievement among European-American boys.

Examination of the beta coefficients among the European-American boys/paternal model indicated that no significant direct relationship existed between either of the intervening variables, i.e., autonomy from fathers and conformity to fathers, and the endogenous variables, i.e., adolescent self-esteem and adolescent academic achievement (See Figure 4.1). Therefore, no mediating or indirect relationships existed for the model within this subsample of European-American boys.

Chinese Sample

**Chinese Girls/Maternal Model**

Examination of the fit indices among the sample of Chinese girls/maternal model indicated that the chi-square statistic was non-significant ($\chi^2(1) = .038; p=.8$), indicating a good fit of the model to this subsample. In addition, the values of both the RMSEA (.0) and the GFI (1.0) were well within the recommended levels.

Examination of the gamma coefficients within the Chinese girls/maternal model indicated several significant direct relationships between the exogenous variables and the endogenous variables (See Figure 4.2). More specifically, maternal support was a significant positive predictor of adolescent self-esteem ($\gamma = .21$, $p<.05$), autonomy from mothers ($\gamma = .27$, $p<.05$) and conformity to mothers ($\gamma = .17$, $p<.05$), whereas maternal
Figure 4.2: Chinese Models
support was not a significant predictor of adolescent academic achievement among this subsample of Chinese girls.

For the direct relationships between maternal behavioral control and the endogenous variables, behavioral control was a significant positive predictor of adolescent academic achievement (γ = .19, p<.05) and conformity to mothers (γ = 21, p<.05). In contrast, maternal behavioral control did not significantly predict adolescent self-esteem or autonomy from mothers among Chinese girls.

For the direct relationships between maternal psychological control and the endogenous variables, psychological control was a significant negative predictor of autonomy from mothers (γ = -.15, p<.05). However, maternal psychological control was not a significant predictor of adolescent self-esteem, adolescent academic achievement, or conformity to mothers among Chinese girls.

Examination of the beta coefficients indicated that two significant direct relationships existed between the intervening variables and the endogenous variables (See Figure 4.2). More specifically, autonomy from mothers was a positive predictor of adolescent self-esteem (β = .21, p<.05) and adolescent academic achievement (β = .15, p<.05) among Chinese girls. In contrast, conformity to mothers was not significant predictor of adolescent self-esteem or adolescent academic achievement.

Following these results, autonomy from mothers was found to be a potential mediator of several relationships between maternal parenting behaviors and adolescent self-esteem and academic achievement within this cultural and gender subsample. Therefore, a second analysis for a mediation model was conducted for the hypothesized
model controlling for (i.e., deleting) the direct paths between the exogenous variables (i.e., maternal support, maternal behavioral control, and maternal psychological control) and the endogenous variables. Comparing the mediation model ($\chi^2(7) = 16.73; \ p=0.02$) to the full model ($\chi^2(1) = .038; \ p=.8$) for the Chinese mother-daughter dyad resulted in a significant loss of fit ($\chi^2$ difference of 16.69 with 6 $df$, $p<.025$). These results indicated that there was not significant mediation within the Chinese mother-daughter dyad. That is, with the direct relationships between the exogenous variables (i.e., parenting behaviors) and the endogenous variables (i.e., adolescent academic achievement and self-esteem) controlled for, the model lost fit, indicating that the direct paths are important within this culture by gender dyad.

**Chinese Girls/Paternal Model**

Examination of the fit indices among the Chinese girls/paternal model indicated that the chi-square statistic was non-significant ($\chi^2(1) = .0014; \ p=.97$). In addition, the value of the RMSEA (.0) was well below the recommended limit of .1, and the value of the GFI (1.0) was well above the recommended minimum of .9. These findings indicated that the hypothesized model appears to be an adequate fit to data for the Chinese girls/paternal subsample.

Examination of the gamma coefficients among the Chinese girls/paternal model indicated several significant direct relationships between the exogenous variables and the endogenous variables (See Figure 4.2). More specifically, paternal support was a significant positive predictor of autonomy from fathers ($\gamma = .23, \ p<.05$) and conformity to
fathers ($\gamma = .19, p<.05$), whereas paternal support was not a significant predictor of adolescent self-esteem or academic achievement.

For the direct relationships between paternal behavioral control and the endogenous variables, behavioral control was a significant positive predictor of adolescent academic achievement ($\gamma = .18, p<.05$) and conformity to fathers ($\gamma = .29, p<.05$). In contrast, paternal behavioral control was not a significant predictor of adolescent self-esteem or autonomy from fathers among Chinese girls.

For the direct relationships between paternal psychological control and the endogenous variables, psychological control was a significant negative predictor of autonomy from fathers ($\gamma = -.26, p<.05$) and a positive predictor of conformity to fathers ($\gamma = .15, p<.05$). However paternal psychological control was not significantly related to adolescent self-esteem or academic achievement among Chinese girls.

Examination of the beta coefficients among the Chinese girls/paternal model indicated one significant direct relationship between the intervening variables and the endogenous variables (See Figure 4.2). More specifically, autonomy from fathers positively predicted adolescent self-esteem ($\beta = .22, p<.05$), but was not a significant predictor of adolescent academic achievement among Chinese girls. Moreover, conformity to fathers was not a significant predictor of adolescent self-esteem or adolescent academic achievement.

Following these results, autonomy from fathers was found to be a potential mediator of the relationships between several paternal parenting behaviors and adolescent self-esteem. Therefore, a second analyses for a mediation model was
conducted for the hypothesized model, controlling for the direct paths between the exogenous variables (i.e., paternal support, paternal behavioral control, and paternal psychological control) and the endogenous variables. Comparing the mediation model ($\chi^2(7) = 8.70; p=.27$) to the full model ($\chi^2(1) = .0014; p=.97$) for the Chinese father-daughter dyad resulted in no significant loss of fit ($\chi^2$ difference of 8.7 with 6 df, $p<.25$). These results indicated that there was significant mediation within the Chinese father-daughter dyad (See Figure 4.2). That is, with the direct relationships between the exogenous variables (i.e., parenting behaviors) and the endogenous variables (i.e., adolescent academic achievement and self-esteem) controlled for, the model did not loose fit, indicating that the direct paths are not as important within this culture by gender dyad.

Autonomy from fathers mediated two relationships. Although paternal support did not significantly predict adolescent self-esteem directly ($\gamma = .01, p<.86$), paternal support positively predicted autonomy from fathers ($\gamma = .23, p<.05$), which in turn, positively predicted adolescent self-esteem ($\beta = .22, p<.05$). In addition, although paternal psychological control did not significantly predict adolescent self-esteem directly ($\gamma = .01, p<.36$), paternal psychological control was a significant negative predictor of autonomy from fathers ($\gamma = -.26, p<.05$), which in turn, positively predicted adolescent self-esteem ($\beta = .22, p<.05$).

**Chinese Boys/Maternal Model**

Examination of the fit indices of the Chinese boys/maternal model indicated that the chi-square statistic was non-significant ($\chi^2(1) = .27; p=.6$), indicating that the
hypothesized model was a good fit to the data from this subsample. In addition, the value of the RMSEA (.0) was well below the recommended limit of .1, and the value of the GFI (1.0) was well above the recommend minimum of .9. These findings indicated that the hypothesized model appears to be a good fit to the data for the Chinese boys/maternal subsample.

Examination of the gamma coefficients among the Chinese boys/maternal model indicated several significant direct relationships between the exogenous variables and the endogenous variables (See Figure 4.2). More specifically, maternal support was a significant positive predictor of adolescent autonomy from mothers (γ = .18, p<.05), and conformity to mothers (γ = .27, p<.05). In contrast, maternal support was not a significant predictor of adolescent self-esteem or adolescent academic achievement among Chinese boys.

For the direct relationships between maternal behavioral control and the endogenous variables, behavioral control was a significant positive predictor of adolescent self-esteem (γ = .17, p<.05) and autonomy from mothers (γ = .15, p<.05). However, maternal behavioral control did not significantly predict adolescent academic achievement or adolescent conformity to mothers among Chinese boys.

Examination of the direct relationships between maternal psychological control and the endogenous variables revealed that psychological control was a significant negative predictor of autonomy from mothers (γ = -.21, p<.05). However, maternal psychological control was not a significant predictor of adolescent self-esteem, adolescent academic achievement, or conformity to mothers among Chinese boys.
Examination of the beta coefficients among the Chinese boys/maternal model indicated two significant direct relationships between the intervening variables and the endogenous variables (See Figure 4.2). More specifically, autonomy from mothers was a significant positive predictor of adolescent self-esteem ($\beta = .20$, $p<.05$), but was not a significant predictor of adolescent academic achievement among Chinese boys. In turn, conformity to mothers positively predicted academic achievement ($\beta = .15$, $p<.05$), but was not a significant predictor of adolescent self-esteem.

Following these results, conformity to mothers and autonomy from mothers were both found to potentially mediate several relationships between maternal parenting behaviors and adolescent self-esteem within the Chinese boys/maternal subsample. Therefore, a second analyses for a mediation model was conducted for the hypothesized model controlling for the direct paths between the exogenous variables and the endogenous variables. Comparing the mediation model ($\chi^2(7) = 8.29$; $p=.31$) to the full model ($\chi^2(1) = .27$; $p=.6$) for the Chinese mother-son dyads resulted in no significant loss of fit ($\chi^2$ difference of 8.02 with 6 degrees of freedom, $p<.25$). These findings indicated that there was significant mediation within the Chinese mother-son dyads (See Figure 4.2). That is, with the direct relationships between the exogenous variables (i.e., parenting behaviors) and the endogenous variables (i.e., adolescent academic achievement and self-esteem) controlled for, the model did not lose fit, indicating that mediation is more significant than the direct relationships within this culture by gender dyad.
Although maternal support did not significantly predict adolescent self-esteem directly ($\gamma = -.08, p<.20$), autonomy from mothers mediated this relationship with maternal support positively predicting autonomy to mothers ($\gamma = .18, p<.05$), which in turn, positively predicted adolescent self-esteem ($\beta = .20, p<.05$). In addition, the relationship between maternal support and adolescent academic achievement was mediated by conformity to mothers. That is, although maternal support did not significantly predict academic achievement directly ($\gamma = -.05, p<.16$), maternal support positively predicted conformity ($\gamma = .27, p<.05$), which, in turn, positively predicted academic achievement ($\beta = .15, p<.05$). In addition, maternal psychological control did not directly predict self-esteem ($\gamma = -.02, p<.48$), but this relationship was mediated by autonomy from mothers ($\gamma = -.21, p<.05$), which in turn, positively predicted self-esteem ($\beta = .20, p<.05$).

**Chinese Boys/Paternal Model.**

Examination of the fit indices among the Chinese boys/paternal model indicated that the chi-square statistic was non-significant ($\chi^2(1) = .78; p=.38$), denoting a good fit to the data. In addition, the value of the RMSEA (.0) was well below the recommended limit of .1, and the value of the GFI (1.0) was well above the recommend minimum of .9. These findings indicate that the hypothesized model appears to be a good fit to data for the Chinese boys/paternal subsample.

Examination of the gamma coefficients among the Chinese boys/paternal model indicated several significant direct relationships between the exogenous variables and the endogenous variables (See Figure 4.2). More specifically, paternal support was a
significant positive predictor of adolescent autonomy from fathers ($\gamma = .27$, $p<.05$), and conformity to fathers ($\gamma = .21$, $p<.05$). In contrast, paternal support was not a significant predictor of adolescent self-esteem or adolescent academic achievement among Chinese boys.

For the direct relationships between paternal behavioral control and the endogenous variables, behavioral control was not a significant positive predictor of either intervening variable or either of the endogenous variables among Chinese boys.

For the direct relationships between paternal psychological control and the endogenous variables, psychological control was a significant negative predictor of autonomy from fathers ($\gamma = -.18$, $p<.05$). However, paternal psychological control was not significantly related to adolescent self-esteem, adolescent academic achievement, or conformity to fathers among Chinese boys.

Examination of the beta coefficients among the Chinese boys/paternal model indicated two significant direct relationships between the intervening variables and the endogenous variables (See Figure 4.2). More specifically, autonomy from fathers was a significant positive predictor of both adolescent self-esteem ($\beta = .30$, $p<.05$) and adolescent academic achievement ($\beta = .18$, $p<.05$) among Chinese boys. In contrast, conformity to fathers was not a significant predictor of adolescent self-esteem or adolescent academic achievement.

Following these results, autonomy from fathers was found to be a potential mediator of several relationships between paternal parenting behaviors and adolescent self-esteem within this subsample of Chinese boys. A second analyses for a mediation
model was conducted for the hypothesized model controlling for the direct paths between the exogenous variables (i.e., paternal support, paternal behavioral control, and paternal psychological control) and the endogenous variables. Comparing the mediation model ($\chi^2(7) = 5.30; p=.62$) to the full model ($\chi^2(1) = .78; p=.38$) for the Chinese father-son dyad resulted in no significant loss of fit ($\chi^2$ difference of 4.52 with 6 df, $p<.50$). These results indicated that there was significant mediation within the Chinese father-son dyads. That is, with the direct relationships between the exogenous variables (i.e., parenting behaviors) and the endogenous variables (i.e., adolescent academic achievement and self-esteem) controlled for, the model did not loose fit, indicating that mediation is more significant than the direct relationships within this culture by gender dyad.

Therefore, several mediating relationships were indicated. That is, although paternal support was not a direct significant predictor of adolescent self-esteem ($\gamma = -.06$, $p<.46$), paternal support was an indirect predictor of adolescent self-esteem through mediation by autonomy from fathers. That is, paternal support positively predicted autonomy to fathers ($\gamma = .27$, $p<.05$), which in turn, positively predicted adolescent self-esteem ($\beta = .30$, $p<.05$). In addition, paternal support also indirectly predicted adolescent academic achievement through mediation by autonomy to fathers, which, in turn, positively predicted adolescent academic achievement ($\beta = .18$, $p<.05$). Moreover, paternal psychological control did not directly predict self-esteem ($\gamma = .07$, $p<.40$), but indirectly predicted self-esteem through a negative mediating relationship with autonomy
from fathers ($\gamma = -.18$, $p<.05$), which, in turn, positively predicted self-esteem ($\beta = .30$, $p<.05$).

Russian Sample

Russian Girls/Maternal Model

Examination of the fit indices among the Russian girls/maternal model indicated that the chi-square statistic was non-significant ($\chi^2(1) = .00004$; $p=.94$). In addition, the value of the RMSEA (.0) was well below the recommended limit of .1, and the value of the GFI (1.0) was well above the recommend minimum of .9. These findings indicate that the hypothesized model appears to be a good fit to the data for the Russian girls/maternal subsample.

Examination of the gamma coefficients among the Russian girls/maternal model indicated several significant direct relationships between the exogenous variables and the endogenous variables (See Figure 4.3). More specifically, maternal support was a significant positive predictor of autonomy from mothers ($\gamma = .17$, $p<.05$). In contrast, maternal support was not a significant predictor of adolescent self-esteem, conformity to mothers, or adolescent academic achievement among Russian girls.

For the direct relationships between maternal behavioral control and the endogenous variables, behavioral-control was a significant positive predictor of adolescent academic achievement ($\gamma = .32$, $p<.05$) and conformity to mothers ($\gamma = .37$, $p<.05$). In contrast, maternal behavioral control was not a significant predictor of adolescent self-esteem or autonomy from mothers among Russian girls.
Figure 4.3: Russian Models
For the direct relationships between maternal psychological control and the endogenous variables, psychological control was a significant negative predictor of autonomy from mothers ($\gamma = .36$, $p < .05$) and a significant positive predictor of conformity to mothers ($\gamma = .28$, $p < .05$). However, maternal psychological control was not a significant predictor of adolescent self-esteem or adolescent academic achievement among the Russian girls.

Examination of the beta coefficients for the Russian girls/maternal model indicated only one significant direct relationship between the intervening variables and the endogenous variables (See Figure 4.3). More specifically, conformity to mothers was a significant negative predictor of adolescent self-esteem ($\beta = -.15$, $p < .05$), but was not a significant predictor of adolescent academic achievement among Russian girls. Autonomy from mothers was not a significant predictor of adolescent self-esteem or adolescent academic achievement for the Russian girls/maternal subsample.

Following these results, conformity to mothers was found to be a potential mediator of several relationships between maternal parenting behaviors and adolescent self-esteem within the Russian girls/maternal model. Following this, a second analyses for a mediation model was conducted for the hypothesized model controlling for the direct paths between the exogenous variables (i.e., maternal support, maternal behavioral control, and maternal psychological control) and the endogenous variables. Comparing the mediation model ($\chi^2(7) = 27.58$; $p = .001$) to the full model ($\chi^2(1) = .0049$; $p = .94$) for the Russian mother-daughter dyad resulted in a significant loss of fit ($\chi^2$ difference of 27.57 with 6 $df$, $p < .001$). These results indicated that there was not significant mediation.
within the Russian mother-daughter dyad. That is, with the direct relationships between the exogenous variables (i.e., parenting behaviors) and the endogenous variables (i.e., adolescent academic achievement and self-esteem) controlled for, the model lost fit, indicating that the direct paths are important within this culture by gender dyad.

**Russian Girls/Paternal Model**

Examination of the fit indices among the Russian girls/paternal model indicated that the chi-square statistic was non-significant ($\chi^2(1) = .66; p=.42$). In addition, the value of the RMSEA (.0) was well below the recommended limit of .1, and the value of the GFI (1.0) was well above the recommend minimum of .9. These findings indicate that the hypothesized model appears to be a good fit to the data for the Russian girls/paternal subsample.

Examination of the gamma coefficients among the Russian girls/paternal model indicated several significant direct relationships between the exogenous variables and the endogenous variables (See Figure 4.3). However, paternal support was not a significant predictor of any of the variables (i.e., autonomy from fathers, conformity to fathers, adolescent self-esteem or adolescent academic achievement).

For the direct relationships between paternal behavioral control and the endogenous variables, behavioral control was a significant positive predictor of conformity to fathers ($\gamma = .23, p<.05$). In contrast, paternal behavioral control was not a significant predictor of adolescent self-esteem, autonomy from fathers, or adolescent academic achievement.
For the direct relationships between paternal psychological control and the endogenous variables, psychological control was a significant negative predictor of autonomy from fathers ($\gamma = -.42, p<.05$) and a significant positive predictor of conformity to fathers ($\gamma = .35, p<.05$). However, paternal psychological control was not significantly related to adolescent self-esteem or adolescent academic achievement among Russian girls.

Examination of the beta coefficients among the Russian girls/paternal model indicated that two significant direct relationships existed between the intervening variables and the endogenous variables (See Figure 4.3). More specifically, conformity to fathers was a significant negative predictor of adolescent self-esteem ($\beta = -.24, p<.05$), but was not a significant predictor of adolescent academic achievement among Russian girls. In contrast, autonomy from fathers was a significant positive predictor of adolescent academic achievement ($\beta = .25, p<.05$), but it was not a significant predictor of adolescent self-esteem.

Following these results, conformity to fathers and autonomy from fathers were both found to be potential mediators of several relationships between paternal parenting behaviors and adolescent self-esteem within this subsample of Russian girls. A second analyses for a mediation model was conducted for the hypothesized model controlling for the direct paths between the exogenous variables (i.e., paternal support, paternal behavioral control, and paternal psychological control) and the endogenous variables. Comparing the mediation model ($X^2(7) = 7.24; p=40$) to the full model ($X^2(1) = .66; p=.42$) for the Russian father-daughter dyad resulted in no significant loss of fit ($X^2$
difference of 6.58 with 6 df, p<.25). These results indicated that there was significant mediation within the Russian father-daughter dyad. That is, with the direct relationships between the exogenous variables (i.e., parenting behaviors) and the endogenous variables (i.e., adolescent academic achievement and self-esteem) controlled for, the model did not loose fit, indicating that the direct paths are not as important within this culture by gender dyad.

Autonomy from fathers and conformity to fathers were significant mediators. More specifically, paternal behavioral control was not a significant direct predictor of adolescent self-esteem (γ = .08, p<.30); however, paternal behavioral control was a significant positive predictor of conformity to fathers (γ = .23, p<.01), which in turn, was a significant negative predictor of adolescent self-esteem (β = -.24, p<.01). In addition, although paternal psychological control was not a significant direct predictor of adolescent self-esteem (γ = -.03, p<.70), paternal psychological control was a significant positive predictor of conformity to fathers (γ = .35, p<.01), which in turn was a significant negative predictor of adolescent self-esteem (β = -.24, p<.05). Moreover, although paternal psychological control was not a significant direct predictor of adolescent academic achievement (γ = -.05, p<.50), paternal psychological control was a significant negative predictor of autonomy from fathers (γ = .42, p<.01), which in turn was a significant positive predictor of adolescent academic achievement (β = .25, p<.05).

**Russian Boys/Maternal Model**

Examination of the fit indices among the Russian boys/maternal model indicated that the chi-square statistic was non-significant ($\chi^2(1) = .27; p=.6$), indicating a good fit.
to the data. In addition, the value of the RMSEA (.0) was well below the recommended limit of .1, and the value of the GFI (.9) was well above the recommended minimum of .9. These findings indicated that the hypothesized model appears to be a good fit to the data for the Russian boys/maternal subsample.

Examination of the gamma coefficients among the Russian boys/maternal model indicated several significant direct relationships between the exogenous variables and the endogenous variables (See Figure 4.3). More specifically, maternal support was a significant positive predictor of adolescent self-esteem ($\gamma = .27, p<.05$), adolescent academic achievement ($\gamma = .17, p<.05$), and autonomy from mothers ($\gamma = .27, p<.05$). In contrast, maternal support was not a significant predictor of conformity to mothers among Russian boys.

For the direct relationships between maternal behavioral control and the endogenous variables, maternal behavioral control was a significant positive predictor of academic achievement ($\gamma = .18, p<.05$) and conformity to mothers ($\gamma = .38, p<.05$).

Examination of the direct relationships between maternal psychological control and the endogenous variables revealed that psychological control was a significant negative predictor of autonomy from mothers ($\gamma = -.32, p<.05$) and a significant positive predictor of conformity to mothers ($\gamma = .33, p<.05$) among Russian boys. However, maternal psychological control was not a significant predictor of adolescent self-esteem or academic achievement among.

Examination of the beta coefficients among the Russian boys/maternal model indicated that only one significant direct relationship existed between the intervening
variables and the endogenous variables (See Figure 4.3). That is, conformity to mothers was a significant negative predictor of adolescent self-esteem ($\beta = -0.18, p<.05$), but was not a significant predictor of adolescent academic achievement among Russian boys. Autonomy from mothers, in turn, was not a significant predictor of adolescent self-esteem or adolescent academic achievement.

These results indicated that conformity to mothers is a potential mediator of several relationships between maternal parenting behavior and adolescent self-esteem the Russian boys/maternal model. Therefore, a second analyses for a mediation model was conducted for the hypothesized model controlling for the direct paths between the exogenous variables (i.e., maternal support, maternal behavioral control, and maternal psychological control) and the endogenous variables. Comparing the mediation model ($\chi^2(7) = 21.74; p=.002$) to the full model ($\chi^2(1) = 27.27; p=.6$) for the Russian mother-son dyads resulted in a significant loss of fit ($\chi^2$ difference of 21.44 with 6 $df$, $p<.001$). These results indicated that there was not significant mediation within the Russian boys/maternal model. That is, with the direct relationships between the exogenous variables (i.e., parenting behaviors) and the endogenous variables (i.e., adolescent academic achievement and self-esteem) controlled for, the model lost fit, indicating that the direct paths are important within this culture by gender dyad.

**Russian Boys/Paternal Model**

Examination of the fit indices among the Russian boys/paternal model indicated that the chi-square statistic was non-significant ($\chi^2(1) = .12; p=.73$). In addition, the value of the RMSEA (.0) was well below the recommended limit of .1, and the value of
the GFI (1.0) was well above the recommend minimum of .9. These findings indicate that the hypothesized model appears to be a good fit to the data for the Russian boys/paternal subsample.

Examination of the gamma coefficients among the Russian boys/paternal model indicated several significant direct relationships between the exogenous variables and the endogenous variables (See Figure 4.3). However, paternal support was not significantly related to either of the intervening variables or either of the endogenous outcome variables among this subsample of Russian boys.

For the direct relationships between paternal behavioral control and the endogenous variables, behavioral control was a significant positive predictor of conformity to fathers ($\gamma = .32$, $p<.05$) and adolescent academic achievement ($\gamma = .31$, $p<.05$). In contrast, paternal behavioral control did not significantly predict adolescent self-esteem or autonomy from fathers.

For the direct relationships between paternal psychological control and the endogenous variables, psychological control was a significant negative predictor of autonomy from fathers ($\gamma = -.44$, $p<.05$) and a significant positive predictor of conformity to fathers ($\gamma = .41$, $p<.05$). However, paternal psychological control was not significantly related to adolescent self-esteem or academic achievement among Russian boys.

Examination of the beta coefficients in the Russian boys/paternal model indicated that no significant direct relationships existed between either of the intervening variables and either of the endogenous variables (See Figure 4.3). Therefore, no potential mediating or indirect relationships existed within this subsample of Russian boys.
CHAPTER V

OVERVIEW, DISCUSSION, AND CONCLUSIONS

Overview of Study

The purpose of this study was to examine the direct and indirect relationships between three dimensions of parenting behavior (i.e., support, behavioral control, and psychological control) and the self-esteem and academic achievement of European-American, Chinese, and Russian adolescents. That is, the direct relationships between each of these three dimensions of parenting behavior and adolescent self-esteem and academic achievement were examined while considering the effects of two intervening variables (i.e., autonomy from parents and conformity to parents), each representing cultural influences within the parent-adolescent relationship. That is, the hypothesized model allowed for the examination of: (a) the direct relationships between the predictor variables (i.e., dimensions of parenting behaviors) and the outcome variables (i.e., adolescent self-esteem and academic achievement); (b) the direct relationships between the predictor variables and the intervening variables (i.e., autonomy from parents and conformity to parents); (c) the direct relationships between the intervening variables and the outcome variables; and (d) the mediating and/or indirect relationships between predictor variables that influence one or both outcome variables through influencing one or both intervening variables.
More specifically, several research questions were examined:

(1) What are the direct and indirect relationships between the three dimensions of parenting behavior, autonomy from parents, and adolescent self-esteem? That is, does the intervening variable of autonomy from parents serve as a link (i.e., mediator) between the dimensions of parenting behavior and adolescent self-esteem, and what are the effects on the direct relationships (i.e., between the parenting behaviors and adolescent self-esteem) when the intervening variable (i.e., autonomy from parents) is included?

(2) What are the direct and indirect relationships between the three dimensions of parenting behavior, autonomy from parents, and adolescent academic achievement? That is, does the intervening variable of autonomy from parents serve as a link (i.e., mediator) between the dimensions of parenting behavior and adolescent academic achievement, and what are the effects on the direct relationships (i.e., between the parenting behaviors and adolescent academic achievement) when the intervening variable (i.e., autonomy from parents) is included?

(3) What are the direct and indirect relationships between the three dimensions of parenting behavior, conformity to parents, and adolescent self-esteem? That is, does the intervening variable of conformity to parents serve as a link (i.e., mediator) between the dimensions of parenting behavior and adolescent self-esteem, and what are the effects on the direct relationships (i.e., between the parenting behaviors and adolescent self-esteem) when the intervening variable (i.e., conformity to parents) is included?

(4) What are the direct and indirect relationships between the three dimensions of parenting behavior, conformity to parents, and adolescent academic achievement? That
is, does the intervening variable of conformity to parents serve as a link (i.e., mediator) between the dimensions of parenting behavior and adolescent academic achievement, and what are the effects on the direct relationships (i.e., between the parenting behaviors and adolescent self-esteem) when the intervening variable (conformity to parents) is included?

In addition, because previous research has indicated that differences may exist in the patterns of influence between mothers and fathers on developmental outcomes of boys and girls (Bartle et al., 1989; Block, 1983; Demo, Small, & Savin-Williams, 1987), gender of parent and gender of adolescent were included as moderating variables in the examination of the aforementioned research questions. That is, the patterns of direct and indirect relationships in the four research questions stated above were also examined for (a) differences and similarities by gender of adolescent and (b) gender of parent.

Moreover, previous empirical and theoretical work also suggests that the relationships examined here may vary across cultural groups (Chao, 1994; Lam, 1997; Peterson, 1995; Triandis, 1995). Therefore, cultural group (i.e., European-American, Chinese, and Russian) was also included as a potential moderator of the relationships examined in the four research questions. The analyses were conducted separately by each gender dyad (e.g., fathers-daughters) for each cultural group, resulting in four subsamples within each of the three cultural groups, for a total of twelve (i.e., culture by gender) subsamples (See Figures 4.1 – 4.3). In addition, correlation matrices for each subsample are provided in Tables 5.1 – 5.3.
### European-American Girls

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Support</td>
<td>.463**</td>
<td>-.351**</td>
<td>.551**</td>
<td>.157*</td>
<td>.273**</td>
<td>.188**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Behavioral Control</td>
<td>.625**</td>
<td>-.216**</td>
<td>.203**</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>.225**</td>
<td>.435**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Psychological Control</td>
<td>-.437**</td>
<td>-.266**</td>
<td>-.318**</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>-.183**</td>
<td>-.100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Autonomy</td>
<td>.617**</td>
<td>.329**</td>
<td>-.480**</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>.323**</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Conformity</td>
<td>.281**</td>
<td>.290**</td>
<td>-.042</td>
<td>.224**</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Self-esteem</td>
<td>.258**</td>
<td>.170*</td>
<td>-.291**</td>
<td>.317**</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>.286**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Academic Achievement</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>.221**</td>
<td>-.147</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.286**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlations above the diagonal are for maternal model and correlations below the diagonal are for the paternal model

N=211 adolescents

*p<.05

**p<.01

### European-American Boys

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Support</td>
<td>.512**</td>
<td>-.113</td>
<td>.394**</td>
<td>.195**</td>
<td>.384**</td>
<td>.417**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Behavioral Control</td>
<td>.530**</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.227**</td>
<td>.285**</td>
<td>.307**</td>
<td>.449**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Psychological Control</td>
<td>-.152*</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>-.235**</td>
<td>.317**</td>
<td>-.066</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Autonomy</td>
<td>.432**</td>
<td>.241*</td>
<td>-.210**</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>.197**</td>
<td>.222**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Conformity</td>
<td>.265**</td>
<td>.346**</td>
<td>.279**</td>
<td>.162*</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>.220**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Self-esteem</td>
<td>.262**</td>
<td>.324**</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>.161*</td>
<td>.156*</td>
<td>.521**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Academic Achievement</td>
<td>.226**</td>
<td>.463**</td>
<td>.168*</td>
<td>.166*</td>
<td>.248**</td>
<td>.521**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlations above the diagonal are for maternal model and correlations below the diagonal are for the paternal model

N=208 adolescents

*p<.05

**p<.01

Table 5.1: Pearson’s Correlation Coefficients for European-American Sample
### Chinese Girls

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.261**</td>
<td>-.229**</td>
<td>.331**</td>
<td>.245**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Behavioral Control</td>
<td>.306**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Psychological Control</td>
<td>-.229**</td>
<td>-.130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>.254**</td>
<td>.265**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Autonomy</td>
<td>.282**</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>-.313**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.305**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Conformity</td>
<td>.245**</td>
<td>.362**</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td></td>
<td>.073</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Self-esteem</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>-.016</td>
<td>.213**</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Academic Achievement</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td>.222**</td>
<td>-.082</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>.259**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Correlations above the diagonal are for maternal model and correlations below the diagonal are for the paternal model

N=242 adolescents

*p<.05

**p<.01

### Chinese Boys

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Support</td>
<td>.249**</td>
<td>-.152*</td>
<td>.236**</td>
<td>.250**</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>-.065</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Behavioral Control</td>
<td>.223**</td>
<td>-.043</td>
<td>.193**</td>
<td>.150*</td>
<td>.121</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Psychological Control</td>
<td>-.133*</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>-.255**</td>
<td>-.013</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>-.069</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Autonomy</td>
<td>.244**</td>
<td>.143*</td>
<td>-.257**</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>.185**</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Conformity</td>
<td>.174*</td>
<td>.196**</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Self-esteem</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>.241**</td>
<td>-.018</td>
<td>.338**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Academic Achievement</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>-.022</td>
<td>.135*</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.338**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Correlations above the diagonal are for maternal model and correlations below the diagonal are for the paternal model

N=238 adolescents

*p<.05

**p<.01

Table 5.2: Pearson’s Correlation Coefficients for Chinese Sample
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## Russian Girls

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Support</td>
<td></td>
<td>.372 **</td>
<td>-.386 **</td>
<td>.375 **</td>
<td>.135 *</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>.173 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Behavioral Control</td>
<td>.497 **</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.077</td>
<td>.138 *</td>
<td>.388 **</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.320 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Psychological Control</td>
<td>-.318 **</td>
<td>-.106</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.385 **</td>
<td>.222 **</td>
<td>-.210 **</td>
<td>-.115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Autonomy</td>
<td>.227 **</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>-.420 **</td>
<td></td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.166 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Conformity</td>
<td>.141 *</td>
<td>.264 **</td>
<td>.253 **</td>
<td>.147 *</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.159 **</td>
<td>.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Self-esteem</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>-.154 *</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>-.220 **</td>
<td></td>
<td>.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Academic Achievement</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>-.167 *</td>
<td>.259 **</td>
<td>-.026</td>
<td></td>
<td>.031</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a Correlations above the diagonal are for maternal model and correlations below the diagonal are for the paternal model
N=234 adolescents
*p<.05
**p<.01

## Russian Boys

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Support</td>
<td>.283 **</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.304 **</td>
<td>.391 **</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.243 **</td>
<td>.176 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Behavioral Control</td>
<td>.383 **</td>
<td>.171 *</td>
<td>.158 *</td>
<td>.423 **</td>
<td>-.056</td>
<td>.168 *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Psychological Control</td>
<td>-.233 **</td>
<td>.265 **</td>
<td>-.375 **</td>
<td>.391 **</td>
<td>-.092</td>
<td>-.016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Autonomy</td>
<td>.253 **</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>-.406 **</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.078</td>
<td>.213 **</td>
<td>.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Conformity</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>.434 **</td>
<td>.462 **</td>
<td>.154 *</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.189 **</td>
<td>.180 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Self-esteem</td>
<td>.153 *</td>
<td>-.062</td>
<td>-.116</td>
<td>.155 *</td>
<td>-.152 *</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Academic Achievement</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>.246 **</td>
<td>-.083</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.044</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a Correlations above the diagonal are for maternal model and correlations below the diagonal are for the paternal model
N=161 adolescents
*p<.05
**p<.01

Table 5.3: Pearson’s Correlation Coefficients for Russian Sample
Discussion

Direct and Indirect Effects: Parenting, Autonomy, and Self-Esteem

Overall, adolescent autonomy from parents was a significant direct predictor of adolescent self-esteem across two of the three cultural groups. That is, adolescent autonomy from parents served as a positive predictor of adolescent self-esteem among six of the twelve culture by gender dyads. More specifically, across all four gender dyads within the Chinese sample, and for European-American girls, perceptions of autonomy from mothers and/or fathers served to enhance self-esteem. However, autonomy from parents only served as a significant mediator between parenting behaviors and adolescent self-esteem within the paternal model among European-American girls and Chinese girls, whereas, for Chinese boys, autonomy from fathers and autonomy from mothers mediated the relationships between parenting and adolescent self-esteem. These findings are consistent with research which suggests that supportive parenting behaviors influence the development of autonomy from parents (Peterson et al., 1999; Peterson & Hann, 2000) which, in turn, influences healthy self-esteem among US and Chinese in Hong Kong (Allen et al., 1994; Cheung & Lau, 1985). However, the findings among the Chinese sample stand in sharp contrast to what would be expected within a collectivistic cultural group where parents are viewed as discouraging autonomy (Chao, 1994, 1996; Lam, 1997; Triandis, 1995).

European-American Sample

Examination of the correlation coefficients within the European-American sample indicate that paternal and maternal support were significant correlates with
adolescent self-esteem for both boys and girls (See Table 5.1). This finding is consistent with previous research among US samples in which supportive parenting has been reported to be positively related with adolescent self-esteem (Gecas & Schwalbe, 1983, 1986). However, within the context of the full model, the direct paths between parental support (i.e., paternal and maternal) and adolescent self-esteem are non-significant among girls, and paternal and maternal support positively predict self-esteem through autonomy from parents. In contrast, for European-American boys, paternal and maternal support continues to significantly relate to adolescent self-esteem within the full model, while autonomy from parents is not related to self-esteem. These findings suggest that among European-American adolescents, autonomy from both parents is more important for the self-esteem development of girls than boys. Among European-American boys then, self-esteem development appears to be more of a product of direct support from mothers and fathers along with direct behavioral control from fathers. In other words, for European-American boys, self-esteem development depends on connection to parents (i.e., parental support) and firm consistent structure and rules (i.e., behavioral control), and not on autonomy development. In contrast, for European-American girls, self-esteem development appears to be a product of gaining autonomy from parents, but within the context of a supportive relationship with both parents. These findings contradict much of Western research and theory which propose that autonomy is more important in the socialization of males (Silverberg & Gondoli, 1996), with female socialization being less encouraging of such traditionally masculine qualities as self-governance and self-confidence (Gilligan, Lyons, & Hanmer, 1990).
These findings suggesting that autonomy is more important for girls than boys, however, are consistent with research in the US suggesting different trajectories for boys and girls in reference to autonomy development (e.g., Bartle et al., 1989; Cooper, Grotevant, 1987; Cooper, Grotevant & Condon, 1983; Grotevant & Cooper, 1985). Although girls are socialized in infancy and childhood more towards closeness while boys are socialized during this time more towards autonomy (Mahler, Pine, & Bergman, 1975; Robinson & Biringen, 1995), the emphasis appears to switch in adolescence. That is, autonomy may be more important for the development of female adolescents because they have not yet experienced autonomy to the extent that boys have (Robinson & Biringen, 1995). Cooper and Grotevant and colleagues (Cooper, Grotevant, 1987; Cooper, Grotevant & Condon, 1983; Grotevant & Cooper, 1985) conclude that female adolescents who experience more autonomy in reference to their parents report higher levels of identity exploration, whereas boys who report more connectedness to their parents report higher levels of identity exploration. Moreover, these findings are also consistent with the results of a study among European-American adolescents in which maternal authoritative parenting (i.e., support, reasoning, and firm control) positively predicted female adolescent individuation (i.e., psychological autonomy and/or separation) from parents (Bartle et al., 1989). For girls, individuation (i.e., autonomy) from both parents, along with paternal authoritative parenting positively predicted self-esteem (Bartle et al., 1989). In contrast, individuation from parents was not related to the self-esteem development of boys, but paternal authoritative parenting positively predicted adolescent self-esteem (Bartle et al., 1989).
Another potential reason for the gender differences found in relation to parenting, autonomy, and adolescent self-esteem development among the European-American sample may be that macro level changes in society have influenced socialization (Steinberg & Silverberg, 1986). That is, the encouragement of autonomy and equality for females appear to have been dramatic in recent times, especially among Western individualistic societies (Hutter, 1998; Lamanna & Riedmann, 1997). This striving for equality appears to have influenced the role of parents in the fostering of autonomy development for adolescent girls (Steinberg & Silverberg, 1986), and, in turn, facilitated the importance of autonomy to the development of self-esteem among females.

Autonomy from parents did not serve as a significant mediator of the relationship between parental behavioral control and adolescent self-esteem. Examination of the correlations between parental behavioral control and autonomy from parents within the European-American sample indicates significant positive relationships across all four gender dyads (See Table 5.1). This finding is consistent with previous research among US samples which suggests that parental behaviors such as behavioral control provide structure and consistent monitoring, serving to facilitate the development of adolescent autonomy (Peterson et al., 1999; Peterson & Hann, 2000). However, when considered in the context of the full model, all of the relationships between parental behavioral control and autonomy from parents were non-significant. As mentioned previously, examination of the correlation coefficients among the European-American sample indicates that autonomy from parents and adolescent-self-esteem are positive correlates; however,
when considered in the context of the full model, these relationships between autonomy and self-esteem only remained significant for girls.

Behavioral control serves to create an environment in which adolescents are able to perceive accurate role expectations and develop appropriate levels of self-regulation (Barber, 1996). Moreover, previous research suggests that behavioral control provides adolescents with clear role expectations from which they can then evaluate themselves, thus enhancing self-esteem (Peterson, 1987; Peterson & Hann, 2000). In this sense, parental behavioral control should serve to foster autonomy from parents, as well as self-esteem, however, in the context of the full model, this is not the case. One potential reason for the lack of significant relationships between parental behavioral control and self-esteem, and the lack of autonomy in mediating these relationships may be the inclusion of academic achievement within the model. That is, previous research suggests that behavioral control is a consistent positive predictor of adolescent academic achievement among diverse US samples (Baumrind, 1991; Bean et al., 1999; Herman 1997; Steinberg et al., 1992). Therefore, the inclusion of academic achievement in the same model with self-esteem may decrease the influence of behavioral control on self-esteem, and decrease the influence of autonomy on these relationships that may be present in a model that does not include academic achievement. In fact, the findings from this study suggest that the impact of behavioral control is stronger for adolescent academic achievement in comparison to self-esteem. However, one direct significant relationship between paternal behavioral control and the self-esteem of boys was found in the full model. This finding is consistent with theoretical and empirical work among
US samples suggesting that parents who employ rules and structure with adolescents provide them with clear role expectations from which to evaluate themselves, thus enhancing self-esteem (Gecas & Schwalbe, 1983, 1986; Peterson & Hann, 2000). One possible explanation for the moderation by gender of parent and gender of adolescent may be that fathers tend to serve as the main role models for boys during adolescence as they attempt to learn their adult roles (Newman & Newman, 1995). In turn, European-American fathers who provided clear rules and structure to their sons, provide boys with clear role expectations from which they evaluated themselves more positively.

For parental psychological control, a direct negative relationship was found between parental psychological control and both autonomy from mothers and autonomy from fathers for both boys and girls. In fact, this negative relationship between parental psychological control and adolescent autonomy was the only relationship that was consistent across each of the twelve culture by gender subsamples. Moreover, for adolescent girls, the relationship between paternal psychological control and self-esteem was mediated by autonomy from fathers. In addition, although there was not significant mediation within the full model, maternal psychological control negatively predicted autonomy from mothers, which, in turn, influenced adolescent self-esteem within the European-American girls/maternal model.

**Chinese Sample**

Autonomy from parents was a significant mediator of the relationships between parental support and adolescent self-esteem for three of the four gender dyads. Therefore, for Chinese boys and girls, self-esteem was facilitated by the development of
autonomy from parents within the context of supportive relationships with parents. These relationships are contrary to descriptions of Chinese and/or Asian-American parenting as authoritarian, with support (i.e., the Western notion of support) not being a primary emphasis (e.g., Chiu, 1987; Dornbusch et al., 1987; Stevenson et al., 1992). In addition, these findings are contrary to what one would expect to find following an individualism-collectivism perspective, which suggests that Chinese parents discourage autonomy (Lam, 1997; Tafarodi & Swan, 1995; Triandis, 1995). However, in consideration of the recent “open door” policy in mainland China, Western investors have not only influenced rapid economic growth, but cultural values have also been changing (Chen & Lan, 1998). Moreover, studies of Chinese adolescents in mainland China and Hong Kong have noted the increased demands for autonomy from parents (Chen & Lan, 1998; Cheung & Lau, 1985; Lau & Cheung, 1987; Yau & Smetana, 1996). For example, Chen and Lan (1998) found no significant differences on a measure of adolescent perceptions of independence from parents across samples of Chinese, Chinese-American, and European-American adolescents.

Examination of the direct relationships within the Chinese sample suggests that parental support is only a direct predictor of self-esteem within the girls/maternal model (i.e., the model in which significant mediation did not occur). The lack of parental support to directly predict adolescent self-esteem among Chinese boys, and for Chinese girls in reference to their fathers, is contrary to findings among Hong Kong Chinese in which adolescent self-esteem of both boys and girls was positively related to family environments characterized as supportive (Cheung & Lau, 1985). However, previous
studies examining these direct relationships among Chinese have not investigated gender of parent or gender of adolescent differences (e.g., Cheung & Lau, 1985). One potential reason for gender moderating the relationship between parental support and adolescent self-esteem may be that Chinese mothers spend more time with their daughters in comparison to fathers (Ho, 1989). In addition, following traditional Chinese values, females are more likely to see their mothers as their main role model (Shon & Ja, 1982; Smith, 1991).

Autonomy from parents was a significant mediator of the relationship between parental behavioral control and adolescent self-esteem only within the Chinese boys/maternal model. In fact, this was the only gender dyad across all three cultural groups in which autonomy from parents mediated this relationship. Therefore, for Chinese boys, perceptions that their mothers were monitoring their activities led to increased perceptions of autonomy from mothers, which, in turn, enhanced self-esteem. Following the Chinese cultural notion of child training, parents would be expected to use firm but non-punitive methods of parental control to provide rules and structure in the socialization process (Chao, 1994, 1996; Cheung & Lau, 1985). These rules and structure (i.e., parental behavioral control), in turn, serve as a method for parents to convey role expectations to adolescents (Barber, 1996; Peterson, 1987). Perhaps in this case, Chinese mothers who provided consistent monitoring (i.e., behavioral control) of their son’s activities are more likely to negotiate and allow them autonomy. Autonomy from mothers then enhances the self-esteem of Chinese boys (Cheung & Lau, 1985). In addition, considering the value of males to Chinese society, and the importance of the
father-son relationship (Cheung, 1996; Meredith et al., 1987), mothers may not be as aware of the adult male role (e.g., privileges and expectations) as fathers. Therefore, by mothers monitoring their sons in the context of a developing autonomous relationship, Chinese sons will be better prepared to take on a primary adult role of responsibility in the family, where they are positioned over their mothers and other females (Cheung, 1996).

The findings that behavioral control did not influence the self-esteem of Chinese girls (and boys in reference to fathers) is contrary to empirical and theoretical work which suggests that parental behavioral control serves as a method for parents to convey role expectations to adolescents (Peterson, 1987). However, these non-significant findings are consistent with scholars who suggest that Chinese parents focus less on fostering individualistic outcomes such as self-esteem, and more on outcomes that are a reflection of the family, such as conformity and academic achievement (Chao, 1994; Lam, 1997). In fact, parental behavioral control was a significant predictor of conformity and academic achievement (girls only) among Chinese within this study.

Autonomy from parents was a significant mediator of the relationships between parental psychological control and Chinese adolescent self-esteem within three of the four gender dyads (i.e., both paternal models and boys/maternal model). Although autonomy was not a significant mediator within the full model for the mother/daughter dyad, maternal psychological control also influenced the self-esteem of girls through autonomy from mothers. These findings are consistent with theory and extensive research among US samples which suggests that punitive, excessive, and arbitrary parenting
behaviors inhibit the youthful development of autonomy (Gecas & Seff, 1990; Peterson et al., 1999; Peterson & Hann, 2000). Therefore, for both Chinese boys and girls, psychologically controlling parenting inhibited autonomy development, which, in turn, influenced adolescent self-esteem.

**Russian Sample**

For the Russian sample, autonomy from parents did not significantly predict adolescent self-esteem. The failure of autonomy to mediate the relationships between parenting behaviors and adolescent self-esteem among Russian adolescents follows what would be expected among more collectivistic societies. That is, autonomy did not serve to mediate or facilitate the relationships between dimensions of parental behavior and adolescent self-esteem. These findings suggest that the socialization processes that influence Russian adolescent self-esteem are more collectivistic in social orientation, where autonomy is not seen as an important socialization goal or influence on adolescent self-esteem (Chao, 1996; Lam, 1997; Triandis, 1995). In addition, only one direct relationship existed between parenting behaviors and adolescent self-esteem. More specifically, in the Russian boys/maternal model, maternal support was a positive predictor of adolescent self-esteem. Examining the correlation coefficients within the Russian sample indicate that both maternal and paternal support was positively correlated with self-esteem for boys (See Table 5.3). However, within the full model, the relationship between paternal support and the self-esteem of boys did not remain significant. Following theoretical and empirical work among US and collectivistic cultural groups (i.e., Chinese in Hong Kong), parental behavior that is supportive conveys
clear role expectations to adolescents and facilitates positive self-esteem development (Cheung & Lau, 1985; Gecas & Schwalbe, 1983, 1986; Lau & Cheung, 1987). Therefore, it appears that for Russian boys, the relationship between maternal support and self-esteem is consistent with previous research and theory. In contrast, neither paternal nor maternal support was related to self-esteem for Russian girls. The moderation of these relationships by gender of parent is somewhat consistent with scholars who suggest that Russian mothers are more involved with their children than fathers (Golofast, 1991; Gurko, 1997), and fathers' interactions with their children convey lower levels of warmth, support and confidence compared to mothers (Golofast, 1991).

The lack of autonomy from parents and parenting behavior to influence the self-esteem of Russian girls is somewhat consistent with the findings from a recent study reporting that Russian girls were more critical of their mothers than Russian boys (Gurko, 1997). This author also found that Russian girls were more likely to disagree with their mothers and feel that their mothers did not understand them (Gurko, 1997). Following this, parents are less effective when their children have no affection or emotional connection with them (Gurko, 1997). Perhaps parenting behaviors have less impact on self-esteem development among Russian girls because they do not perceive that their parents are effective significant others able to convey appropriate role expectations. Gurko’s (1997) finding that Russian adolescents feel that their parents do not understand them makes sense considering the societal-level changes occurring in Russia. From this perspective, Russian adolescents may feel that their parents are not able to understand
them (i.e., and are not able to convey appropriate role expectations) because their parents were raised in the Soviet Era and are not aware of the current social expectations.

Examination of the correlation coefficients indicates that both paternal and maternal psychological control were significant negative correlates with adolescent self-esteem for Russian girls (See Table 5.3). This finding is consistent with previous research among US samples suggesting that punitive and psychologically controlling behaviors inhibit self-esteem by not conveying clear role expectations for youth to evaluate themselves (Gecas & Schwalbe, 1986; Peterson, 1987). However, within the full model, neither parental behavioral control nor parental psychological control was significantly related to Russian adolescent self-esteem. That is, other variables in the model (i.e., conformity) were stronger influences. These non-significant findings are somewhat consistent with the sparse literature which has characterized Russian parenting as permissive (Gurko, 1997) and uninvolved (Hogan, Maddox, Antonov, & Matskovsky, 1994). During the Soviet Era, parents performed more of a secondary role in the socialization process, where the state and society as a whole were seen as largely responsible for socializing children (Gurko, 1997; Hutter, 1998; Jose et al., 1998). A leading Russian sociologist, Anatolyi Antonov suggests that a fundamental change in social values during and since the Soviet Era has decreased the extent that Russian parents take responsibility for bearing and nurturing children (Hogan, Maddox, Antonov, & Matskovsky 1994; Hutter, 1998). Moreover, the lack of significant relationships between parenting and self-esteem is consistent with suggestions that self-esteem is less important among more collectivistic and/or non-Western groups (e.g., Chinese), and is
more likely to be a socialization goal among more individualistic and/or Western cultural
groups (Chao, 1996; Lam, 1997; Lau, 1996).

Direct and Indirect Effects: Parenting, Autonomy, and Academic Achievement

Although studies suggest that parental support, behavioral control, and
psychological control are predictive of adolescent academic achievement (Barber, 1997;
Steinberg et al., 1991; Herman et al., 1997) and autonomy development (Peterson et al.,
1999) among Western or US samples, no previous studies have examined autonomy as a
mediator of these relationships. Moreover, previous studies have not examined
autonomy from parents as a mediator of these relationships among Russian and Chinese
adolescents. Therefore, the findings of this study provide new insight into the complex
relationship between parenting behaviors, autonomy from parents, and academic
achievement within the contexts of culture and gender.

Across all three cultural groups, autonomy from parents was only a direct
predictor of adolescent academic achievement within three of the twelve culture by
gender dyads (i.e., Russian mother-daughter, Chinese mother-daughter and Chinese
father-son dyads). Based on the samples and measures used in this study, therefore,
autonomy from parents does not appear to serve as an important link between the three
dimensions of parenting behavior and adolescent academic achievement. However, a
more academically oriented measure of autonomy may have produced different results.

European-American Sample

Examination of the correlation coefficients within the European-American model
indicates that both autonomy from mothers and autonomy from fathers were positively
correlated with academic achievement among boys (See Table 5.1). However, within the full model, autonomy from parents did not significantly predict adolescent academic achievement among any of the gender dyads within the European-American sample. Therefore, despite theoretical and empirical work suggesting that the development of autonomy fosters academic achievement (Ginsburg & Bronstein, 1993; Grolnick & Ryan, 1989; Herman et al., 1997; Rosenholtz & Simpson, 1984), in the context of the full model, this relationship did not hold. The lack of autonomy to serve as a mediator or indirect link between parenting and academic achievement among European-American adolescents is contrary to what would be expected from an individualism-collectivism perspective. Moreover, these findings are also contrary to previous studies with US samples suggesting that autonomy in the classroom (Rosenholtz & Simpson, 1984) and autonomy from parents are predictive of higher academic achievement (Ginsburg & Bronstein, 1993; Grolnick & Ryan, 1989). That is, among individualistic cultural groups (i.e., European Americans), adolescent autonomy is thought to be an important socialization goal of parents and an important influence on adolescent development (Chao, 1996; Lam, 1997; Triandis, 1995). One possible explanation for the lack of autonomy in predicting academic achievement within this study may be the fact that the measure of autonomy used here is not specific to academic achievement and is more a measure of general behavioral autonomy.

Examination of the correlation coefficients for the European-American sample indicated that parental support and academic achievement were significant positive correlates (See Table 5.1) within three of the gender dyads (i.e., except for girls/maternal
model). However, in the context of the full model (See Figure 4.1), this relationship remained significant in only one gender dyad (i.e., boys/maternal model). In fact, maternal support was a direct positive predictor of all four endogenous variables for boys, suggesting that for European-American boys, support from mothers is an especially important factor in facilitating psychosocial competence among boys. However, contrary to previous research, parental support did not significantly predict adolescent academic achievement for girls (or for boys in reference to fathers). That is, previous studies have consistently reported that authoritative parenting (i.e., parental support, behavioral control, and lack of psychological control) consistently predicts higher levels of academic achievement (Dornbusch et al., 1987; Steinberg et al., 1992). Perhaps, the reason for the inconsistency between the findings from this study and previous research with authoritative parenting is the separation of parental support and behavioral control within this study (i.e., which are typically combined in the parental styles approach). That is, although parental support was not a consistent predictor of adolescent academic achievement, parental behavioral control was a consistent positive predictor of academic achievement across all three cultural groups. In addition, most studies examining the relationship between parental styles and adolescent academic achievement have not differentiated between mothers and fathers (e.g., Dornbusch et al., 1987; Steinberg et al., 1991). Therefore the findings of this study point both to the need to consider the influence of mothers and fathers on adolescent development, in addition to the importance of examining parental support separately from behavioral control.
The relationship between parental behavioral control and academic achievement was not mediated by autonomy from parents. Despite the significant correlations between parental behavioral control and autonomy from parents across all four gender dyads (See Table 5.1), when considered in the context of the full model (See Figure 4.1), all of the relationships between parental behavioral control and autonomy from parents were non-significant. In addition, autonomy from mothers and autonomy from fathers were significant positive correlates with academic achievement among boys (See Table 5.1), although these relationships were also non-significant in the context of the full model (See Figure 4.1). Therefore, it appears that when the effects of autonomy and parental behavioral control on adolescent academic achievement are simultaneously considered (as is the case in this study), the relationship between behavioral control and adolescent academic achievement is stronger. Thus, any influence from autonomy from parents is overpowered by this relationship. Although the results from this study appear inconsistent with previous empirical and theoretical work, previous studies have not examined these relationships simultaneously (i.e., within the same model).

Parental behavioral control was a significant direct positive predictor of academic achievement for boys and girls within the European-American model. This finding is consistent with previous research on US samples suggesting that behavioral control serves to create an environment in which adolescents are able to perceive accurate role expectations and develop appropriate levels of self-regulation (Barber, 1996). In other words, parental behavioral control facilitates academic achievement by providing a structured and consistent environment (Herman et al., 1997). Moreover, parental
behavioral control has been found to be a consistent positive predictor of adolescent academic achievement among samples of Asian-American, African-American, European-American, and Hispanic-American adolescents (Herman et al., 1997).

Autonomy from parents was not a significant mediator of the relationship between psychological control and adolescent academic achievement among the European-American sample. In fact, contrary to theoretical and empirical work, parental psychological control was not a significant predictor of adolescent academic achievement among European-American adolescents (Steinberg et al., 1991, 1992). These findings also point to the importance of examining the separate influences of parenting dimensions instead of the combined influence of behavioral control and psychological control and parental support, as is done the parental styles approach. That is, previous research using the parental styles approach has reported negative associations with authoritarian parenting (i.e., combining measures of behavioral control and psychological control) and adolescents academic achievement, at least among European-Americans (e.g., Dornbusch et al., 1987; Steinberg et al., 1992, 1992). However, these measures of authoritarian parenting typically combine high levels of psychological control with high levels of behavioral control (Barber, 1996, 1997).

**Chinese Sample**

Autonomy from parents served as a significant mediator of the relationship between parental support and adolescent academic achievement only within the Chinese boys/paternal model (See Figure 4.2). In addition, although the full model did not have significant mediation, autonomy from mothers served as an indirect path through which
maternal support influenced academic achievement for Chinese girls. In other words, for the same sex parent-child dyad within the Chinese sample, parental support served to increase the adolescent’s perceptions of autonomy from the same sex parent, which in turn, served to enhance adolescent academic achievement. Therefore, within the Chinese sample, autonomy from the same sex parent appears to be an important path through which parental support serves to enhance adolescent academic achievement. The moderating role of gender in this finding may be that as the young reach adolescence they depend more on their same sex parent to convey appropriate role expectations (Newman & Newman, 1995).

Overall, these findings are contrary to expectations following the individualism-collectivism perspective. That is, from this view, Chinese parents should emphasize conformity in socialization and discourage autonomy (Chao, 1996; Lam, 1997; Triandis, 1995). However, these unexpected findings among the Chinese sample are partially supported by findings from recent studies which suggest that parental granting of autonomy also plays an important role in the academic achievement of Asian, Chinese and Asian-American adolescents (Asakawa & Csikszentmihalyi, 1998; Chen & Lan, 1998; Stewart et al., 1999). Contrary to the individualism-collectivism perspective, these findings from recent studies suggest that even among more collectivistic groups, autonomy from parents plays an important role in the socialization of adolescents (Asakawa & Csikszentmihalyi, 1998; Chen & Lan, 1998; Stewart et al., 1999). For example, Stewart et al. reported that adolescent’s expectations for autonomy were consistent positive predictors of academic achievement among both Asian adolescents
(e.g., Chinese, Malaysian, and Thai) and Western adolescents (e.g., Australian, British, Canadian, and US) despite the fact that Western adolescents scored significantly higher on autonomy expectations than Asian adolescents.

Autonomy from parents was not a significant mediator of the relationship between parental behavioral control and adolescent academic achievement within the Chinese sample (See Figure 4.2). Moreover, parental behavioral control was a significant positive predictor of adolescent academic achievement for Chinese girls, but not boys. Therefore, these findings are consistent with expectations based on the individualism-collectivism perspective, in that autonomy from parents did not mediate the relationship between behavioral control and academic achievement. These findings for Chinese girls are also consistent with empirical and theoretical work suggesting that Chinese parents “train” their children in the sense that they provide rules and structure which fosters academic achievement (Chao, 1994, 1996; Lam, 1997). The moderating role of adolescent gender in these findings (i.e., parental behavioral control enhanced the academic achievement of girls but not boys), is somewhat consistent with parenting in traditional Chinese families. That is, in traditional Chinese families, the socialization of boys and girls differs from birth, with boys being socialized to take over power and responsibility, whereas girls are socialized to be subordinate to their fathers and other males, as well as to mothers and other women in the family (Cheung, 1996). From this perspective, perhaps Chinese parents use firmer forms of parental control (i.e., behavioral control) with girls to foster development.
For Chinese boys, autonomy from fathers was a significant mediator of the relationship between paternal psychological control and academic achievement (See Figure 4.2). In addition, although the full model was not a significant mediator, maternal psychological control influenced the academic achievement of Chinese girls indirectly through autonomy from mothers. That is, parents' psychologically controlling behavior decreased adolescent autonomy from parents, which, in turn, influenced academic achievement. No other parenting behaviors were directly related to Chinese boys' academic achievement. Therefore, within the Chinese sample, autonomy from the same sex parent appears to be an important path through which psychological control influences adolescent academic achievement. As mentioned previously, as the young reach adolescence they depend more on their same sex parent to convey appropriate role expectations (Newman & Newman, 1995). In addition, these findings are consistent with traditional Chinese parenting, in that the father-son relationship was regarded as most important, while mothers were responsible for socializing daughters (Cheung, 1996). In contrast, these findings are contrary to the view that Chinese parents discourage autonomy (Chao, 1996; Lam, 1997; Triandis, 1995).

**Russian Sample**

Autonomy from parents did not mediate the relationships between parental support and academic achievement among Russian adolescents (See Figure 4.3), supporting what would be expected according to the individualism-collectivism perspective (Kagitbasci, 1996; Triandis, 1995). In contrast, these findings are contrary to suggestions from a recent study on Russian parent-adolescent relationships in which
adolescents reported being autonomous in reference to their parents (Gurko, 1997). However, Gurko (1997) also reported that Russian mothers were relatively permissive. Therefore, it may be that Russian adolescents feel autonomous because of parental permissiveness, and not because of parents gradually granting adolescents autonomy. Following this, autonomy not developed in the context of an emotionally connected relationship is less likely to lead to healthy psychosocial outcomes (Anderson & Sabatelli, 1988; Baumrind, 1971; Peterson & Hann, 2000; Peterson, et al., 1999).

Examination of the correlation coefficients within the Russian sample revealed that maternal support and academic achievement were positive correlates for boys and girls (See Table 5.3). However, in the context of the full model, maternal support was only a significant direct predictor of academic achievement for boys (See Figure 4.3). This positive direct relationship is consistent with previous studies among US samples reporting that parental support facilitates academic achievement (Dornbusch et al., 1987; Herman et al., 1997; Steinberg et al., 1992). The moderation of these relationships by gender of parent are consistent with suggestions that Russian fathers are less involved (Golofast, 1991; Gurko, 1997) and less likely to convey support to children compared to mothers (Golofast, 1991). In fact, paternal support was not a significant predictor of any of the endogenous variables within the Russian sample.

The moderation of these relationships by gender of adolescent is difficult to explain. One potential explanation may be increased stress experienced by Russian women because of the dual roles expected of women in Russian society, where they are expected to work full time and bear the majority of the responsibility for the household
(Danes, Doudchenko, & Yasnaya, 1994; Hutter, 1998). Although these dual roles are also common in other societies such as the US (Lamanna & Reidman, 1997), the adverse economic conditions in Russia have especially impacted women (Breslav & Khasan, 1993; Hutter, 1998). Following this perspective, Russian girls may feel more pressure to excel in school in an attempt to attain a better standard of living. This interpretation is consistent with the findings from a recent study reporting that Russian girls experience more stress from schoolwork in comparison to boys (Andersson, 1997). Although gender equality was stressed by Soviet policy, the reality during the Soviet Era was that women were expected to work as much as men, in addition to taking care of the household and children (Hutter, 1998; Lapidus, 1982). In modern day Russia, women maintain this dual role as the primary caretaker of children, while also working full time (Danes et al., 1994; Hutter, 1998). For this sample, the strongest predictor of academic achievement for Russian girls was maternal behavioral control, which overpowered the relationship between maternal support and academic achievement within the full model. Following this, perhaps because of the increased stress experienced by Russian girls and the increased expectations for Russian women, mothers may feel they have to use more methods of firm control in order to foster academic achievement and to prepare them for their adult roles of full-time worker both inside the home and outside of the home. In contrast, for Russian boys, the expectations for their adult roles are perhaps more clear, subsequently, academic achievement was fostered by a combination of maternal support, paternal behavioral control, and maternal behavioral control.
Autonomy from parents was only a significant mediator of the relationship between parental psychological control and academic achievement within the Russian girls/paternal model (See Figure 4.3). For Russian girls then, autonomy from fathers mediated the relationship between paternal psychological control and academic achievement. That is, excessive psychologically controlling paternal behavior influenced academic achievement through autonomy. This finding is contrary to what would be expected in a collectivistic culture, but consistent with expectations from individualistic cultures where autonomy from parents facilitates academic achievement (Chao, 1996; Lam, 1997). The moderation by gender of parent in these findings is consistent with Golofast’s (1991) study suggesting that Russian fathers are more influential in the areas of education, but are less likely to convey emotional support. That is, although Russian fathers are less involved in day to day activities with their children, they are more likely to have a higher education and more prestigious and higher paying employment, and therefore, have more influence in education and career decisions (Golofast, 1991; Hutter, 1998).

Direct and Indirect Effects: Parenting, Conformity, and Self-Esteem

Adolescent conformity to parents was a significant direct predictor of adolescent self-esteem only within the Russian sample (See Figures 4.1 – 4.3). That is, adolescent conformity to parental expectations served as a negative predictor of adolescent self-esteem among three of the twelve gender by culture dyads - - all of which were within the Russian sample.
European-American Sample

Conformity to parents did not mediate the relationships between parenting behaviors and adolescent self-esteem within the European-American sample (See Figure 4.1) which would be consistent with the individualism-collectivism perspective (Lam, 1997; Tafarodi & Swann, 1995; Triandis, 1995). Examination of the correlation coefficients within the European-American sample indicates that conformity to fathers and adolescent self-esteem were positive correlates for boys (See Table 5.1). However, the relationships between parental support and self-esteem, and behavioral control and self-esteem appear to be stronger than the relationship between conformity and self-esteem in the context of the full model (i.e., conformity and self-esteem are not significantly related in full model).

Despite the lack of conformity in significantly predicting adolescent self-esteem, conformity to both mothers and fathers were fostered by European-American parents. More specifically, parental support, parental behavioral control, and maternal psychological control were all positive predictors of conformity to parents for both boys and girls. In addition, paternal psychological control was also a positive predictor of conformity, but only for boys. These findings support previous research which has found parental support and firm behavioral control to be positive predictors of adolescent conformity (Thomas et al., 1974; Peterson et al., 1985). These findings are also consistent with previous research that suggests that coercive parenting is predictive of adolescent conformity (Peterson et al., 1985). However, conformity to parents did not serve to mediate any of the relationships between parenting and self-esteem.
Conformity to parental expectations is an aspect of relationship connectedness between adolescents and parents (Peterson, 1995). From this view, moderate levels of adolescent conformity to parents are considered to be neither excessive nor intrusive in the sense that a person’s self development is inhibited (Grotevant & Cooper, 1986; Peterson, 1995). Instead, such manifestations of collectivism or connectedness at the family level are viewed as a secure base or primary bonds from which healthy self-concepts are thought to emerge (Peterson, 1995; Silverberg & Gondoli, 1996). Despite that lack of conformity to predict adolescent self-esteem within the European-American sample, a moderate degree of youthful conformity to parents is seen as necessary within families, regardless of culture in order for effective cooperation and social relationships (Henry, Wilson, & Peterson, 1989; Peterson, 1995; Peterson, Rollins, & Thomas 1985; Thomas, Gecas, Weigert, & Rooney, 1974; Youniss & Smollar, 1985).

**Chinese Sample**

Conformity to parents was not significantly correlated with adolescent self-esteem (See Table 5.2). Moreover, within the full model, conformity to parents did not serve as a significant predictor of self-esteem within the Chinese sample (See Figure 4.2). This finding is contrary to what one would expect in a collectivistic culture where conformity to parents is thought to be an important influence and component of self-esteem (Lam, 1997; Lau, 1996; Tafarodi & Swann, 1995). However, these findings are consistent with what one would expect in more individualistic cultures. That is, parenting behaviors foster conformity to parents which, in turn, facilitate effective
cooperation and social relationships (Henry, Wilson, & Peterson, 1989; Peterson, Rollins, & Thomas 1985; Thomas, Gecas, Weigert, & Rooney, 1974; Youniss & Smollar, 1985).

Similar to the European-American sample, Chinese parenting fostered the development of adolescent conformity. However, these relationships varied somewhat across gender of parent and gender of adolescent. For Chinese girls, parental support, parental behavioral control, and paternal psychological control positively predicted conformity. For boys, however, only parental support significantly predicted adolescent conformity. Therefore, these findings support more of a collectivistic orientation in that parents fostered youthful conformity; however, the lack of conformity to significantly predict adolescent self-esteem is more consistent with an individualistic orientation (Lam, 1997; Tafarodi & Swann, 1995).

Russian Sample

Conformity to parents mediated the relationships between parenting behaviors and adolescent self-esteem in three of the four gender dyads within the Russian sample. More specifically, for Russian girls, perceptions of conformity to mothers and/or fathers were significant predictors of adolescent self-esteem. In addition, for Russian boys, perceptions of conformity to their mothers was a negative predictor of their self-esteem. However, conformity to parents only served as a significant mediator within the girls/paternal model. That is, for Russian girls, perceptions of conformity to fathers mediated the relationship between paternal psychological control and adolescent self-esteem. However, for Russian boys and girls, maternal behavioral control and maternal psychological control influenced adolescent self-esteem through conformity to mothers.
Overall, these findings are contrary to what one would expect to find within an individualism-collectivism interpretation, where conformity to parents is viewed as an important aspect of socialization and positive component of self-esteem (Lam, 1997; Traffordi & Swann, 1996; Triandis, 1995). That is, although conformity to parents' expectations was a significant mediator of self-esteem among Russian adolescents, the direction of the relationship was the opposite of what would be expected in a more collectivistic culture. That is, conformity to parents should serve to enhance the self-esteem of adolescents within more collectivistic cultures (Lam, 1997; Lau, 1996; Triandis, 1995; Tafarodi & Swann, 1996). In contrast, for Russian adolescents, conformity served as a negative predictor of self-esteem. Moreover, conformity to parents was the only significant predictor of Russian adolescent self-esteem (i.e., with the exception of the mother-son dyad). Therefore, there were no positive predictors of adolescent self-esteem among the Russian sample. As mentioned, previously, these findings suggest that self-esteem may not be a socialization outcome highly valued by Russian parents, similar to suggestions from theoretical and empirical work regarding self development among other non-Western cultural groups (e.g., Lam, 1997; Lau, 1996).

Perhaps for Russian adolescents, conformity to parental expectations for educational, career, and personal values serves as a liability for self-esteem as adolescents perceive that their parents have not yet adapted their expectations to the reality of what is attainable and/or adaptive in modern day Russia. Because of the dramatic societal-level changes in Russia in recent years (Hart et al., 1998; Jose et al., 1998), perhaps adolescents do not see the behaviors and values of their parents as
consistent with a more democratic Russia. From this point of view, when adolescents perceive themselves as conforming to, or matching their parents' value systems, they evaluate themselves lower on self-esteem because their parents' behaviors and values are not as adaptive in modern Russia and are not seen as valuable by wider society. This interpretation is consistent with a recent survey of Russian parent-adolescent relationships in which adolescents demonstrated more of an orientation towards self development compared to conforming to authority figures (Gurko, 1997). Almost half of the 980 adolescents surveyed reported that they wanted to be like themselves and not like anyone else. In fact, Gurko (1997) found that less than twenty percent of the adolescents in her study reported that they wanted to be like their mothers, and less than seven percent reported wanting to like their fathers. From this perspective, Russian parents of adolescents today may represent the ideals of the communist political system, and thus are likely to encounter problems in preparing their adolescents for life in a very different, modern, and changing society (Gurko, 1997).

One potential explanation for this pattern may be a reflection of the primary socialization influences during the Soviet Era. During communist times, the main socialization influences came from the government via schools and youth collectives with parents playing a secondary role in the socialization of children and adolescents (Jose et al., 1998; Hart et al., 1998; Hogan, Maddock, Antonov, & Matskovsky, 1994). Following this period of high government influence and control, Russian parents have suddenly been given the task of childrearing without training or experience (Gurko, 1997). The “generation gap” between Russian adolescents and their parents is likely to
be larger than in other societies that have not experienced such dramatic changes.

Moreover, adolescents are more likely to be influenced by current trends than are their parents. That is, adolescents are more likely to be in the process of exploring and forming an identity (Blos, 1967; Erikson, 1968; Newman & Newman, 1995). Therefore, adolescents are more likely to be accepting and receptive to change, whereas parents are more likely to be content in their values and resist change (Newman & Newman, 1995).

Another potential reason for the negative relationship between conformity and adolescent self-esteem among Russian adolescents may be related to the types of parenting practices used to foster adolescent conformity. Examination of the types of parenting used to foster conformity among the three cultural groups indicate that psychological control appears to play more of an important role within the Russian sample (See Figures 4.1 - 4.3). More specifically, within the Russian sample, conformity to parents is fostered by a combination of psychological control and behavioral control. In contrast, among the Chinese and European-American samples, parental support is also used (i.e., in addition to psychological control and behavioral control) to facilitate adolescent conformity. Research suggests that psychologically controlling parenting may lead to conformity, but also fosters negative or hostile attitudes towards parents (Barber, 1996; Peterson et al., 1985).

**Direct and Indirect Effects: Parenting, Conformity, and Academic Achievement**

Overall, across all three cultural groups and culture by gender dyads, adolescent conformity to parents did not serve as a significant mediator of adolescent academic achievement (See Figures 4.1 – 4.3). Moreover, adolescent conformity to parents was a
significant predictor of adolescent academic achievement within only one of the twelve culture by gender dyads. More specifically, among Chinese boys, perceptions of conformity to mothers was a positive significant predictor of adolescent academic achievement. Moreover, conformity to mothers was a significant mediator of the relationship between maternal support and adolescent self-esteem for boys. In other words, the more supportive Chinese boys perceived their mothers to be, the more they conformed to their mothers, which, in turn, lead to increased levels of academic achievement. This relationship follows what would be expected from an individualism-collectivism perspective. That is, more collectivistic parents foster conformity, which, in turn, leads to academic achievement which is a highly valued outcome among Chinese (Asakawa & Csikszentmihalyi, 1998; Chao, 1994, 1996; Lam, 1997).

The finding that conformity to parents did not mediate the relationship between parenting and academic achievement among European Americans is consistent with the individualism-collectivism perspective. Moreover, the fact that conformity only mediated this relationship among one gender dyad within the Chinese sample points to the ongoing societal-level changes and influences of both individualism and collectivism within these societies (Chen & Lan, 1998; Hart et al., 1998; Jose et al., 1998).

Conclusions

Any conclusions drawn from this study must be received in light of the study limitations. First, the “direction of effects” for predictive models using cross-sectional data is always subject to reinterpretation, for example, the assumption that both autonomy and conformity in reference to parents are “influences” on adolescent self-
esteem. Instead, it is important to recognize that the opposite direction may be true (i.e., self-esteem may influence autonomy and conformity) or that both directions of influence may operate simultaneously. In addition, developmental change cannot be directly assessed with cross-sectional studies.

Secondly, all three of these samples came from limited geographic areas within their respective societies and caution about over-generalizing these results should be underscored. That is, since these were purposive samples, one can only generalize to similar groups within these particular nations. For example, the respondents within the Chinese samples were all residents of Beijing which is the economic, social, and political capital of the People’s Republic of China. This particular area in mainland China is likely to be subject to influences from Western societies more than smaller and/or isolated cities and rural areas (Hofstede, 1980; Triandis, 1995). In addition, although socioeconomic status is a difficult concept to compare across countries and cultures, adolescents from all three samples were mainly from middle-class families. Considering the potential of biases across socioeconomic statuses, adolescents of middle-class and upper-class socioeconomic status families are more likely to be individualistic in social orientation, whereas families of the lower-class socioeconomic status are more likely to be collectivistic (Hofstede, 1980; Triandis, 1995). Moreover, subjects from all three samples were from large urban areas, which have been reported to be more individualistic than rural areas even within the same country (Hofstede, 1980; Katgicibasi, 1994, 1996; Triandis, 1994, 1995).
Another limitation of the present study was the assumption that socialization goals, strategies, and methods used by parents in mainland China and Russian are similar to those among US parents. That is, although this study attempted to assess the impact of cultural influences on adolescent socialization through the constructs of autonomy and conformity, the dimensions of parenting behaviors and adolescent outcome variables examined here are based on theoretical and empirical work among US samples.

In addition, some of the $R^2$ values were of moderate or small size and thus do not provide definitive findings. That is, examination of the amount of variance accounted for in the endogenous variables suggests that potential influences other than those examined in this study exist, such as peer influence. Despite these limitations, however, the findings from this study emphasize many important similarities as well as differences among the relationships between autonomy, conformity, and parenting behaviors, and their impact on adolescent self-esteem and academic achievement across these three cultures.

It also should be noted that the findings from this study constitute some important methodological and theoretical contributions. First, parental influences on adolescent psychosocial development varies between mothers and fathers. Secondly, the relationships between parenting and adolescent self-esteem and academic achievement were found to vary between boys and girls. Consistent with previous research among US samples, the relationships between the dimensions of parenting, autonomy, conformity, and adolescent self-esteem and adolescent academic achievement were found to vary across gender of adolescent and gender of parent (Bartle et al., 1989; Demo et al., 1987).
Thirdly, operationalizing parental support, behavioral control, and psychological control separately as opposed to combining these dimensions of parenting behaviors into parenting styles clarified previous inconsistent findings. For example, although previous research following a parental styles approach has suggested that parental support (i.e., a component of authoritative parenting) predicts adolescent academic achievement, this was not the case here. Consistent with these findings parental support and adolescent academic achievement were significantly correlated. However, when the impact of parental behavioral control and parental support were considered separately, (i.e., these two constructs are combined in the parental styles approach) the effects of parental support were no longer significant in the context of the full model. In contrast, parental behavioral control was a consistent positive predictor of academic achievement across all three cultural groups. Fourthly, the constructs individualism and collectivism are not polar opposites that clearly distinguish between societies in a general sense, but in contrast, may each operate in varied ways within the socialization processes of the same cultures (Kagitcibasi, 1994, 1996; Triandis, 1994). That is, adolescents in all three cultural groups perceived that their parents fostered both autonomy and conformity. Moreover, contrary to theoretical and empirical work following the individualism perspective, both autonomy and conformity facilitated the development of psychosocial competence among Chinese and Russian adolescents. These findings point to considering the influence of macro-level changes (i.e., occurring in mainland China and Russia) on family relationships and adolescent development.
The general findings from this study are largely contrary to what would be expected following the individualism and collectivism perspective. For example, both autonomy from parents and conformity to parents were fostered by parents in all three of the cultural groups examined. In turn, autonomy from parents served as an important mediator of adolescent self-esteem within both the Chinese and European-American samples. Autonomy from parents also served as a mediator between parenting practices and academic achievement among Chinese girls and boys in reference to their mothers. Somewhat consistent with the individualism-collectivism perspective was the finding that conformity to parents was the only significant predictor of adolescent self-esteem among Russian adolescents. However, contrary to this perspective, the relationship was negative. This finding and the overall findings from this study point to the influence of both individualism and collectivism within the parent-adolescent relationship, regardless of cultural group.

The findings of this study also point to the importance of considering the mediating and indirect influences of autonomy and conformity on the relationships between parenting behaviors and adolescent self-esteem and academic achievement. For example, the direct relationships between parental support and adolescent self-esteem and psychological control and self-esteem were mediated by autonomy from parents. That is, parenting behaviors influenced the development of adolescent autonomy which, in turn, influence adolescent self-esteem. Contrary to previous studies, parental psychological control did not serve as a significant direct influence on either adolescent self-esteem or academic achievement. In contrast, psychological control influences
adolescent psychosocial competence through autonomy from parents among the Chinese and European-American samples, and through conformity to parents among the Russian sample.

The role of autonomy and conformity, however, was not as important for facilitating adolescent academic achievement, compared to the influence of these two variables on adolescent self-esteem. That is, even when these parent-adolescent variables are considered (i.e., autonomy from parents and conformity to parents), parental behavioral control remained a significant positive predictor of adolescent academic achievement across all three cultural groups, with some variation by gender of adolescent and gender of parent (i.e., among the Chinese and Russian samples).

The overall results for this study clearly support previous literature indicating that autonomy from parents and conformity to parents within the parent-adolescent relationship are significant mediators and/or predictors of adolescent self-esteem and academic achievement among Chinese, European-American, and Russian adolescents. However, the role of autonomy and conformity varied across cultures, with autonomy playing a more important role among European-American and Chinese, whereas conformity served a more important role among Russian adolescents. Nonetheless, this does not mean, in a general sense, that the present results support the view that influences on self-esteem and academic achievement are more collectivistic at the expense of individualism or vise a versa within any one particular cultural group. Instead, the findings for this study point to the particular importance of youthful autonomy from parents (i.e., individualistic influences) for the development of self-esteem in samples of
adolescents both from China and the US; whereas, parental influences appear to be less important for the development of Russian adolescent self-esteem. Although autonomy was less of a consistent influence on the academic achievement of adolescents across cultural groups, parental behavioral control served as a consistent positive predictor across all three cultural groups. Therefore, individualism and collectivism do not appear to be polar opposites that clearly distinguish between the socialization processes of societies in a general sense. In contrast, conceptualizing each of these constructs as existing on a separate continuum, both of which operate in each society regardless of the dominant social orientation, may prove more useful (Katgicibasi, 1994, 1996; Triandis, 1994). That is, the socialization process is likely to be influenced by both of these macro level constructs regardless of the culture (Katgicibasi, 1994; Triandis, 1994).

Another salient finding that emerged is the importance of the interaction by gender (i.e., gender of parent and gender of adolescent) and culture for the specific influences on both adolescent self-esteem and academic achievement. For example, contrary to most of the empirical and theoretical literature on autonomy development in the US, autonomy from parents was a more important influence on European-American girls than boys. In fact, self-esteem development for boys was fostered in the context of supportive relationships with both mother and father, and firm behavioral control from fathers. In contrast, among European-American girls, self-esteem development was fostered by autonomous relationships from both parents in the context of a supportive relationship with both parents. In contrast, the only significant predictor of self-esteem among both Russian boys and girls was the negative influence of conformity to parents.
Recommendations for Future Research

The results of this study and methodological constraints point to a need for future longitudinal studies that examine the nature of specific changes both for individual adolescents, and parent-adolescent relationships within Chinese, European-American, and Russian families. Adolescence is a developmental period of continued negotiations of separatedness and connectedness from one’s parents (Allison & Sabatelli, 1990; Anderson & Sabatelli, 1988; Bartle et al., 1989; Damon, 1988). Therefore, the relationships investigated here are likely to change as youth progress through adolescence. A longitudinal approach would allow researchers to assess patterns of changing relationships between adolescents and parents.

Potential influences not examined in this study such as relationships with peers should also be included as influences of psychosocial development, as adolescence is the developmental period when peers are thought to become more important influences (Blos, 1967; Greenberger et al., 1998). Moreover, examining these relationships with diverse (i.e., SES, family structure, and ethnicity) and more representative samples will also increase the generalizability and lessen the chances of biases occurring (Miller, 1991). In addition, targeting families within countries/regions that are not experiencing high societal levels of economic, political, and social change will lower the chances for inconsistent findings and biases because of the influences of these fluctuations on family relationships and adolescent development.

The influence of individualism and collectivism as manifest in the parent-adolescent relationship were measured in this study by assessing adolescents’ perceptions
of autonomy from parents and conformity to parents. However, more specific measures of the influences of individualism and collectivism at the individual level, and at the family level are needed to represent each of these constructs separately and perhaps more comprehensively. That is, measures of collectivistic and individualistic values assessed at the individual level for both parents and adolescents may give insight into how these values are transmitted and fostered across generations. Moreover, this approach would allow researchers to measure the influences of both individualism and collectivism at the individual and family relationship level.

A more comprehensive assessment of the relationships examined here would be aided by the inclusion of data from parents. That is, assessment of parental views of their own behaviors, adherence to individualism and collectivism, and relationships with their adolescents are also needed (i.e., parenting, autonomy, and conformity). Past research assessing adolescent social competence has shown that adolescents’ perceptions of parental behaviors and attributes are more predictive than that of parents reporting about their own childrearing behaviors (Buri, 1989; Felson & Zielinski, 1989; Gecas & Schwalbe, 1986; Peterson et al., 1985; Steinberg et al., 1992). However, reliance on adolescent report of all variables is subject to common method variance, which may lead to inflated coefficients (Cohen & Cohen, 1983). Moreover, recent family systems researchers have advocated the method of measuring family process variables from multiple perspectives. Following the conceptualization of autonomy from parents, conformity to parents, and parent-adolescent interaction (i.e., parenting behaviors) as family processes and/or systems level variables, it makes more sense theoretically to
assess more than one persons’ perspective. That is, instead of simply assuming that one persons’ perspective accurately represents the consensus of the parent-adolescent dyad, or relationship of interest, it is important to assess multiple perspectives (Bartle-Haring & Gavazzi, 1996; Bartle-Haring, Kenny, & Gavazzi, 1999). Moreover, the use of statistical methods to control for methods effects across each person’s perspective allows researchers to obtain a more accurate picture of family relationships (Bartle-Haring & Gavazzi, 1996; Bartle-Haring, Kenny, & Gavazzi, 1999).

Given the small amount of variance accounted for in adolescent self-esteem and academic achievement (i.e., across all three cultural groups, but especially the Russian and Chinese samples), two recommendations can be made. It is possible that the constructs examined in this study (at least as measured here) are not accurate representations of important parent-adolescent interactions (i.e., parenting, autonomy and conformity) and adolescent psychosocial competence (i.e., adolescent self-esteem and academic achievement) among non-Western cultural groups. For example, despite theoretical and empirical work supporting the universality of self development (e.g., Harter, 1983; Hoffman, in press), another body of literature suggests that self-esteem is primarily a Western construct (i.e., individualistic) and is not a highly valued or socialized outcome among non-Western cultural groups (Hamid & Cheng, 1995; Lam, 1997; Lau, 1996; Trafford & Swann, 1995). Therefore, it is important for future studies to examine the important developmental outcomes of adolescence and the important influences on adolescents across cultures. In addition, it is equally important for future studies to examine the important socialization goals, strategies, and methods of parents
across cultural groups. One potential method of assessing these socialization goals, methods, and developmental influences is through conducting face to face qualitative interviews (Chao, 1994). Interviews with both parents and adolescents may be a good way to establish the importance of constructs across cultures (Chao, 1994; Damon & Hart, 1988). Secondly, another potential reason for the low amount of variance explained in the outcome variables may be that other influences such as schools, teachers, and/or peers are more important. Therefore, future studies assessing the relationships examined here should also consider the importance of other potential influences on adolescent psychosocial development across cultures. Moreover, the attainment of random samples will also aid in the generalizability of the findings, in addition to reducing the potential of bias from non-random sampling.
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APPENDIX A

SELF-ESTEEM QUESTIONS
Self-Esteem Questions

1. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.

2. I am able to do things as well as most people.

3. I take a positive attitude toward myself.

4. I feel that I’m a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others.

5. I feel that I have a number of good qualities.
APPENDIX B

ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT QUESTIONS
Academic Achievement Questions:

1. I try hard in school.

2. Grades are very important to me.

3. I usually finish my homework on time.

4. In general, I like school.

5. Which of the following best describes the grades you are getting at school
APPENDIX C

AUTONOMY QUESTIONS
Autonomy from Parents Questions:

1. This parent gives enough freedom.

2. This parent allows me to choose my own friends without interfering.

3. This parent allows me to decide what is right and wrong without interfering.

4. This parent allows me to decide what clothes I should wear without interfering.

5. This parent allows me to choose my own dating partner without interfering.

6. This parent has confidence in my ability to make my own decisions.

7. This parent encourages me to help in making decisions about family matters.

8. This parent allows me to make my own decisions about career goals without interfering.

9. This parent allows me to make my own decisions about educational goals without interfering.

10. This parent let’s me be my own person in enough situations.
APPENDIX D

CONFORMITY QUESTIONS
Conformity to Parents Questions

1. If this parent did not want me to go to a particular movie, then I believe that I would not go.

2. If this parent did not like me to talk in certain ways, then I would stop talking that way.

3. If this parent wanted me to go to a different school, then I would go to the school that he or she wanted me to attend.

4. If this parent wanted me to go around with a particular group of friends, then I would do as this parent wanted me to.

5. If this parent wanted me to attain a certain level of education, then I would try to attain this level of education.

6. If this parent wants me to marry a particular person in the future, then I would marry that person.

7. If this parent wanted me to live at home, then I would do so as long as the parent wished me to do so.

8. If this parent wanted me to choose a particular career, then I would try to prepare for this career.
APPENDIX E

PARENTAL BEHAVIOR QUESTIONS
Parental Support Questions

1. This parent tells me how much she/he loves me.
2. This parent says nice things about me.
3. This parent has made me feel that she/he would be there if I needed her/him.
4. This parent seems to approve of me and the things I do.

Parental Behavioral Control Questions

1. This parent knows where I am after school.
2. I tell this parent who I am going to be with when I go out.
3. When I go out, this parent knows where I am.
4. This parent knows the parents of my friends.
5. This parent knows who my friends are.
6. This parent knows how I spend my money.

Parental Psychological Control Questions

1. This parent does not give me any peace until I do what he/she says.
2. This parent punishes me by not letting me do things that I really enjoy.
3. This parent yells at me a lot without a good reason.
4. This parent punishes me by not letting me do things with other teenagers.
5. This parent is always finding fault with me.
6. This parent punishes me by sending me out of the room.