Family Relationship Predictors of Parent-Adolescent Conflict: Cross-Cultural Similarities and Differences

Kevin R. Bush[*]   **Gary W. Peterson**
Miami University

Grace H. Chung
Seoul National University

The purpose of the present study was to examine how dimensions of socialization practice and relationship quality may function to manage or increase parent-adolescent conflict. Of particular concern was to examine the comparative efficacy of potential predictors of parent-adolescent conflict across three cultural groups consisting of samples from Mainland China, Russia, and the U.S. as well as across gender-of-parent/gender-of-adolescent dyads from each culture. Findings from a sample of 1,365 adolescents indicated that adolescents' perceptions of parental influences on parent-adolescent conflict differ across cultural groups and gender-of-adolescent. The use of punitive behavior by parents was the strongest and most consistent predictor of parent-adolescent conflict across all cultural groups and gender dyads, suggesting that a general pattern exists for punitiveness to increase parent-adolescent conflict cross-culturally. Perceptions of support, monitoring, conformity to parents, and autonomy from parents influenced parent-adolescent conflict within some of the cultures and selectively for adolescent boys and girls.

Keywords: parent-adolescent conflict, parent-adolescent relationships, adolescence, cross-cultural

The topic "parent-adolescent conflict" often conjures up popular images in Western societies of emotional turmoil, conflict, and rebellion by the young in reference to their parents. Throughout much of the past century, adolescence in Western cultures was supposed to be a developmental stage characterized by "storm and stress," declining family influences, and a growing separation from parents (Arnett, 1995; Blos, 1979; Hall, 1904). As a result of these traditional conceptions, parent-adolescent conflict has been the subject of a long history of scholarship in the social sciences (Arnett, 1995; Hall, 1904), though only limited research has been conducted on this topic in many non-Western societies (Barber, 1994; Bush & Peterson, 2013; Fuligni, 1998).

Despite these earlier views of adolescence as a period of very difficult parent-adolescent conflict, recent scholarship favors a more balanced view in which either positive or negative outcomes can result, depending upon how conflict is managed. Moderate conflict, in fact, has been viewed increasingly as a normative process that may foster strength and adaptive change within parent-adolescent relationships (Collins, Laursen, Mortenson, & Ferreira, 1997). Constructive outcomes may result, particularly when

---

[*] **Corresponding Author:** Kevin R. Bush, Associate Professor, Department of Family Studies and Social Work, McGuffey Hall 101C, Miami University, Oxford, Ohio 45056, USA, E-mail: bushkr@muohio.edu

disagreements encourage parents and adolescents to revise their relationship expectations gradually and renegotiate adolescent autonomy, without damaging their feelings of being connected to each other (Peterson, 2005).

One approach to this tradition of research is to examine parent-adolescent conflict in terms of the bickering, verbal interruptions, as well as frequency and severity of arguments that occur between parents and their young. Western research indicates that these conflictual exchanges often originate over daily issues involving household chores, clothing preferences, music tastes, choice of friends, and leisure activities. Parent-adolescent conflict originates much less from fundamental differences in beliefs, values, and attitudes, but more often originates in everyday family tasks or in the life-style preferences of adolescents that are viewed as important for peer relationships (Montemayer, 1986; Steinberg & Levine, 1997; Wang, Peterson, & Morphey, 2007).

Another possible origin of parent-adolescent conflict is the kind of relationship contexts structured by parents that may either manage (i.e., inhibit or stabilize) or exacerbate conflict between adolescents and their elders. Important aspects of relationship contexts structured by parents include socialization behaviors or practices used by mothers and fathers as well as the normative atmosphere that parents convey to adolescents for particular degrees of youthful autonomy and conformity to their expectations. These socialization practices and normative expectations may serve to inhibit, manage or foster increased conflict, depending on the social-cultural meanings assigned to these aspects of parent-adolescent relationships (Bugenthal & Grusec, 2006; Chen-Gaddini, 2012; Collins & Steinberg, 2006).

A limited number of studies, for example, have reported that parent-adolescent conflict is significantly predicted (i.e., or managed) by the socialization behaviors used by parents (e.g., Barber, 1994; Baumrind, Larzelere, & Owens, 2010; Parkin & Kuczynski, 2012) and the degree to which adolescent behavioral autonomy is fostered (Fuligni, 1998; Zhang & Fuligni, 2006).

For example, the degree to which parental support and autonomy-granting behavior are evident within parent-adolescent relationships is thought to decrease the likelihood of conflict between the young and their elders. Parental support is thought to diminish conflict by fostering positive feelings and cohesiveness between parents and adolescents (Baumrind et al., 2010; Peterson & Hann, 1999). Adolescent autonomy, in turn, a highly valued social outcome by adolescents in Western societies, inhibits conflict when granted to youth in appropriate degrees but functions as a source of conflict when autonomy is denied to young. In contrast, harsh, restrictive or punitive parenting, a practice frequently used to inhibit autonomy excessively, has been found to increase the likelihood of parent-adolescent conflict as adolescents resist such excessive forms of control.

Only limited information exists, however, on the extent to which such relationship predictors of parent-adolescent conflict vary across cultures (Barber, 1994), and particularly for cultural groups beyond the U.S. (Lahat, Helwig, Yang, Tan, & Lui, 2009; Zhang & Fuligni, 2006). Consequently, the purpose of the present study was to examine how several socialization practices (i.e., parental support, monitoring, and punitiveness) and relationship atmospheres (i.e., perceived autonomy from parents and conformity to parents) may function to manage (i.e., decrease or stabilize) or increase (i.e., predict) parent-adolescent conflict. Of particular concern in this study were the objectives of examining these potential predictors of parent-adolescent conflict across three cultural groups consisting of parent-adolescent relationships from Mainland China, Russia, and the U.S. as well as across gender-of- parent/gender-of-adolescent dyads from each culture (e.g., mothers' parental qualities predicting conflict with boys)

Cultural and Gender Differences in Parent-Adolescent Conflict

An important larger issue that requires

additional exploration concerns the extent to which parent-adolescent conflict varies across cultures. With few exceptions (Lahat et al., 2009; Zhang & Fuligni, 2006), when the existing studies on parent-adolescent conflict within non-Western countries are considered, most have focused on a single country, and none of the studies have examined familial predictors among Russian adolescents. The small body of extant literature on the family predictors of parent-adolescent conflict has been focused primarily on Chinese samples (e.g., Shek, Chan, & Lee, 2011). Moreover, existing research has not examined the simultaneous influence of parenting behaviors, adolescent autonomy, and adolescent conformity to parents' expectations as predictors of parent-adolescent conflict.

Both theory and a growing body of empirical evidence provide the view that parent-adolescent conflict is likely to be less frequent in cultures and ethnic groups that emphasize collectivistic values consisting of economic interdependence, social interdependence, parental authority, and the priority of family bonds over the need for personal autonomy. This also suggests that cultures may differ in specific aspects of parent-adolescent relationships that may predict or influence the development of parent-adolescent conflict (Arnett, 1995; Collins & Steinberg, 2006; Chung, Flook, & Fuligni, 2009; Phinney & Ong, 2002). For example, parents from Western cultures that are reputed to place the greatest value on individualistic rather than collectivistic values may contribute to lower conflict when they encourage their young to become more autonomous during the adolescent years. In contrast, non-Western and traditional cultures as well as particular U.S. ethnic groups (e.g., Asian and Asian-American, Latino and Latino-American) are believed to have cultural expectations that diminish conflicts in the interest of deferring to authority, having close family bonds, and placing less emphasis on autonomy as part of the socialization process (Arnett, 1995; Collins & Steinberg, 2006; Chung et al., 2009; Phinney & Ong, 2002). Youth from these "collectivistic" cultures are believed by some observers to be less inclined to seek autonomy and challenge authority figures because of social-cultural forces that reinforce group solidarity (Feldman & Quatman, 1988; Greenberger & Chen, 1996; Peterson & Bush, 2013).

An alternative view, however, is that cultural differences in parent-adolescent conflict may be diminishing as globalization occurs or are more complex than theories of collectivism and individualism would suggest. Specifically, cultural differences in parent-adolescent conflict may be disappearing with the spread either of Western individualism or of cultural values referred to as social-emotional "interdependence." This latter perspective involves some unique balance between individualism and collectivism that encompasses both continued connections with *and* autonomy from others (e.g., parents) as prominent aspects of social development (Kagitcibasi, 1996; Rothbaum & Trommsdorf, 2007; Tamis-LeMonda et al., 2008).

Cultural values and traditions influence parent-adolescent conflict to the extent that particular social groups adhere to normative cultural expectations that discourage such confrontations (Bush, 2000; Bush, Peterson, Cobas, & Supple, 2002; Peterson, Steinmetz, & Wilson, 2005; Wu & Chao, 2011). Parents in different cultures are thought to vary in the parenting behaviors used, which, in turn, may contribute to diverse family atmospheres that either foster or manage parent-adolescent conflict. The specific meaning of these behaviors may differ across cultures consistent with the varied emphasis placed within each context on encouraging such things as greater autonomy, conformity to parents' expectations, and the maintenance of family harmony (Barber, 1994; Bush, 2000; Bush et al., 2002; Fuligni, 1998; Peterson et al., 2005; Wu & Chao, 2011).

The few studies that have examined parent-adolescent conflict within ethnically diverse samples in the U.S. have found differences in the familial correlates across cultural groups. For example, Barber (1994) reported that higher parental expectations for children's conformity negatively predicted (or decreased) parent-child conflict for Hispanics, but not European

Bush, Peterson, & Chung

American families. Similarly, Fuligni (1998) reported that U.S. adolescents from Chinese, Mexican, and Filipino backgrounds had lower expectations for behavioral autonomy (in comparison to adolescents of European-American backgrounds) and were less willing to engage in conflict with their parents. Findings from a comparative study of parent-adolescent conflict within families from Hong Kong and Mainland China suggest that Chinese teens conform to parental wishes when resolving conflict, but also desire more autonomy and freedom in decision-making (Yau & Smetana, 2003). Taken together, these findings suggest that, besides parental behavior (i.e., support, monitoring, and punitive control), parent-adolescent conflict also may be influenced by aspects of the parent-adolescent relationship such as the degree to which parents emphasize both autonomy and conformity in reference to their expectations. The exact pattern of these relationships, however, remains somewhat inconsistent and unclear.

Another area of inconclusive findings requiring further research concerns the specific relationships between gender (i.e., parental gender and adolescent gender) and parent-adolescent conflict (e.g., Yau & Smetana, 2003). For example, findings on gender differences in parent-adolescent relationships among Hong Kong Chinese families suggest that conflict with fathers has a stronger influence on adolescent development than does conflict with mothers (Shek & Ma, 2002). In contrast, adolescents from Mainland China were reported to experience greater conflict with mothers than was true with fathers (Yau & Smetana, 1996; Smetana & Villaboos, 2009). Differences across boys and girls in regard to parent-adolescent conflict also were found in the sense that, Chinese adolescent girls, more than boys, rated their mothers as being higher in their use of restrictive control. Moreover, girls' reasoning about conflicts focused more extensively on psychological justifications, while boys' focused more on interpersonal justifications (Yau & Smetana, 1996; Smetana & Villaboos, 2009).

Specific Predictions and Exploratory Issues

Some of the potential predictors of parent-adolescent conflict examined in this study were sufficiently grounded in previous research and theory to justify the specification of formal hypotheses. In contrast, additional exploratory tests were conducted where previous scholarship did not provide an adequate basis to justify the formulation of specific hypotheses. These exploratory tests were intended to serve as starting points for future work and to provide an additional basis for theorizing about patterns and meaning of parent-adolescent conflict.

Across all three cultural groups, therefore, Hypothesis 1 proposes that positive parenting behaviors (i.e., parental support and monitoring) were expected to inhibit or negatively predict parent-adolescent conflict. Positive supportiveness and non-intrusive monitoring (or knowledge of the adolescent's activities) may operate to maintain close parental bonds and parental influence, which, in turn, is likely to inhibit conflict by maintaining strong connections between parents and adolescents (Shek & Ma, 2002). Both of these behaviors contribute to an immediate social environment for the young that is more secure by solidifying close bonds and by maintaining consistent expectations in the family system (Rohner, 2008). From the perspective of adolescents, having a secure family environment with consistent (but moderate and fair) expectations is likely to minimize hostility towards parents and reduce (though not eliminate) parent-adolescent conflict.

In contrast, Hypothesis 2 specifies that parental punitiveness, an aversive form of excessive parental behavior, was hypothesized to foster or positively predict parent-adolescent conflict across the three cultures (Baumrind et al., 2010). Some observers have predicted, on the other hand, that the more collectivistic (and perhaps) restrictive culture of China will manifest greater parental punitive behavior, but the impact on parent-adolescent conflict is unclear (Chao, 1994; Dornbusch et al., 1987; Steinberg et al., 1992; Yang, 1981, 1986). Recent studies, however, do not support such a

prediction that Chinese or Russian parenting is unusually punitive compared to Western parental practices (Peterson et al., 2005) and would have distinctive influences on parent-adolescent conflict.

When considering the extensive emphasis placed on the authority of parents within Chinese families (e.g., Lam, 1997), however, Hypothesis 3 specifies that expectations for conformity to parents were expected to inhibit or be a negative predictor of parent-adolescent conflict for Chinese adolescents but less so for Russian and U.S. adolescents. It has been argued, for example, that parental roles may carry greater authority in collectivistic cultures like China compared to individualistic cultures like the U.S. Adolescents who are socialized to conform to their parents, as part of the collectivistic emphasis on maintaining group cohesiveness, may be less likely to express hostility towards parents and engage in conflict (Baumrind, 1991; Bush, 2000; Henry, Wilson, & Peterson, 1989; Peterson, Rollins, and Thomas, 1985). The greater emphasis placed on maintaining group order and harmony in collectivistic cultures might result in adolescents being less inclined to engage in conflict with their parents (Arnett, 1995; Peterson & Bush, 2013). Predictions about how expectations for conformity to parents will influence parent-adolescent conflict are less definitive in the U.S., a culture typically characterized as individualistic (and as placing less value on conformity), and in Russia, a society experiencing great social and economic transition, though once characterized as emphasizing obedience to group interests in its socialization values for children (i.e., a key element of collectivism) (Bronfenbrenner, 1972; Stetsenko, 2002). Nonetheless, considering that parents in most cultures expect at least moderate levels of youthful conformity to their expectations (Peterson & Hann, 1999; Peterson & Bush, 2013; Peterson, Rollins, & Thomas, 1985), exploratory tests on this issue were conducted within the U.S. and Russian samples to see if a pattern similar to that of the Chinese sample would result.

Finally, given the extensive focus on individuality and autonomy within European American families (Arnett, 1995; Peterson, 1995), adolescents in the U.S. often expect to acquire autonomy at a fairly early age and are more likely to engage in conflict with parents when their desires for self-direction are denied (Smetana, 2005; Collins & Steinberg, 2006). Consequently, Hypothesis 4 proposed that autonomy granting was expected to be a negative predictor or assist in managing parent-adolescent conflict within the sample from the U.S. In contrast, recent research also suggests that traditional "collectivist" values are becoming less influential whereas individualistic values have become more prevalent in modern Chinese societies (Yau & Smetana, 1996, 2003), especially in urban areas such as Beijing (Bush, 2000; Bush et al., 2002). Consequently, the relationships between adolescent autonomy and parent-adolescent conflict also were examined on an exploratory basis within the Chinese and Russian samples.

Method

Data were gathered from 1995-2009 with a questionnaire designed for a larger research project that was administered in school classrooms to adolescents (13-18 years old) from the countries of Chile, China, the Czech Republic, Mexico, India, Russia, Kenya, South Korea, Colombia, and the U.S. Each of the samples (a total of 12 samples, with 2 samples being drawn in China and Kenya) for this cross-national study was selected using a convenience strategy that was as similar as possible within each country. The research strategy of surveying adolescents with questionnaires in school classrooms was used as a convenient and cost-effective means of acquiring an adequate sample size with sufficient socioeconomic diversity in common locations. The same questionnaire with only moderate variations was administered in the same manner across the countries. The same measures of the concepts addressed in this study were included in all twelve samples gather for the larger project.

The specific data of interest for this study were

questionnaire responses by adolescents who ranged in age from 13-18 years and were students in The People's Republic of China, Russia, and the United States. Adolescent respondents were assessed in state-funded or public schools located in large urban areas of the sampled countries.

Six hundred questionnaires were distributed in the classrooms of participating secondary schools in each country. Research assistants and teachers, trained in accordance with a standardized protocol, administered the survey in classrooms to the participating students. Respondents were instructed to complete the questionnaires independently and to provide responses corresponding 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 to clarify the meaning of the items as needed.

Participants

During the progress of this study, a significant effort was undertaken to sample adolescents whose parents from the three countries demonstrated a wide range of socioeconomic backgrounds as measured by parents' education. This was accomplished by sampling adolescents in multiple schools within each country having diverse sociodemographic characteristics. Results of this sampling process for the three countries indicated that the educational attainment of the adolescents' parents ranged from "completed less than a high school education" to "completed a graduate degree." The average scores for the parents' educational attainment in the three countries fell between the categories "graduation from secondary school" and "received some advanced training beyond secondary school (but without graduation)."

The original sample from the United States consisted of 556 adolescents who were students in six public high schools located in urban areas of the Mid-Western part of the United States. Because the number of ethnic minorities (e.g., African American, Asian American, and Hispanic American) was not sufficiently large for comparisons across cultural groups, adolescents reporting ethnicities other than Caucasian (i.e., European American) were not included in the analyses for the current study. The remaining 419 European American adolescents ranged in age from 13 to 18, with a mean age of 15.52 years and a gender distribution that was fairly balanced (i.e., 211 females and 208 males).

The Chinese participants consisted of 480 adolescents selected from six state-funded high schools in Beijing, China. The age of these adolescent ranged from 13 to 18, with a sample mean age of 15.42 years and a gender distribution that was fairly balanced (i.e., 242 females and 238 males).

The Russian sample consisted of 582 adolescents, ages 11 to 17 years, who were students in four state-funded public schools in Volgograd, Russia. For the purposes of making comparisons across samples, a subsample of 466 adolescents aged 13 and higher was selected for this study so that the age-range of the Russian adolescents would be comparable to the U.S. and Chinese samples. Consequently, the adolescent respondents in this subsample ranged in age from 13 to 17 years, with a mean age of 15.18 years and a gender distribution of 269 females and 197 males.

Measures

The questionnaire for the study consisted of items that assessed characteristics of the relationship between the participating adolescents and their family members. All of the constructs measured in this study have a long history in the study of parent-adolescent relationships as independent constructs based on factor analytic analyses (Rollins & Thomas, 1979, Peterson & Hann, 1999; Peterson & Bush, 2013; Bush & Peterson, 2013). The survey requested adolescents to report separately on their mothers' and fathers' behaviors (i.e., the adolescents' perceptions of maternal and paternal support, monitoring, and punitiveness) and other relationship qualities (adolescent autonomy from and conformity to parent). The participants

responded to items for each of the potential predictor variables (e.g., parenting practices, autonomy, and conformity) in terms of four-point Likert scales that varied from "Strongly Agree" (4) to "Strongly Disagree" (1). Demographic questions included those assessing adolescents' age, parents' and adolescents' gender, and parents' educational attainment. Item comparability among the non-English speaking samples was maximized through back translation 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).

Autonomy from parents. Adolescents' reports of autonomy achieved in reference to mothers and fathers, a potential predictor variable for this study, was measured by a scale of 10 items based on previous research dealing with the extent to which they viewed themselves as being self-directing in reference to parents (Peterson, Bush, & Supple, 1999; Sessa & Steinberg, 1991). Specifically, the items from this scale 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. A sample item from this scale is: "This parent allows me to choose my own friends without interfering too much."Cronbach's alphas ranging from .83 to .88 across the U.S., Chinese, and Russian samples and confirmation of theoretically-based predictions in previous research demonstrated good reliability and validity for this scale of items (Bush, 2000; Kupanoff, Bush, & Peterson, 2000; Peterson et al.,1999; Peterson et al., 2005).

Conformity to parents' expectations. Adolescents' reports of conformity to mothers' and fathers' expectations, a potential predictor variable for this study, was 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 items composing this instrument measured

the extent to which adolescents are responsive to or conform to parental values, beliefs, and expectations about leisure time activities, friends, dating, education, and careers. A sample item from this scale 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 of their relationships with both their mothers and fathers separately. Good reliability and validity have been demonstrated for this scale of items, with Cronbachs alphas ranging from .77 to .85 across the U.S., Chinese, and Russian samples and confirmation of theoretically-based predictions in previous research (Bush, 2000; Henry, Wilson, & Peterson, 1989; Kupanoff, Peterson, & Bush, 2000; Peterson et al., 1999; Peterson et al., 2005).

Parental behaviors. The parental behaviors (i.e., parental support, monitoring, and punitiveness), potential predictor variables for this study, were assessed with the Parent Behavior Measure (PBM). The PBM is 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 direct at adolescents in efforts to influence them (Bush et al., 2002; Henry et al., 1989; Peterson, Bush, & Supple, 1999; Peterson, Rollins, & Thomas, 1985).

Parental support on the PBM was measured by four items assessing the extent to which mothers and fathers were perceived by adolescents as being accepting, warm, approving, and nurturant. Parental punitiveness was assessed by six items measuring the perception that mothers and fathers use both verbal and physical control attempts that were excessively harsh, coercive, and arbitrary. Parental monitoring was measured by six items intended to capture the extent to which mothers and fathers were perceived as supervising how adolescents spend their free time and money as well as how they relate to their friends. Sample items for each of these parental behaviors include: (a) "This parent tells me how much

Bush, Peterson, & Chung

he/she loves me" (support); (b) "This parent yells at me a lot without a good reason" (punitiveness); and (c) "This parent knows where I am after school" (monitoring). The reliability and validity for these scales varied from acceptable to good, with Cronbach's alphas for these parental behaviors ranging from .71 to .87 and confirmation of theoretically-based predictions in previous research across the three samples (Bush et al., 1999; Kupanoff et al., 2000; Peterson, Bush, & Supple, 1999; Rollins & Thomas, 1985).

Parent-adolescent conflict. The sum of two items assessing adolescents' perceptions of the frequency and severity of conflict with parents was used to measure parent-adolescent conflict. Preliminary analyses indicated the two questions were assessing a single global construct of parent-adolescent conflict, based on the significant positive correlations between the two items within each subsample. The two parent-adolescent conflict items composing this measure were worded as follows: "How often do you argue with your parents?" and "How serious are your arguments with your parents?" Responses to these items were provided by adolescents in terms of a six point scale that was scored 1-6. For example, scores of "1" on the item measuring the frequency of conflict corresponded to the response: "My parents and I rarely or never have arguments or fights," whereas scores of "6" corresponded to the response: "My parents and I have arguments or fights several times a day." Similarly, scores of "1" on the item measuring the severity of conflict corresponded to the response: If they ever occur, our fights or arguments are very minor," whereas scores of "6" corresponded to the response "These fights or arguments are always serious." Cronbach's alphas for this measure of parent-adolescent conflict ranged from .70 to .76 across the samples from the three countries.

Sociodemographic variables. The variable age of the adolescent was measured on the day of the survey through a standard fact sheet item included in the project questionnaire that requested respondents to provide their age in number of years. The educational attainment of the fathers (i.e., used as the indicator of parents' education) was reported by adolescents as standard fact sheet response categories such as "some high school" or "graduate degree."

Analysis

Hierarchical multiple regression analysis was used to test the magnitude and direction of the relationships that were either hypothesized or exploratory in this study. The independent or predictor variables were parental support, parental monitoring, parental punitiveness, autonomy from parents and conformity to parents' expectations, whereas the dependent variable for this study was parent-adolescent conflict. Separate statistical models were conducted for each gender-of-parent/gender-of-adolescent dyad (i.e., adolescent boys' perceptions of mothers' attributes, adolescent boys' perceptions of fathers' attributes, adolescent girls' perceptions of mothers' attributes, and adolescent girls' perceptions of fathers' attributes) within each cultural group (i.e., U.S., China, and Russia). The sociodemographics variables age of adolescent and fathers' education (i.e., used as the indicator of parents' education) were entered into the equation as independent control variables to include in the model as tests for the possible contaminating affects of these variables.

Each multiple regression model involved a nested three-step procedure, with the sequence of entry being the socio-demographic/control variables (adolescents' age, mothers' education, and fathers' education) in the first step, the three parental behaviors (support, monitoring, and punitiveness) in the second step, and the entry of adolescent conformity to parents' expectations and adolescent autonomy from parents in a third step. A summary of the hierarchical multiple regression analyses are presented in Table 1 for the U.S. sample, Table 2 for the Chinese sample, and Table 3 for the Russian sample.

Family Relationship Predictors of Parent-Adolescent Conflict: Cross-Cultural Similarities and Differences

Table 1
Multiple Regression Analysis of U.S. Sample: Predictors of Parent-Adolescent Conflict

	Maternal Model						Paternal Model					
	Males			Females			Males			Females		
Step One	b	β	S.E.	b	β	S.E.	b	β	S.E.	b	β	S.E.
Age of Adol	(-.01)	-.06	(.11)	(-.01)	-.03	(.10)	(-.01)	-.04	(.12)	(-.01)	-.03	(.10)
Parents' Ed.	(-.01)	-.05	(.09)	(-.01)	-.06	(.10)	(-.01)	-.05	(.10)	(-.01)	-.03	(.11)
R^2	.01			.00			.00			.00		
F	n.s.			n.s.			n.s.			n.s.		
Step Two												
Age of Adol	(.01)	.01	(.10)	(.01)	.01	(.09)	(-.01)	-.01	(.11)	(-.01)	-.01	(.09)
Parents' Ed.	(.01)	.01	(.09)	(-.01)	-.01	(.09)	(.01)	.04	(.09)	(-.01)	-.02	(.10)
Punitive	(.01)	.25**	(.02)	(.01)	.21**	(.02)	(.10)	.29**	(.03)	(.01)	.30**	(.02)
Support	(-.31)	-.30**	(.07)	(.28)	-.33**	(.06)	(-.18)	-.23**	(.07)	(-.11)	-.17*	(.05)
Monitoring	(-.01)	-.08	(.05)	(-.01)	-.17*	(.04)	(-.01)	-.13	(.04)	(-.01)	-.20*	(.04)
R^2 Change	.20			.29			.19			.26		
F	$F(6,211)=9.41***$			$F(6,217)=15.27***$			$F(6,184)=7.36***$			$F(6,180)=10.74***$		
Step Three												
Age of Adol	(-.01)	-.01	(.10)	(.01)	.01	(.09)	(-.01)	-.02	(.11)	(-.01)	.01	(.09)
Parents' Ed.	(.01)	.02	(.09)	(-.01)	-.01	(.09)	(.01)	.07	(.09)	(-.01)	-.01	(.10)
Punitive	(.01)	.28**	(.03)	(.01)	.22***	(.02)	(.12)	.32**	(.03)	(.01)	.26***	(.02)
Support	(-.23)	-.23**	(.08)	(.27)	-.32***	(.07)	(-.01)	-.11+	(.07)	(-.01)	-.09	(.06)
Monitoring	(-.01)	-.01	(.05)	(-.01)	-.16*	(.04)	(-.01)	-.08	(.05)	(-.01)	-.18*	(.04)
Autonomy	(-.01)	-.12+	(.03)	(-.01)	.00	(.03)	(-.01)	-.18*	(.03)	(-.01)	-.16*	(.03)
Conformity	(-.01)	-.18*	(.03)	(-.01)	-.04	(.03)	(-.01)	-.20**	(.04)	(-.01)	-.06	(.04)
R^2 Change	.04			.00			.06			.02		
F	$F(8,209)=8.57***$			$F(8,215)=11.41***$			$F(8,182)=7.61***$			$F(8,178)=8.91***$		
Total R^2	.25			.29			.25			.28		
Total Adj. R^2	.22			.27			.22			.25		

Note. $*p<.05$; $**p<.01$; $***p<.001$; + = approached significance; b=unstandardized beta; β=standardized beta; S.E.=standard error of b.

Table 2

Multiple Regression Analysis of Chinese Sample: Predictors of Parent-Adolescent Conflict

	Maternal Model						Paternal Model					
	Males			Females			Males			Females		
Step One	b	β	S.E.	b	β	S.E.	b	β	S.E.	b	β	S.E.
Age of Adolescent	(.24)	.22**	(.07)	(.10)	.12	(.06)	(.24)	.22**	(.07)	(.01)	.12	(.06)
Parents' Education	(-.22)	-.12	(.17)	(-.02)	-.02	(.11)	(-.22)	-.12	(.17)	(-.02)	-.02	(.11)
R^2	.06			.01			.06			.01		
F	$F(3,204)=4.65**$			n.s.			$F(3,204)=4.65**$			n.s.		
Step Two												
Age of Adolescent	(.25)	.23***	(.07)	(.11)	.13*	(.06)	(.26)	.24***	(.07)	(.09)	.11	(.06)
Parents Education	(-.31)	-.17*	(.16)	(.01)	-.01	(.10)	(-.23)	-.12	(.16)	(.04)	.03	(.10)
Punitiveness	(.07)	.32***	(.01)	(.06)	.28***	(.01)	(.06)	.26***	(.02)	(.05)	.27***	(.01)
Support	(-.09)	-.16*	(.04)	(-.03)	-.07	(.03)	(-.08)	-.14*	(.04)	(-.05)	-.13*	(.03)
Monitoring	(-.03)	-.08	(.02)	(-.03)	-.12	(.02)	(-.03)	-.07	(.02)	(-.02)	-.07	(.02)
R^2 Change	.15			.11			.10			.12		
F	$F(6,201)=9.22***$		$F(6,214)=4.69***$				$F(6,201)=6.44**$		$F(6,214)=5.34***$			
Step Three												
Age of Adolescent	(.26)	.24***	(.07)	(.01)	.11	(.06)	(.27)	.25***	(.07)	(.08)	.09	(.06)
Parents' Education	(-.29)	-.15*	(.15)	(.01)	.01	(.10)	(-.19)	-.10	(.15)	(.05)	.04	(.10)
Punitiveness	(.06)	.30***	(.01)	(.06)	.28***	(.01)	(.05)	.24***	(.01)	(.05)	.27***	(.01)
Support	(-.05)	-.09	(.04)	(-.02)	-.04	(.03)	(-.03)	-.05	(.04)	(-.04)	-.11	(.03)
Monitoring	(-.01)	-.04	(.02)	(-.02)	-.08	(.02)	(-.01)	-.03	(.02)	(-.01)	-.05	(.02)
Autonomy	(-.06)	-.16*	(.03)	(-.01)	-.01	(.02)	(-.07)	-.17*	(.03)	(-.01)	-.02	(.02)
Conformity	(-.10)	-.19**	(.03)	(-.06)	-.16*	(.03)	(-.11)	-.21**	(.03)	(-.04)	-.12	(.02)
R^2 Change	.06			.02			.07			.01		
F	$F(8,199)=9.37***$		$F(8,212)=4.26***$				$F(8,199)=7.58***$		$F(8,212)=4.409***$			
Total R^2	.27			.14			.23			.14		
Total Adjusted R^2	.24			.11			.20			.11		

Note. *$p<.05$; **$p<.01$; ***$p<.001$; b=unstandardized beta; β=standardized beta; S.E.=standard error of b.

Table 3
Multiple Regression Analysis of Russian Sample: Predictors of Parent-Adolescent Conflict

	Maternal Model						Paternal Model					
	Males			Females			Males			Females		
Step One	b	β	S.E.	b	β	S.E.	b	β	S.E.	b	β	S.E.
Age of Adolescent	(.14)	.02	(.14)	(-.05)	-.03	(.11)	(-.01)	-.01	(.15)	(-.03)	-.02	(.12)
Parents' Education	(.09)	.08	(.11)	(.05)	.03	(.09)	(.08)	.06	(.12)	(.04)	.03	(.10)
R^2	.01			.00			.02			.00		
F	n.s.			n.s.			n.s.			n.s.		
Step Two												
Age of Adolescent	(.01)	.00	(.13)	(-.02)	-.01	(.09)	(.01)	.01	(.14)	(-.03)	-.02	(.11)
Parents' Education	(.08)	.06	(.10)	(.06)	.05	(.08)	(.05)	.04	(.11)	(.01)	.08	(.09)
Punitiveness	(.09)	.24***	(.03)	(.13)	.34***	(.02)	(.12)	.29***	(.03)	(.13)	.32***	(.03)
Support	(-.09)	-.08	(.09)	(-.29)	-.29***	(.06)	(-.12)	-.11	(.09)	(-.25)	-.27***	(.06)
Monitoring	(-.27)	-.37***	(.05)	(-.06)	-.09	(.04)	(-.26)	-.34 ***	(.06)	(-.03)	-.04	(.05)
R^2 Change	.20			30			.20			.24		
F	$F(6,171)=7.86$***			$F(6,243)=17.78$***			$F(6,157)=7.36$***			$F(6,216)=11.28$***		
Step Three												
Age of Adolescent	(-.03)	-.01	(.13)	(-.04)	-.02	(.10)	(-.02)	-.01	(.14)	(-.02)	-.01	(.11)
Parents' Education	(.10)	.08	(.10)	(.06)	.04	(.08)	(.08)	.06	(.11)	(.11)	.08	(.09)
Punitiveness	(.11)	.28***	(.03)	(.14)	.36***	(.03)	(.13)	.32***	(.04)	(.13)	.32***	(.03)
Support	(-.06)	-.05	(.09)	(-.28)	-.28***	(.07)	(-.08)	-.08	(.09)	(-.22)	-.24***	(.07)
Monitoring	(-.23)	-.31***	(.06)	(-.03)	-.05	(.04)	(-.21)	-.28**	(.06)	(-.01)	-.02	(.05)
Autonomy	(-.02)	-.05	(.04)	(-.01)	-.02	(.03)	(-.03)	-.06	(.04)	(-.04)	-.09	(.03)
Conformity	(-.10)	-.18*	(.04)	(-.08)	-.11	(.04)	(-.11)	-.20*	(.05)	(-.05)	-.07	(.04)
R^2 Change	.03			.02			.03			.01		
F	$F(8,169)=6.79$***			$F(8,241)=13.81$***			$F(8,155)=6.43$***			$F(8,214)=8.89$***		
Total R^2	.24			.32			.25			.25		
Total Adjusted R^2	.21			.29			.21			.22		

Note. *$p<.05$; **$p<.01$; ***$p<.001$; b=unstandardized beta; β=standardized beta; S.E.=standard error of b.

Results

The assessment of the results for model effects indicates that step 2 in all the multiple regression models (involving the entry of the variables punitiveness, support, and monitoring) accounted for most of the explained variance in parent-adolescent conflict. This was followed in succession by step 3 (involving the entry of autonomy from mothers/fathers and conformity to the expectations of mothers/fathers) and step 1 (involving the entry of parents' education and adolescents' age) in terms percentage of variance explained (see R^2 changes in Tables 1-3)

U.S. sample

Findings for parental support were mostly consistent with Hypothesis 1 for the U.S. sample by demonstrating negative predictors of (or inhibited) parent-adolescent conflict in three of the four gender-of-parent/gender-of-adolescent dyads and approached significance in the fourth parent-adolescent dyad (i.e., fathers' support predicting parent-adolescent conflict with boys) (see Table 1). Moreover, partially consistent with Hypothesis 1 were findings that mothers' and fathers' monitoring behavior were negative predictors of (or inhibited) parent-adolescent conflict with daughters but demonstrated nonsignificant coefficients in reference to parent-adolescent conflict with sons (see Table 1). In contrast, the opposite pattern of partial confirmation resulted for Hypothesis 4 involving adolescent autonomy from parents as a potential predictor of parent-adolescent conflict. Specifically, this hypothesized relationship for the U.S. sample demonstrated negative relationships with (or inhibited) conflict with boys (i.e., autonomy from fathers was a negative predictor of conflict with boys but autonomy from mothers only closely approached significance as a negative predictor of conflict with boys) but was nonsignificant in reference to conflict with girls (see Table 1). Results for parental punitiveness, in turn, provided strong confirmation of Hypothesis 2 within the U.S. sample, by demonstrating consistent positive

predictions in reference to (or increased) parent-adolescent conflict in all four of the gender-of-parent/gender-of-adolescent dyads. Other exploratory tests for the U.S. sample, conformity to mothers' and fathers' expectations as predictor of parent-adolescent conflict, was a significant negative predictor of (or inhibited) conflict with boys but was nonsignificant for conflict with girls (see Table 1).

In summary, results in the U.S. sample indicated that parental support functions to inhibit parent-adolescent conflict fairly consistently across all the parent-adolescent dyads, whereas parental monitoring inhibits parental conflict with girls but was not significant for conflict with boys. Adolescent autonomy functioned to inhibit parent-adolescent conflict with boys but was not significant for girls. Parental punitiveness, in turn, operated consistently to increase parent-adolescent conflict in all the parent-adolescent dyads, whereas conformity to parents' expectations inhibited conflict with boys but was not significant for girls. Besides the consistent results for parental support and punitiveness, therefore, parental monitoring, adolescent autonomy from parents, and conformity to parents' expectations demonstrated gender-of-adolescent differences.

Chinese sample

Findings for parental support in the Chinese sample provided only limited support for Hypothesis 1 because only one of four gender-of-parent/gender-of-adolescent dyads (i.e., mothers' support as a predictor of reduced parent-conflict with girls) demonstrated a significant negative prediction in reference to parent-adolescent conflict (see Table 2). Moreover, results for parental monitoring provided no support for Hypothesis 1 by failing to predict parent-adolescent conflict within any of the parent-adolescent dyads (see Table 2). An exploratory prediction in the Chinese sample, in turn, adolescent autonomy from parents, demonstrated the same pattern that appeared in the U.S. sample by being a negative predictor of (or inhibited) parent-adolescent conflict with

boys but was nonsignificant in reference to girls (see Table 2). Similar to findings from the U.S. sample, in turn, results for parental punitiveness in the Chinese sample provided strong confirmation for Hypothesis 2 by demonstrating consistent positive predictions in reference to (or fostered) parent-adolescent conflict within all four of the gender-of-parent/gender-of-adolescent dyads (see Table 2). Yet another similarity with the U.S. results were findings in the Chinese sample that conformity to mothers' and fathers' expectations were significant negative predictors of (or inhibited) conflict with boys but were nonsignificant predictors of conflict with girls (see Table 2). Finally, two of the sociodemograhic variables, age of adolescent and parents' educational attainment, were significant predictors of parent-adolescent conflict, with age of adolescent for boys being a positive predictor and fathers' education for boys being a negative predictor of parent-adolescent conflict.

In summary, results for the Chinese sample indicated that parental support has only limited consequence and monitoring has no influence on parent-adolescent conflict. Similar to results for the U.S., both adolescent autonomy from parents and conformity to parents' expectations functioned to inhibit parent-adolescent conflict with boys but were not significant for girls. Another similarity with the U.S. pattern was the fact that parental punitiveness operated consistently to foster parent-adolescent conflict in all of the parent-adolescent dyads. Moreover, a significant result for the age of adolescent variable indicated that, as Chinese boys become older, parent-adolescent conflict will increase. Finally, another result is that, as fathers' educational attainment increases, boys' will engage in less conflict with their parents. Once again, parental monitoring, adolescent autonomy from parents, and conformity to parents' expectations within the Chinese sample demonstrated gender-of-adolescent differences in patterns comparable to the U.S. sample.

Russian sample

Hypothesis 1 was provided only partial

confirmation in the Russian sample because mothers' and fathers' support were negative predictors of (or inhibited) mothers' and fathers' conflict with daughters but were nonsignificant in reference to predicting conflict with sons (see Table 3).

In contrast, findings for mothers' and fathers' monitoring provided only partial confirmation for Hypothesis 1 by being a significant negative predictor of (or inhibited) parent-adolescent conflict for boys (see Table 1). Similar to results for the U.S. and China, in turn, substantial support was provided for Hypothesis 2 because parental punitiveness was a significant positive predictor of (or fostered) parent-adolescent conflict across all the gender-of-parent/gender-of-adolescent combinations. Yet another similarity with the U.S. and Chinese results were exploratory findings in the Russian sample indicating that conformity to mothers' and fathers' expectations were significant negative predictors of (or inhibited) parent-youth conflict with boys but not with girls (see Table 2). Finally, in an exploratory analysis for the Russian sample, parental autonomy failed to predict parent-adolescent conflict within any of the parent-youth dyads.

In summary, results for the Russian sample provided some unique patterns of prediction, including the fact that parental support functions to inhibit parent-adolescent conflict with girls but not with boys. Moreover, parental monitoring has the opposite influence based on gender-of-adolescent influences by managing parent-youth conflict for boys but not for girls.

Another pattern in the Russian sample that differed from the U.S. and Chinese samples was that autonomy from parents failed to influence parent-adolescent conflict in any of the gender-of-parent/gender-of-adolescent dyads. However, similar to results for the U.S. and China, parental punitiveness operated consistently to foster parent-adolescent conflict in all the Russian parent-adolescent dyads. Finally, also similar to the U.S. and China, adolescent conformity to mothers' and fathers' expectations in Russia functioned to inhibit parent-adolescent conflict with boys but was not a significant predictor for

conflict with girls. In the case of the Russian sample, therefore, parental support demonstrated gender-of adolescent differences that varied for China and the United States, but conformity to parents' expectations in Russia demonstrated gender-of-adolescent differences in patterns comparable to the U.S. and China samples.

Discussion

This study revealed patterns of relationship predictors for parent-adolescent conflict within three cultures that are more complex than are often acknowledge by advocates of cross-cultural universality within parent-adolescent relationships.

Beliefs that general orientations like individualism or collectivism are (1) each associated with distinct cultures and will encourage corresponding patterns of managing parent-adolescent conflict, probably underestimates the role of cultural diversity as a means of fostering variation in socialization processes.

Parents in collectivist cultures (e.g., China and Russia) have often been viewed, for example, as simply fostering social traits such as interdependence and connectedness with others to manage parent-youth conflict. In contrast, parents in individualistic cultures (e.g., The U.S.) are seen as emphasizing autonomy and personal agency (e.g., Lam, 1997; Triandis, 1995) to manage parent-youth conflict. However, as our findings indicate, components of individualism and collectivism probably become translated into socialization processes at the parent-adolescent level of analysis in much more complex ways than has been originally thought. That is, individualism and collectivism do not appear to become manifest in the socialization process to manage parent-adolescent conflict in terms well-defined polar opposites located in different societies, but in contrast, both of these value complexes appear to operate in a variety of ways within the socialization processes of the same cultures (Bush, 2000; Kagitcibasi, 1994; Peterson et al., 2005; Tamis-LeMonda et al., 2008; Triandis, 1995). Instead, parents from all

or most cultures are likely to demonstrate some aspects of both of these general value complexes to manage conflict, regardless what the dominant value orientation of a culture may be (Bugenthal & Grusec, 2006; Bush, 2000; Collins & Steinberg, 2006; Kagitcibasi, 1994; Yau & Smetana, 1996, 2003). This combined influence of individualism and collectivism is clearly evident in aspects of the present findings, which indicate that both autonomy from parents' (a relationship aspect of individualism) and conformity to parents' expectations (a relationship aspect of collectivism) function to manage parent-adolescent conflict with boys, within both the U.S. and China samples.

One of the most striking patterns in this study were the cultural and gender-of-adolescent differences that became prevalent for the predictors of parent-adolescent conflict. Consistent with other cross-cultural studies (e.g., Bush, 2000), results for this study indicate that gender-of-adolescent differences are at least equal in prominence with cultural differences, with only parental punitiveness being a significant predictor across all gender-of-adolescent combinations for the three cultures.

Parental support, for example, operated to manage parent-adolescent conflict across the three cultures more consistently for adolescent girls than for boys. That is, support may foster closeness, positive emotional bonds, and trust between parents and their daughters, all of which may help to manage conflict between girls and their parents (Peterson, 2005; Rohner, 1986, 2008). Across cultures, but compared to boys, close emotional bonds or connections with parents play a greater role in managing parent-adolescent conflict with girls. Moreover, the comparative importance of relationship connections for females as a means of managing conflict is consistent with classic conceptions of gender-role differences. Specifically, females are believed to place greater emphasis on relational thinking and communion within in relationships, whereas males are expected to focus more extensively on independence and self-direction in their relationships (Gore, Aseltine, & Colton, 1993).

Parental support also demonstrated substantial cultural differences in managing parent-adolescent conflict across the three cultures. The U.S. sample demonstrated the most consistent role for parental support in managing conflict for both male and female adolescents, with the Russian sample being second in terms of the influence of support (but for females only), followed by the Chinese sample with the most attenuated role for parental support in conflict management. These predictive variations suggest that parental support may be differentially emphasized across societies and may convey distinctive cultural meanings (Bush et al., 2002; Chao, 2000, 2001) that have varied consequences for managing conflict. For the Chinese sample, in particular, some observers have reported that Chinese, Chinese American, and other Asian parents are less warm (supportive) or less emotionally demonstrative toward adolescents (Bush et al., 2002, Chao, 2001; Chiu, 1987; Stevenson, Chen, & Lee, 1992; Wu, 1996). One possibility is that Chinese parents convey supportiveness differently, not as emotional demonstrativeness, like in western cultures, but more as care and concern that becomes evident through other aspects of he parent-youth relationship (Chao, 2000).

Parental monitoring also demonstrated cultural and gender-of-parent differences as a predictor of parent-adolescent conflict. Specifically, this form of parental supervision refers to efforts by parents to become aware of and manage their teenager's schedules, peer associations, activities, and physical whereabouts. Successful monitoring implies that parents must maintain a clear set of rules about the time that adolescents should be home, when they should return from peer activities, with whom they may associate, and places where the young are forbidden to go. The primary role of parental monitoring, therefore, is to apply a comparatively fair, non-arbitrary form of control designed to prevent the drift of teenagers toward problematic peer relationships, risk behavior, and deviant activities (Barber, Olson, & Shagle, 1994; Fuligni & Eccles, 1993; Racz & McMahon, 2011, Small, 1990). These findings suggest that adolescent girls in the U.S.

and adolescent boys in Russia may recognize the appropriateness of parental monitoring and are less inclined to engage in conflict with their elders over parents' efforts to control or manage their behavior. Perceived risks may vary across cultures and male and female adolescents may differ in the extent to which they recognize and attend to these threats. Consequently, the efficacy of parental monitoring, as a means of managing conflict, will be greatest in those cultures where the perceived risks are the greatest and by those adolescents (males or females) who feel most threatened by circumstances in their social environments (Pipher, 1994; Stetsenko, 2002). An important topic for future research is to examine what specific risks are recognized by adolescent boys in Russia and by adolescent girls in the Unites States that may legitimize the use of parental monitoring to manage parent-adolescent conflict. Greater insight will then be provided into why these adolescents appear to view their parents' monitoring behavior as being particularly justified to an extent that conflict with parents is managed.

Gender-of adolescent differences also were clearly prevalent for conformity to parents as a predictor of parent-adolescent conflict. Across the three cultures, conforming to the expectations of parents helped to manage parent-adolescent conflict with boys but not with girls. This suggests that, compared to adolescent girls, adolescent boys may need to perceive that parents are communicating rules and expectations to them clearly. Compared to the experiences of girls, many sources of gender-role socialization for boys within a variety of societies often emphasize greater assertiveness and autonomy, which may, in turn, create greater tendencies for males to challenge their parents and engage in conflict with them. In contrast, girls often face more concerted social expectations from a variety of sources in the larger society for relationship communion and compliance with conventional social circumstances (Fuligni, 1998; Feldman & Rosenthal, 1990; Helgeson, 1994). Consequently, parents may need to place greater constraints on boys, probably in ways that emphasize firm but

not harsh control, particularly if they wish to manage the potential for conflicts with boys.

The one consistent finding across the three cultures and gender comparisons was that parental punitiveness functioned to increase parent-adolescent conflict. Parental punitiveness refers to the use of excessive force through arbitrary verbal or physical attempts which are intended to impose the will of parents on their young (Peterson & Rollins, 1987). Physical or verbal punitiveness often leads to hostile feelings, resistance, and tendencies by teenagers to reject parental authority over the long-term (Baumrind et al., 2010; Rollins & Thomas, 1979; Turner & Finkelhor, 1996). Other research indicates that children and adolescents often respond to parents' punitive behavior by "counterattacking" and escalating parent-adolescent conflict with their own forms of punitive behavior (Granic & Patterson, 2006). Parental punitiveness appears to act as kind of kindling that both ignites and exacerbates parent-adolescent conflict across the three cultures examined in this study.

An interesting finding for one of the sociodemographic/control variables in the Chinese sample was the positive relationship between age of adolescent and perceptions of conflict with parents, which indicated that parent-youth conflict increases with the age of adolescents. This finding for age and parent-adolescent conflict is contrary to the overall conclusions in the Western research suggesting that parent-adolescent conflicts increase in intensity from early to middle adolescence and then levels off in late adolescence (e.g., Laursen, Coy, & Collins, 1998). Such a conflicting finding is better understood, however, if the age of the current sample (e.g., middle adolescence) is considered. Moreover, it has been increasingly recognized that the typical pattern for Chinese adolescents to attain autonomy from parents often occurs at a later time than for European American youth (e.g., Fuligni, 1998). Moreover, this relationship between age and parent-adolescent conflict is consistent with results from a study by Fuligni (1998) involving Chinese Americans in which tenth graders reported higher frequencies of disagreements with parents

than students who were in the sixth and eighth grades (Fuligni, 1998).

Another finding unique to the Chinese sample was the significant negative relationship between parents' educational attainment and boy's perceptions of conflict with parents. This finding indicates that having parents with higher levels of education appears to decrease the likelihood of conflict with parents for Chinese boys, which is consistent with findings from a study on Hong Kong and Mainland Chinese families (Yau & Smetana, 1996). Specifically, Yau and Smetana (2003) reported that, as parental education increased, the frequency of conflictual discussions and the number of conflicts declined. Perhaps educational attainment, a social outcome of great value in Chinese culture, serves to enhance parental authority, which, in turn, functions as a further break on the tendency of youth to engage in conflict with parents.

This study also demonstrated methodological limitations resulting from the use of cross-sectional data and correlational analyses, which may have conceptual and methodological implications for the implied directions of influence in the research model. Specifically, this study proposed that adolescent autonomy, adolescent conformity, parental support, punitiveness, and monitoring are predictors of parent-adolescent conflict. Similar to much of the existing social science research on this and related topics, the direction of influence can never be truly established with cross-sectional data in a definitive sense. Consequently, the argument presented here about directionality was offered for heuristic value only. For example, instead of assuming that perceptions of increased parental punitiveness will predict or influence increases in parental conflict to occur, one might alternatively propose that if parents and adolescents reduce their conflict, then parents will have fewer reasons to be punitive toward teenagers. A realistic assumption, therefore, is that both of these directions of influence may apply simultaneously and a classic chicken and egg dilemma prevents precise interpretation. This dilemma concerning the reciprocal nature of such reciprocity does not diminish the

importance of establishing that punitiveness and parent-adolescent conflict may be mutually dependent (Kuczynski & Parkin, 2007; Peterson & Hann, 1999).

A final comment involves the recognition that distinguishing between the influence of culture and the influence of gender roles is difficult, but important to consider (c.f., Yau & Smetana, 2003). Perhaps the most likely resolution of this issue is that each cultural context defines the nature of gender-role distinctions along traditional versus less gender-differentiated patterns. Thus, if we are to understand the meaning of cross-cultural research findings, we must learn more about how cultural definitions of gender roles functions to influence the socialization process and the potential for parent-adolescent conflict in a great variety of social-cultural settings.

References

Arnett, J. J. (1995). Broad and narrow socialization: The family in the context of cultural theory. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 54,* 339-373.

Barber, B. K. (1994). Cultural, family, and personal contexts of parent-adolescent conflict. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 56,* 375-386.

Barber, B. K., Olsen, J. E., & Shagle, S. C. (1994). Associations between parental psychological and behavioral control and youth internalized and externalized behaviors. *Child Development, 65,* 1120-1136.

Baumrind, D. (1991). Effective parenting during the early adolescent transition. In P. A. Cowan & M. Hetherington (Eds.), *Family transitions* (pp.111-163). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Baumrind, D., Larzelere, R. E., & Owens, E. B. (2010). Effects of preschool parents' power assertive patterns and practices on adolescent development. *Parenting: Science & Practice, 10*(3), 157-201.

Blos, P. (1979). *The adolescent passage.* New York: International Universities Press.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1972). *Two worlds of childhood: U.S. and U.S.S.R.* New York: Simon & Schuster.

Bugental, D. P., & Grusec, J. (2006). Socialization processes. In N. Eisenberg (Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology, Vol. 3: Social, emotional, and personality development* (pp. 366-428). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley and Sons.

Bush, K. R. (2000). Separatedness and connectedness in parent-adolescent relationships: The impact on adolescent self-esteem among Chinese and European-American families. *Marriage and Family Review, 30*(1/2), 153-178.

Bush, K. R., & Peterson, G. W. (2013). Parent-child relations in diverse contexts. In G. W. Peterson & K. R. Bush (Eds.), *Handbook of Marriage and the Family, 3rd Edition* (pp. 275-302). New York: Springer.

Bush, K. R., Peterson, G. W., Cobas, J., & Supple, A. J. (2002). Adolescents' perceptions of parental behaviors as predictors of adolescent self-esteem in mainland China. *Sociological Inquiry, 72* (4), 503-526.

Chao, R. K. (1994). Beyond parental control and authoritarian parenting style: Understanding Chinese parenting through the cultural notion of training. *Child Development, 65,* 1111-1119.

Chao, R. K. (2000). Cultural explanations for the role of parenting in the school success of Asian-American children. In R. Taylor & M. C. Wang (Eds.), *Resilience across contexts: Family, work, culture, and community* (pp. 333-363). Temple University: Center for Research in Human Development.

Chao, R. K. (2001). Extending research on the consequences of parenting style for Chinese Americans and European Americans. *Child Development, 72,* 1832-1843.

Chen-Gaddini, M. (2012). Chinese mothers and adolescents' views of authority and autonomy: A study of parent-adolescent conflict in urban and rural China. *Child Development, 83*(6), 1846-1852.

Chiu, L. H. (1987). Child-rearing attitudes of Chinese, Chinese-American, and Anglo-American mothers. *International Journal of Psychology, 22,* 409-419.

Cheng, S. T., & Hamid, P. N. (1995). An error in the use of translated scales: The Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale for Chinese. *Perceptual and Motor Skills, 81,* 431-434.

Chung, G. H., Flook, L., & Fuligni, A. (2009). Daily family conflict and emotional distress among adolescents from Latin America, Asian, and European backgrounds. *Developmental Psychology, 45*, 1406-1415.

Collins, W. A., Laursen, B., Mortenson, N., & Ferreira, M. (1997). Conflict processes and transitions in parent and peer relationships: Implications for autonomy and regulation. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 12*, 178-198.

Collins, W. A., & Steinberg, L. A. (2006). Adolescent development in interpersonal context. In N. Eisenberg (Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology, Vol. 3: Social, emotional, and personality development* (pp. 1003-1067). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley and Sons.

Dornbusch, S. M., Ritter, P. L., Leiderman, P. H., Roberts, D. F., & Fraleigh, M. J. (1987). The relation of parenting style to adolescent school performance. *Child Development, 56*, 326-341.

Feldman, S. S., & Quatman, T. (1988). Factors influencing age expectations for adolescent autonomy: A study of early adolescents and parents. *Journal of Early Adolescence, 8,* 325–343.

Feldman, S. S., & Rosenthal, D. (1990). The acculturation of autonomy expectations in Chinese highschoolers residing in two Western nations. *International Journal of Psychology, 25*, 259-281.

Fuligni, A. J. (1998). Authority, autonomy, and parent-adolescent conflict and cohesion: A study of adolescents from Mexican, Chinese, Filipino, and European backgrounds. *Developmental Psychology, 34*(4), 782-792.

Fuligni, A., & Eccles, J. (1993). Perceived parent-child relationships and early adolescents' orientation toward peers. *Developmental Psychology, 29*, 622-632.

Gore, S., Aseltine, R. H., & Colton, M. E. (1993). Gender, social–relational involvement, and depression. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 3,*101–125.

Granic, I., & Patterson, G. R. (2006). Toward a comprehensive model of antisocial development: A dynamic systems approach. *Psychological Review, 113*, 101-131.

Greenberger, E., & Chen, C. (1996). Perceived family relationships and depressed mood in early and late adolescence: A comparison of European and Asian Americans. *Developmental Psychology, 32,* 707-716.

Hall, G. S. (1904). *Adolescence: Its psychology and its relation to physiology, anthropology, sociology, sex, crime, religion, and education* (Vols. I & II). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Helgeson, V. S. (1994). Relation of agency and communion to well-bing: Evidence and potential explanations. *Psychological Bulletin, 116*, 412-428.

Henry, C. L., Wilson, S. M., & Peterson, G. W. (1989). Parental competence bases and processes as predictors of adolescent conformity. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 4,* 15-32.

Kagitcibasi, C. (1994). A critical appraisal of individualism and collectivism: Toward a new formulation. In U. Kim, H. C. Triandis, C. Kagitcibasi, S. C. Choi, & G. Yoon (Eds.), *Individualism and collectivism: Theory, methods, and applications* (pp.52-65), Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kagitcibasi, C. (1996). *Family and human development across cultures: A view from the other side.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associated.

Kuczynski, L., & Parkin, M. (2007). Agency and bidirectionality in socialization: Interactions, transactions, and relational dialectics. In J. E. Grusec & P. D. Hastings (Eds.), *Handbook of socialization theory and research* (pp.259-283). New York: Guilford Press.

Kupanoff, K., Bush, K. R., & Peterson, G. W. (2000, November). Parental behaviors as predictors of autonomy among Russian adolescents. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the National Council on Family Relations, Minneapolis, MN.

Lahat, A., Helwig, C. C., Yang, S., Tan, D., & Liu, C. (2009). Mainland Chinese adolescents' judgments and reasoning about self-

determination and nurturance rights. *Social Development, 18*, 690-710.

Lam, C. M. (1997). A cultural perspective of the study of Chinese adolescent development. *Child and Adolescent Social Work Journal, 14*(2). 85-113.

Laursen, B., Coy, K., & Collins, W. A. (1998). Reconsidering changes in parent-child conflict across adolescence: A meta-analysis. *Child Development, 69*, 81-832.

Montemayor, R. (1986). Family variation in parent-adolescent storm and stress. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 1*, 15-31.

Parkin, C. M., & Kuczynski, L. (2012). Adolescent perspectives on rules and resistance within the parent-child relationship. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 27*, 632-658.

Peterson, G. W. (1995). Autonomy and connectedness. In R. D. Day, K. R. Gilbert, B. H. Settles, & W. R. Burr (Eds.), *Research and theory in family science*. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Peterson, G. W. (2005). Family influences on adolescent development. In G. R. Adams & T. P. Gullotta (Eds.), *Handbook on the treatment and prevention of dysfunctional behavior: Evidence-based approaches to prevention and treatment* (pp.27-56). New York, NY: Springer.

Peterson, G. W., & Bush, K. R. (2013). Conceptualizing cultural influences on socialization: Comparing parent-adolescent relationships in the U. S. and Mexico. In G. W. Peterson & K. R. Bush (Eds.), *Handbook of Marriage and the Family, 3rd Edition* (pp.177-208). New York: Springer.

Peterson, G. W., Bush, K. R., & Supple, A. J. (1999). Predicting adolescent autonomy from parents: Relationship connectedness and restrictiveness. *Sociological Inquiry, 69*, 431-457.

Peterson, G. W., & Hann, D. (1999). Socializing parents and children in families. In M. B. Sussman, S. K. Steinmetz, & G. W. Peterson (Eds.), *Handbook of marriage and the family* (pp.327-370). New York: Plenum Press.

Peterson, G. W., & Rollins, B. C. (1987). Parent-child socialization. In M. B. Sussman & S. K. Steinmetz (Eds.), *Handbook of marriage and the family* (pp.471-507). New York: Plenum Press.

Peterson, G. W., Rollins, B. C., & Thomas, D. L. (1985). Parental influence and adolescent conformity: Compliance and internalization. *Youth and Society, 16*, 397-420.

Peterson, G. W., Steinmetz, S., & Wilson, S. (2005). Persisting issues in cultural and cross-cultural parent-youth relationships. *Marriage and Family Review, 36*(3/4), 229-240.

Phinney, J. S., & Ong, A. D. (2002). Adolescent-parent disagreement and life satisfaction in families from Vietnam and European American backgrounds. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 26*, 556-562.

Pipher, M. (1994). *Reviving Ophelia*. New York: Ballantine Books.

Racz, S., & McMahon, R. (2011). The relationship between parental knowledge and monitoring and child and adolescent conduct problems: A 10-year update. *Clinical Child & Family Psychology Review, 14*, 377-398.

Rohner, R. P. (1986). *The warmth dimension: Foundation of parental acceptance-rejection theory*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Rohner, R. P. (2008). Parental acceptance-rejection theory studies of intimate adult relationships. *Cross-Cultural Research, 42*, 5-12.

Rothbaum, F., & Trommsdorf, G. (2007). Do roots and wings complement or oppose one another? The socialization of relatedness and autonomy in cultural context. In J. E. Grusec & P. D. Hastings (Eds.), *Handbook of socialization: Theory and research* (pp.461-489). New York: Guilford Press.

Rollins, B. C., & Thomas, D. L. (1979). Parental support, power, and control techniques in the socialization of children. In W. R. Burr, R. Hill, F. I. Nye, & I. L. Reiss (Eds.), *Contemporary theories about the family, Vol 1, Research based theories* (pp.317-364). New York: Free Press.

Sessa, F. M., & Steinberg, L. (1991). Family structure and the development of autonomy during adolescence. *Journal of Early Adolescence, 11*(1), 38-55.

Shek, D. T. L., Chan, L. K., & Lee, T. Y. (2011).

Parenting styles, parent-adolescent conflict, and psychological well-being of adolescents with low academic achievement in Hong Kong. *International Journal of Adolescent Medicine and Health, 9*(4), 233-248.

Shek, D. T. L., & Ma, H. K. (2002). Parent-adolescent conflict and adolescent antisocial and prosocial behavior: A longitudinal study in a Chinese context. *Adolescence, 36*(143), 545-555.

Small, S. (1990). *Preventive programs that support families with adolescents.* Working paper: Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development. Carnegie Corporation, Washington, DC.

Smetana, J. G. (2005). Adolescent-conflict: Resistance and subversion as developmental process. In L. Nucci (Ed.), *Conflict, contradiction, and contrarian elements in moral development and education* (pp.69-91). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Smetana, J. G., & Villalobos, M. (2009). Social cognitive development in adolescence. In R. Lerner & L. Steinberg (Eds.), *Handbook of adolescent psychology (3rd Ed., Vol. 1,* pp.187-228). New York: Wiley.

Steinberg, L., Lamborn, S. D., Dornbusch, S. M., & Darling, N. (1992). Impact of parenting practices on adolescent achievement: Authoritative parenting, school involvement, and encouragement to succeed. *Developmental Psychology, 63,* 1266-1281.

Steinberg, L., & Levine, A. (1997). *You and your adolescent: A parents' guide for ages 10 to 20* (rev. ed.). New York: Harper Collins.

Stetsenko, A. (2002). Surviving the turmoil and creating a brighter future. In B. B. Brown, R. W. Larson, & T. S. Saraswathi (Eds.), *The world's youth: Adolescence in eight regions of the globe* (pp.243-275). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Stevenson, H. W., Chen, C., & Lee, S. (1992). Chinese families. In J. L. Roopnarine & D. B. Carter (Eds.), *Parent-child socialization in diverse cultures* (pp.17-33). Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing.

Tamis-LeMonda, C. S., Way, N., Hughes, D., Yoshikawa, H., Kalman, R. K., & Niwa, E. Y.

(2008). Parents' goals for children: The dynamic coexistence of individualism and collectivism in cultures and individuals. *Social Development, 17,* 183-209.

Thomas, D. L., Gecas, V., Weigert, A., & Rooney, E. (1974). *Family socialization and the adolescent.* Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Triandis, H. C. (1995). *Individualism and collectivism.* Boulder CO: Westview Press.

Wu, D. Y. H. (1996). Chinese childhood socialization. In M. H. Bond (Ed.), *The handbook of Chinese psychology* (pp.143-154). Hong Kong: Oxford University Press.

Wang, A., Peterson, G. W., & Morphey, K. M. (2007). Who is more important for early adolescents' developmental choices? Peers or parents? *Marriage and Family Review, 42,* 95-122.

Wu, C., & Chao, R. K. (2011). Intergenerational cultural dissonance in parent-adolescent relationships among Chinese and European Americans. *Developmental Psychology, 47*(2), 493-508.

Yang, K. S. (1981). Social orientation and modernity among Chinese students in Taiwan. *Journal of Social Psychology, 113,* 159-170.

Yang, K. S. (1986). Chinese personality and its change. In M. Bond (Ed.), *The psychology of the Chinese people* (pp. 106-170). New York: Oxford University Press.

Yau, J., & Smetana, J. G. (1996). Adolescent-parent conflict among Chinese adolescents in Hong-Kong. *Child Development, 67,* 1263-1275.

Yau, J., & Smetana, J. (2003). Adolescent-parent conflict in Hong Kong and Shenzhen: A comparison of youth in two cultural contexts. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 27*(3), 201-211.

Zhang, W., & Fuligni, A. (2006). Authority, autonomy, and family relationships among adolescents in urban and rural China. *Research on Adolescence, 16,* 527-537.