Wilfrid Laurier University

Scholars Commons @ Laurier

Theses and Dissertations (Comprehensive)

1997

Cross-cultural differences in parenting and moral development in late adolescence: A narrative approach

Wanna E. Mar
Wilfrid Laurier University

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholars.wlu.ca/etd

Part of the Social Psychology Commons

Recommended Citation

Mar, Wanna E., "Cross-cultural differences in parenting and moral development in late adolescence: A narrative approach" (1997). *Theses and Dissertations (Comprehensive)*. 649.
https://scholars.wlu.ca/etd/649

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Scholars Commons @ Laurier. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations (Comprehensive) by an authorized administrator of Scholars Commons @ Laurier. For more information, please contact scholarscommons@wlu.ca.

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

UMI

A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600

Cross-Cultural Differences In Parenting And Moral Development In Late Adolescence: A Narrative Approach

By

Wanna Mar

B. Sc., University of Toronto, 1994

THESIS

Submitted to the Department of Psychology

in partial fulfilment of the requirements

for the Master of Arts degree

Wilfrid Laurier University

1997

© Wanna Mar 1997

National Library of Canada

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

Acquisitions and Bibliographic Services

Acquisitions et services bibliographiques

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

0-612-21885-6

Canada

Abstract

This study investigated differences in parenting and late adolescents' moral development in two cultural groups: Chinese-Canadian and European-Canadian. Measures of parental authoritativeness and degree of parental influence on moral values were administered to a sample of 62 European-Canadian and 40 Chinese-Canadian university students, aged 17-26 years. The participants were then compared with respect to two outcome measures, one assessing the degree to which they internalized and represented parents' viewpoints ("voice") in narratives about moral socialization, and the other assessing level of moral reasoning development. Results indicated that reported parental authoritativeness was positively related to the degree of parent "voice" displayed in participants' moral narratives. No relationship was found between parental authoritativeness and participants' level of moral reasoning development. Analyses also revealed that Chinese-Canadian participants rated their parents as being more authoritarian and less authoritative when compared to the ratings of their European-Canadian counterparts. Differences in the types of moral values selected as most important were also found between the two cultural groups. Unexpectedly, the European-Canadian students tended to rate parental influence on moral values as higher and to represent parental viewpoints to a greater degree in their moral narratives than did the Chinese-Canadian students. These findings suggest that parents' style of childrearing may have an important role to play in the moral development of older adolescents and young adults, and provide support for the study of parental influence on children's moral values via the collection of moral socialization narratives. The results of this investigation also demonstrate the importance of investigating parenting and morality from a cross-cultural perspective.

Acknowledgements

Completing a thesis has been one of the great challenges that I have faced in my academic career. I could not have done it alone, and my appreciation and gratitude goes to God, for blessing me throughout my life, and to my parents, for their steadfast love and support.

First of all, I want to express my deepest thanks to my thesis advisor, Dr. Michael Pratt, for his guidance and support throughout the duration of my Master's program, and especially in the completion of this thesis. It has been a long and sometimes unpredictable process, and I want to thank Dr. Pratt for his consistently positive attitude and willingness to assist me. His input and advice during each stage of this project were invaluable.

In addition, I would like to thank Dr. Bruce Hunsberger and Dr. Josephine Naidoo for serving as thesis committee members. Their comments and suggestions during the review process were very helpful towards fine-tuning the content and presentation of this work. I am also grateful to Susan Alisat for assisting me with some of the data analyses. She was generous in sharing her statistical knowledge and expertise, even though she was not directly involved in this project.

My recognition and appreciation also goes to Simon Lau, who was of such great help to me in recruiting participants from the Chinese community at Wilfrid Laurier University. Without his contribution in time and effort, I probably would not have been able to realize my goal of doing a cross-cultural study for my thesis.

Lastly, I want to express my gratitude to my fiance, Paul, for patiently hanging in there with me during the course of my studies. His constant encouragement and support has helped make the completion of this work possible.

Table of Contents

Abstract 2

Acknowledgements 3

Table of Contents 4

List of Tables 5

List of Appendices 6

Introduction 7

- Moral Development 8
- Cross-Cultural Variations in Moral Development 17
- Parenting and Moral Development 22
- Cross-Cultural Differences Between Chinese and North American Parenting 32
- Hypotheses 42

Method 43

- Participants 43
- Measures 44
- Procedure 48

Results 49

Discussion 59

References 73

Appendices 80

List of Tables

Table 1 Mean Scores for Chinese- and European-Canadians on Various Study Measures 49

Table 2 Parenting Style and Gender Differences in Mean Level of "Voice" Displayed in Moral Narratives 53

Table 3 Parenting Style and Gender Differences in Mean Levels of Reported Parental Influence 54

Table 4 Differences Between European- and Chinese-Canadians in Choice of Moral Values 59

List of Appendices

Appendix A	Demographic Information Form	80
Appendix B	Parenting Style Measure	81
Appendix C	Measure of Moral Development (Defining Issues Test)...	82
Appendix D	Moral Values Task	86
Appendix E	Protocol for obtaining moral narratives	87
Appendix F	Coding scheme used to score moral narratives	88
Appendix G	Examples of coded narratives	89
Appendix H	Table of correlations involving age and length of residence..	91
Appendix I	Gender differences in selection of moral values	92
Appendix J	Introduction to Study	93

Introduction

To date, very little research has focused on cross-cultural differences in parenting and their role in the moral development of children. The potential value of incorporating cross-cultural perspectives into research has been demonstrated by individuals such as John Ogbu. In his investigation of school achievement, Ogbu (e.g., 1990) sought to understand the reasons underlying the differing patterns of school success typically observed among different minority groups, and showed us the importance of applying theories in wider cultural contexts. Mechanisms of development may operate differently or in more or less complex ways within various settings.

The significance and usefulness of cross-cultural research are also reinforced by the fact that Canadian society is multicultural in composition, and promises to become even more ethnically diverse in the years ahead. One of the larger ethnic minority groups in Canada at present, and the one which was selected as the minority population of interest in this investigation, is the Chinese. According to the 1986 Census of Canada (as cited in Fleras & Elliott, 1992), the Chinese population is the fifth largest ethnic group in Canada. In addition, this population is growing very quickly: in 1990, the top country in terms of immigration to Canada was Hong Kong, which accounted for 10.4% of all immigrants that year (Fleras & Elliott, 1992). Hence, given the influx of Chinese immigrants in recent years, this cultural group has become an important and relevant one to study in Canada.

With this context in mind, the present study focused on possible cultural differences in patterns of family influences on moral development between European-Canadian and Chinese-Canadian[1] adolescents and young adults. In particular, the relationships among parenting style, parental influences and adolescents' moral reasoning development within each culture were of interest.

[1] The term "Chinese-Canadian" used in this study will be applied to individuals of Chinese descent who are currently residing in Canada, regardless of whether they have citizenship status or not.

The following paper will begin with a review of the existing literature on moral development, as it has been approached from the traditional cognitive-structural perspectives of Piaget and Kohlberg, and from the more recent conceptualization of morality as reflected in moral narratives (e.g., Tappan & Brown, 1989). An overview of the cross-cultural validity of Kohlberg's theory of moral development will comprise the next section. Lastly, empirical research which investigated how parenting style and parent behaviours are related to moral development will be reviewed, followed by a summary of cross-cultural research on Chinese parenting orientation and practices.

Literature Review

Moral Development

The moral development of children has been an area of interest for parents and researchers alike for many decades. In particular, the work of Jean Piaget and Lawrence Kohlberg has gained widespread attention. Their theories pertaining to children's morality represent what is known as the *structural* approach, as they posit that all children go through an invariant sequence of *stages* of moral reasoning development.

Piaget (1932) viewed morality in terms of "respect for social rules." His moral judgment model was based on his study of children's rule-following behaviour in the context of play (e.g., marble games) and their conceptions of justice in response to moral stories. Piaget described four stages in the development of a child's respect for social rules. The first stage is a premoral stage which is essentially "asocial." The child, approaching the end of infancy, will play at a game, but this game is strictly private and idiosyncratic. She[2] will invent her own rules and change them as she sees fit. The notion

[2] The pronouns "he" and "she" will be used interchangeably in this report in the interest of being gender unbiased.

of cooperation or competition with another child in this game does not exist (e.g., Windmiller, Lambert, & Turiel, 1980).

The second and third stages of the Piagetian model describe major changes in children's moral reasoning. In the second stage (beginning at about age five), children develop a unilateral respect for external authorities. Rules are regarded as sacred and permanent, being handed down by those in superior positions (e.g., adults, God) and are not subject to modification. Thus, stage two witnesses the emergence of a morality of constraint and "heteronomy." At about age eight, the child enters the third stage of moral development, in which a mutual respect for peers and a more autonomous morality are established. In this stage, the child regards rules as "cooperative regulatory agreements" between equals, rather than as unalterable commands given by adults. Thus, cooperation with peers, as opposed to adult constraint, becomes the child's motivation to follow moral rules. The last stage in Piaget's moral judgment model emerges at about age eleven. During this final stage, the child becomes able to construct new rules to accomodate all possible situations. Moral thought reaches a higher level of complexity to include political and social issues, rather than being limited to individuals and interpersonal relationships. As such, this stage is associated with an "ideological" mode of moral reasoning (e.g., Windmiller et al., 1980).

From Piaget's theoretical position, the roles of parents and peers in the moral development of a child are different. Piaget holds that parental authority is an important factor in a child's moral development early in life. Parents' moral views are internalized by the child and become a source of his "autonomous" functioning later on. Furthermore, parental behaviour can serve to facilitate or hinder the moral development of the child through the "moral atmosphere" that is provided in the home (e.g., Boyes & Allen, 1993). However, Piaget believed that it is peers who are the primary facilitators of a child's moral development, not parents. According to Piaget, advancement in moral reasoning occurs as a result of cognitive disequilibrium brought about by the exposure of the child to moral

reasoning at a level just slightly more advanced than his or her own current level of competence. Parents, in contrast to peers, because of their position of authority, cannot provide these optimal interactions that stimulate development. Thus, in Piaget's theory, parents have a less important role to play in their children's moral development.

In Kohlberg's (1976) theory of moral development, Piaget's ideas were incorporated and his (Piaget's) stage notion of moral development was extended into adulthood. Kolhberg's investigations addressed traditional issues of moral philosophy (e.g., responsibility, value of life, rules and norms, and property), presented as moral story-dilemmas. According to Kohlberg, there are six stages in moral development, spanning from childhood through adulthood. In stage 1, the child's conception of what is morally right is based solely upon a consideration of physical consequences. There is no vision of a moral order that necessitates maintenance through sanctions. Therefore, a child at this stage will obey authorities in order to *avoid* punishment. Stage 2 of Kohlberg's model is marked by the emergence of moral reciprocity. A child's conception of right in stage 2 is guided by the principle of reciprocity, that is, the "equal exchange of goods or favours." The old adage "You scratch my back, I'll scratch yours" characterizes moral reasoning at this stage. Thus, the pursuit of personal gain and rewards is of paramount importance to individuals at this level of moral reasoning. Together, stages 1 and 2 of Kohlberg's theory represent the preconventional level of moral development (Windmiller et al., 1980).

Stage 3 is often referred to as the "Good boy/Nice girl" stage. The conception of right for the individual at this level of moral reasoning centers around meeting the expectations of family and friends. The ability to take the feelings of others into account more systematically (i.e., role-taking) becomes apparent, as does a desire to obtain others' approval and to avoid blame. Hence, individuals in this stage obey rules in order to maintain relationships. However, the relationships that the individual is concerned about are limited to his own circle. In stage 4, the scope of the individual's moral thinking

encompasses the entire society. A sense of obligation to obey the laws of society emerges from a new conception of a moral order that includes those outside one's family and friends. There is a recognition that everyone in a society needs to follow the laws so that social order is maintained. Stages 3 and 4 of Kohlberg's moral development model represent the conventional level of moral reasoning. The majority of adolescents and adults in all societies fall into this category (e.g., Rosen, 1980; Windmiller et al., 1980).

Stages 5 and 6 are the "principled" stages of moral judgment, representing the postconventional level of moral development. Comparatively few individuals progress to this level of moral reasoning. A person who reasons at Stage 5 possesses a "social contract" conception of morality. He believes that laws exist to protect the rights of individuals, and that moral responsibility is binding for all those who would claim the rights of society. As such, laws which are unjust ought to be changed through the democratic process. At stage 6, the highest in Kohlberg's system, the individual is essentially autonomous in his moral reasoning. He is able to understand the viewpoint and position of all parties in a moral conflict, and arrive at a resolution satisfactory to all concerned. Such resolutions are based on universal principles of justice upheld by the individual, rather than on adherence to society's expectations and laws. Respect for the universal and individual rights of others takes on special importance (e.g., Rosen, 1980).

Similar to Piaget, Kohlberg also downplayed the role of parents in children's moral development. His work focused on the peer group and schools. He stated that "family participation is not unique or critically necessary for moral development..." (1969, p.399). In Kohlberg's view, the extent of parents' influence on their child's moral development is their provision of role-taking opportunities, the general mechanism by which the child develops moral reasoning. By the same token, opportunites to develop the ability to adopt others' differing perspectives are also provided by peers, the community, and other adults. Thus, according to Kohlberg, parental failure in this respect would not be particularly

detrimental to moral reasoning development, as he holds that no one individual, group, or institution has special significance in promoting the moral development of children.

In summary, both Piaget and Kohlberg propose that children's moral development proceeds as an invariant sequence of stages and that children are *active* participants in constructing an understanding of the world around them, even where morality is concerned. Within this structural-developmental framework, parents are not considered to have a specific and unique role as agents in their children's moral reasoning development. Piaget suggests that peers are more important than parents in stimulating children's moral development, while Kohlberg does not single out any particular individual or group as having a special role in this respect, but holds that many people can contribute to the moral development of children.

Within the cognitive stage approach, as captured in Piaget's and Kohlberg's theories, the issue of how stages of moral reasoning are related to moral *action* and *real-life* moral experiences must be considered. After all, individuals may be capable of a certain level of moral reasoning, but how does this translate to moral actions in real-life situations? Candee and Kohlberg (1987) addressed this issue in an investigation which involved a re-analysis of the data from Haan, Smith, and Block's (1968) study of the 1964 Free Speech Movement (FSM) protest at the University of California. Using the most current moral judgment scoring system (Colby & Kohlberg, 1987), Candee and Kohlberg (1987) re-analyzed data concerning the moral reasoning of FSM arrestees and other University of California students in the original sample, and looked at the relation of moral reasoning to the action of sitting-in at the protest. The key finding of the study showed that there was a positive, monotonic relationship between stage of moral reasoning and the act of sitting in at the protest. In other words, at each higher stage of moral reasoning, a greater proportion of subjects sat in. Thus, the results of this study suggest that moral reasoning, a cognitive ability, is indeed related to the performance of moral actions, and

that this relation has a monotonic pattern. The higher the stage of moral reasoning, the stronger the relationship between moral reasoning and moral action appears to be.

In recent years, a new approach to the study and conceptualization of real-life moral development, which has its focus on the phenomenon of *narrative*, has emerged. According to Jerome Bruner (1986), this narrative approach represents a *mode of reasoning* that is distinct from the logical, or propositional, mode of reasoning which has been the focus of the traditional cognitive-developmental approaches of Kohlberg and Piaget. The narrative mode of thought "deals in human or human-like intention and action and the vicissitudes and consequences that mark their course," (1986, p. 13), that is, *particular experiences*, whereas the logical mode of thought operates in the realm of the *abstract*. The latter mode involves a search for universal truth conditions, the former for likely particular connections between two events. Stories are intended to convince others of their "lifelikeness", while logical arguments are intended to persuade others of their truth. Both modes of thought, though distinct from each other, are regarded as providing equally valid ways of ordering experience and of constructing reality, and are, thus, important to our understanding of moral development.

As expounded by Tappan and Brown (1989, 1991), the narrative approach to morality proposes that there is a relationship between narrative, morality, and moral development, and that a crucial aspect of our moral development and experience is expressed through storytelling. Narrative is a fundamental human activity, transcending race and culture. Stories provide us with a context for understanding the meaning of human actions, our own and those of others (e.g.,White, 1981). Tappan and Brown (1989) assert that "when we make moral choices and decisions in our lives, we represent those choices and decisions, and give them meaning, primarily by telling stories about them" (p. 187). Thus, the only way that we can gain access to and fully study an individual's experience of and response to moral conflicts and dilemmas is via these retrospective personal accounts of specific choices and decisions.

With these assumptions in mind, Tappan and Brown (1989) make the argument that individuals develop morally by "authoring" stories about the moral experiences in their lives and by learning the lessons in these stories that they tell. So, in their conception of moral development as expressed through narrative, the goal towards which moral development proceeds is that of *authorship*. Simply put, an individual attains authorship by authoring, or telling, his or her own story. Authoring in this sense involves not only recounting a series of events, but also imbuing the story with moral value, thereby claiming moral *authority* for the moral thoughts, feelings, and actions that constitute one's moral experience. Such authority is considered valuable because it allows an individual to clearly express and acknowledge his or her own moral perspective, and to assume responsibility for moral actions and for acting on behalf of his or her moral perspective. According to Augusto Blasi (as cited in Tappan, 1991), moral responsibility is directly connected with an individual's sense of his moral *identity* and *authenticity*.

Many of the ideas contained in the narrative approach originated with Mikhail Bakhtin (as cited in Tappan, 1991), a Russian literary critic and philosopher. Bakhtin asserts that an individual is the "author" of her own life story, and of the thoughts, feelings, and actions therein, just as the author of a novel is the creator of the story that she tells. Furthermore, the author must take responsibility for her story and assume authority for her life (Tappan, 1991). Meaning and values are expressed through the activity of authoring. Tappan and Brown believe that such authorship is most clearly expressed in the stories that individuals tell about their own *moral* experiences.

"Just as an author of a novel expresses her authorship, thereby asserting her moral authority, in the process of creating and writing her narrative, so do we, as individual moral agents, express our authorship, thereby asserting our own authority and responsibility, through the stories we live and tell." (Tappan, 1991, p. 12)

Moreover, they also argue that authorship *develops* through narrative. When an individual tells a moral story about an experience, he must reflect on that experience, on what he thought, felt, and did, and how things turned out. Such reflection encourages learning from the event that is narrated. Authoring a story of moral conflict is facilitated by just such a reflective consideration of one's experience, because to claim authority and assume responsibility one must be aware of the consequences of one's thoughts, feelings, and actions.

The development of the capacity to claim authority and responsibility for one's moral thoughts, feelings, and actions is itself a long process. Tappan and Brown (1991) borrow from Bakhtin's (1981) ideas once again to develop this aspect of their narrative approach. Authorship is not attained in isolation. Rather, each individual moral agent is embedded in a particular sociocultural context, in which there are different "voices." These voices are composed of words, utterances, forms of discourse, and language that the individual hears when growing up (e.g., voices of parents, teachers, friends). These different voices are internalized and reconstructed by the individual and preserved in his/her psyche, where they "exist in some kind of ongoing, dynamic, inner dialogue" (Tappan, 1991, p. 12). The individual gradually appropriates or draws from these voices to formulate his own "voice." It is through this internalization and assimilation process that an individual develops his own moral perspective, thereby achieving authorship, and comes to claim authority and responsibility for his moral actions.

To summarize, Tappan and Brown's (1989, 1991) narrative approach to moral development suggests that individuals develop morally when they take opportunities to "author" stories about the moral experiences in their lives. Constructing a narrative entails moralizing from some particular moral stance that the individual adopts. It also entails reflecting on the moral experience narrated, which enables learning more from that experience, through the individual claiming more authority and taking greater responsibility for his thoughts, feelings, and actions. Hence, authorship is both expressed and developed through opportunities to tell one's own moral stories. The development of authorship itself is a gradual, long-term process, occuring primarily in the context of social relationships and transactions, and involving the internalization and creative appropriation of others' voices.

Finally, it is important to remember that there are numerous existing theories which offer perspectives on moral development and behaviour that are different from those presented by Kohlberg and Piaget. For example, Gilligan's (1982) theory proposed that there are gender differences in moral orientation which affect the way males and females understand and resolve moral problems. According to Gilligan, widely accepted theories of moral development, such as Kohlberg's, have been insensitive to females' "different voice" on morality. With specific reference to Kohlberg's work, Gilligan claimed that his theory was gender-biased in that it emphasized traditionally masculine traits and "justice-oriented" moral values, while inadequately addressing feminine concerns and "care-oriented" moral values. Thus, although there are other perspectives on moral development such as Gilligan's, the ideas of Kohlberg and Piaget, as well as those of Tappan and Brown (1989), serve as the theoretical framework in the present investigation, in the interest of further investigating an established theory of moral development in conjunction with a novel approach.

Cross-Cultural Variations in Moral Development

As discussed earlier, Kohlberg's theory posits a *universal* model of moral development. In other words, he claimed that the development of moral reasoning of individuals in all cultural settings follows a universal, invariant sequence. In fact, Kohlberg based this claim on the empirical findings of his own research on children in five distinct cultural settings: the United States, Taiwan, Turkey, urban Mexico, and a Yucatan village in Mexico. Other studies that investigated Kohlberg's assertion of cross-cultural universality have been conducted within both Western and non-Western cultures. In general, these studies demonstrate that Kohlberg's stage model *does* reasonably describe the moral reasoning development in most countries studied, thereby giving validity to his claim of cross-cultural universality.

An important article addressing this particular issue is that of Snarey (1985). He reviewed the findings of 45 studies in an attempt to evaluate whether Kohlberg's idea of universal moral development in all cultures could be supported by the available research. These studies represented 27 cultural areas (including Taiwan and Hong Kong) and encompassed both longitudinal and cross-sectional research. The results of this review provided evidence for the validity and general applicability of Kohlberg's theory of moral development in many diverse cultures. The invariant sequence proposition was well-supported by the studies reviewed, with instances of stage skipping and stage regression rarely documented. Evidence of preconventional and conventional levels of moral reasoning was found virtually universally when the age range and sample size of the population under study was taken into account. Postconventional level reasoning was extremely rare in all cultures studied, although it was documented to some degree in many cultures (approximately two-thirds of the subcultures sampled that included participants in the 18-60+ age range), including several non-Western societies. For example, Lei and Cheng (1984) studied moral judgment in a sample of Chinese children and adults living in

Taiwan, and found evidence of subjects' reasoning at each one of Kohlberg's stages up to Stage 4/5 (a transition level between conventional and postconventional reasoning).

On a more cautious note, Snarey's (1985) findings also showed that there are some biases in Kohlberg's theory or scoring methods in favour of complex, urban societies and middle-class populations, suggesting that Kohlberg's theory, as it stands, is incomplete. Post- conventional moral reasoning was present in nearly all samples of urban cultural groups and middle-class populations, but was absent in all samples of traditional folk cultural groups. Moreover, the mean scores of urban or middle-class samples were always higher than those of nonurban or non-middle-class samples.

In addition, Snarey and Keljo's (1991) review of research which had been done in the Israeli kibbutz, India, Tibet, Turkey, Taiwan, New Guinea, Kenya, and the United States suggested that there are culturally unique moral values and judgments which are not addressed by Kohlberg's theory or scoring manual. Specifically, Snarey and Keljo (1991) reviewed qualitative, hard-to-score moral judgment interview data from studies representing these eight cultural groups, and found that there are legitimate forms of conventional *and* postconventional moral reasoning that are misconstrued or missing in Kohlberg's theory and scoring manual. Interestingly, these forms of reasoning seem to reflect moral values that are commonly stressed in folk cultural groups and working-class communities, in which there is a more communitarian type of social order (Snarey, 1995). For example, reciprocity or "doing favours" is a primary means of establishing and maintaining relationships within working class and folk communities. This concept of *quid pro quo* (Latin for "something for something") forms the basis of a complex social system that is governed by clear social norms. Reciprocity is expected to be "mutual, equitable, and nonexploitative" and is viewed as "expressions of good citizenship, faithfulness, and loyalty" by individuals within these types of communities (Snarey, 1995, p. 110). However, according to Kohlberg's theory of moral development, the concept of reciprocal exchange is defined as characteristic of Stage 2 reasoning. Hence, such forms

of conventional reasoning in a working class or folk community can be misinterpreted as preconventional reasoning within Kohlberg's model (Snarey, 1995).

To further explore the proposition that there are culturally unique moral judgments which are not addressed in Kohlberg's theory or scoring manual, one can refer to the study by Lei and Cheng (1984). In their study of a Taiwanese sample, Lei and Cheng (1984) questioned their finding that subjects' interview judgments were rarely scored at the postconventional level. Upon investigating the frequency with which Taiwanese subjects used the different criterion judgments in the scoring manual, the researchers found that some of the criterion examples provided in the scoring manual were matched to Taiwanese judgments unusually frequently, while many others were rarely or never illustrated in the interviews. Furthermore, a substantial number of subjects' moral judgments were considered 'hard-to-score' because there was a lack of appropriate criterion judgments to match with. Interestingly, it was found that the most frequently matched criterion judgments were those related to the Chinese traditional values of filial piety and collective utility. Thus, the scorable interview judgments of the Taiwanese sample tended to be over-represented at the conventional level because examples of these Chinese values were absent in the criterion judgments provided in the scoring manual for the higher postconventional stages of moral reasoning.

Hence, there is evidence to suggest that Kohlberg's conceptualization and scoring of moral reasoning may be culturally biased against societies which stress collectivism, as opposed to individualism. To briefly explain, collectivistic societies are those which emphasize such concepts as interdependence, duty, cooperation, and group decision-making. For example, the societies in China, Hong Kong, India, and Taiwan have been described as collectivistic. In contrast, individualistic societies are those which stress independence, self-interest, competition, and personal autonomy. Canada, the United States, and Great Britain are examples of societies classified as individualistic in nature (e.g., Triandis, 1993). Since the present investigation involves both a collectivistic culture

(Chinese) and an individualistic one (European-Canadian), it is important to be aware that Kohlberg's model may not be able to fully describe types of moral reasoning that are reflective of collectivistic values among the Chinese-Canadian participants.

More recent investigations of Kohlberg's model of moral development have, however, provided additional support for his claim of cross-cultural universality. Evidence showing that moral development does, indeed, progress in the manner described in Kohlberg's stage theory has been found in a Polish sample (Niemczynyski, Czyzowska, Pourkos & Mirski, 1988), a diverse sample of East and West Europeans (Lind, 1986), and an Asian Indian sample (Vasudev & Hummel, 1987). Boyes and Walker (1988) reviewed the available literature and also concluded that Kohlberg's theory does reflect much of what is morally relevant in diverse cultures. At the same time, this recent body of work also challenges the full applicability of Kohlberg's model in that there are findings of moral values and concepts, in non-Western cultures particularly, which are not captured adequately in his theory of moral reasoning development.

Thus, the existing body of research on Kohlberg's theory provides general support for his claim of universality. The full range of moral stages is represented in diverse sociocultural groups, and there is a general applicability of the stages to most of the moral judgments made by individuals from these diverse settings. However, there is also evidence showing that Kohlberg's theory does not sufficiently take into account social class and cultural variations in moral reasoning, especially where working-class communities and folk, or nonurban, cultural groups are concerned. Certain forms of reasoning, which are based on moral values that these community-oriented or collectivistic groups endorse, are not addressed in the theory's explication and are missing from the scoring manual's examples of reasoning at the highest stages; for example, the unique function and perception of reciprocity within working class and folk communities, as discussed earlier. These forms of reasoning, however, can legitimately be interpreted as conventional or postconventional in nature (e.g., Snarey, 1995). Any study that intends to

investigate moral development, including the current one, must be aware of possible cultural biases and be cautious about making sweeping conclusions.

The majority of the cross-cultural work mentioned above employed Kohlberg's measure of moral development. In the present study, another measure was used to assess moral development, specifically, the Defining Issues Test (DIT)[3], which was developed by Rest (1979) based on Kohlberg's approach. The cross-cultural work on moral judgment using the DIT will be briefly considered at this point. Moon (1984) reviewed 20 cross-cultural studies which employed the DIT. The samples of these 20 studies represented 15 cultures or countries, and with one exception, all of the studies were cross-sectional in nature. The results showed that there were age/education trends in subjects' scores on the DIT in non-American samples, similar to the trends found in many American DIT studies (Moon, 1984). In other words, the older and better educated subjects were, regardless of culture, the more likely they were to show greater preference for higher stage moral reasoning. Similar to studies with American samples, there was also cross-cultural evidence showing that subjects' DIT scores were correlated with IQ, cognitive measures, and personality variables (Moon, 1984). In addition, there was evidence from these cross-cultural studies indicating that there was a relationship between subjects' DIT scores and moral behaviour (delinquency), and between these scores and the nature of the parents' childrearing orientation. Regarding the latter result, there was evidence showing that children's DIT scores were positively correlated with parental warmth and use of induction (i.e., a childrearing technique focusing on reasoning and explaining the consequences of the child's actions for others). Finally, the results demonstrated that the culturally adapted versions of the DIT had similar psychometric properties (i.e., internal consistency, and reliability) in non-American cultures, although the reported reliabilities and internal consistencies were somewhat low (ranging from .32 to .99 for test-retest

---

[3] A description of the DIT measure is provided in the Method section, p. 46.

reliability and from .50 to .66 for internal consistency) in comparison to those in the American studies. Overall, however, as a construct and as a tool for assessing moral development, Moon (1984) concluded that the DIT does appear to have some cross-cultural validity.

Parenting and Moral Development

As discussed above, neither Piaget nor Kohlberg posited a pivotal role for parents as agents in the moral development of their children. In their view, parents were simply a small part of the general social environment, providing role-taking opportunities but no especially significant or unique experiences concerning moral development. This downplaying of parental influence does not seem to be in accordance with the general observation that most parents are concerned about and invest energy into developing moral maturity in their offspring. It is difficult to imagine that parents, as the most prominent adults in children's lives in most cases, would serve no special role in the development of morality. Furthermore, adults frequently report on the influential role that their parents played in their own moral development and behaviour (e.g., Colby & Damon, 1992; Oliner & Oliner, 1988; Rosenhan, 1970). Nevertheless, due to the widespread acceptance of Piaget's and Kohlberg's ideas, the potential impact of parents on children's moral development has, by and large, been overlooked by researchers investigating moral development (e.g., Berkowitz, Giese, Begun, Mulry & Zweben, 1995; Boyes & Allen, 1993). However, there are some studies which have specifically examined the relationship between different aspects of parenting and moral development. As a whole, the findings of these studies generally suggest that Piaget and Kohlberg underestimated the importance of parents in this area. An overview of these studies will now be presented.

In order to facilitate discussion of the following studies, the concept of parenting style must be understood. A popular way of conceptualizing parenting style has been developed by Diana Baumrind. Baumrind (1971) proposed a typology of three styles of

parenting, each reflecting a unique pattern of parental affect and behaviour. *Authoritarian* parents are described as placing great value on children's obedience, an absolute set of standards for conduct and attitudes, and respect for authority. These parents are also less nurturant and sympathetic towards their children, use harsh disciplinary techniques, and discourage expressions of independence from their children.

At the other extreme, *permissive* parents make very few demands for mature behaviour from their children. They behave in a tolerant, accepting way toward their children's impulses and actions, allowing considerable self-regulation while relying on disciplinary techniques infrequently. In addition to having a lack of firm control over their children, parents who exhibit a permissive style of parenting are also characterized as being very warm and nurturant toward their offspring.

Finally, *authoritative* parenting combines high expectations for mature conduct from children with high responsiveness to children's needs and feelings. Authoritative parents exercise firm control over their children and enforce compliance to a reasonable set of rules, but are also flexible and recognize the rights of both children and adults. These parents encourage independence and self-expression in their children, as well as open communication between parent and child.

Subsequently, Baumrind's typology of parenting style was expanded by Maccoby and Martin (1983) to distinguish between permissive parents whose lack of control over their children reflected an orientation of democracy and indulgence (high in warmth/ responsiveness) and permissive parents whose lack of control reflects a disengagement from the childrearing role (low in warmth/responsiveness). The former type of permissive parenting was labelled as *indulgent* parenting, while the latter type was labelled as *neglectful* parenting.

With respect to the domain of morality, very little research has focused specifically on how parenting style is related to children's moral reasoning. In this sense, the study by Boyes and Allen (1993) is unique and important. These researchers directly examined the

relationship between Baumrind's model of parenting style and Kohlberg's model of moral development, specifically exploring whether parenting style is related to the *rate* at which young people advance through Kohlberg's stages of moral development. Seventy-four high school students and sixty-seven first-year university students participated in the study. Participants completed measures assessing their own current level of moral reasoning and their recollections of parents' behaviour. Parenting behaviour was measured by the Children's Report of Parental Behaviour Inventory (Schaefer, 1965), which tapped three dimensions of parenting. These dimensions were acceptance/rejection, psychological control/ psychological autonomy, and firm control/ lax control. Participants' scores on these three dimensions were then combined to determine parenting style.

Analyses of the data showed that parenting style was, indeed, linked to the use of postconventional reasoning, as assessed on the Defining Issues Test (Rest, 1986). Adolescents who had authoritative parents displayed greater preference for the postconventional level of reasoning than their peers from permissive and authoritarian homes, respectively. Thus, these results support the proposition that parenting style has an important relation to the moral development of young people. To be specific, authoritative parenting appears to facilitate the development of moral reasoning, with children who are exposed to an authoritative style of parenting advancing more quickly through the developmental stages of moral reasoning and reaching the more sophisticated, principled level of moral reasoning (postconventional) sooner than children exposed to the other parenting styles. However, since this study is correlational in nature, the findings must be interpreted with caution and conclusive statements about cause and effect cannot be made.

Pratt and Arnold (1995) also incorporated an explicit focus on parenting style into their study of the family context of adolescent moral socialization, which also involved the collection of narrative data. The mother, father, and a teenaged child in an ethnically diverse sample of 40 Canadian families were interviewed individually. Data from standard

moral reasoning measures and measures assessing socialization and discipline practices within the family were gathered, as well as narrative data pertaining to the content of parent and child values and to processes of family socialization. The narrative tasks, specifically, required that the parents and children independently identify those values that they hold to be most important for the child, and to tell a "moral socialization" story illustrating how the parents had attempted to instill one of these values in the child. These narratives told by the adolescents were analyzed for a sense of parental guidance or "voice," as well as the extent to which the adolescents had been able to appropriate this voice for themselves. Narratives given by the parents were examined to determine the kinds of goals that were important to them with respect to their adolescents' socialization and the overall "climate" of family harmony and trust.

Results indicated that the types of narratives told by parents and adolescents were related to parenting style (Pratt & Arnold, 1995). A more authoritative parenting style was significantly linked to a greater degree of internalization and appropriation of the parents' voice by the adolescent. Results also showed that parenting style was correlated with adolescents' moral stage, with authoritative families having children scoring at higher stage levels on the Kohlberg interview. Finally, there was a relationship between the narrative variables and the standard moral reasoning measures: adolescents who demonstrated a clearer display and appropriation of parental voice in their narratives of socialization also tended to be more sophisticated in their stage of moral reasoning, assessed independently through the standard Kohlberg interview. Thus, this unique study integrates the narrative approach with more standard measures of moral reasoning development, and provides first evidence that narrative is a valuable tool for examining adolescents' own construction of family life and other aspects of family interaction.

Hence, the results of these two studies, focused explicitly on Baumrind's (1971) model, demonstrate that an authoritative parenting style is associated with more advanced moral development in children. However, the majority of the studies that explore how

parental behaviour is related to children's moral reasoning have not focused on parenting style per se, but rather on specific features of parenting, such as disciplinary techniques and parental warmth and involvement. Some tentative conclusions can be made with regards to parenting style from this work, though, because such features can be related conceptually to Baumrind's (1971) description of parenting styles. In general, this literature supports the findings of the few studies that have directly examined the moral correlates of parenting style, that is, advanced moral reasoning in children is most consistently linked to parenting practices that are more authoritative in style.

For example, Walker and Taylor (1991) conducted a longitudinal study of 7- to 16-year- old children and their parents in which they examined the role of parents in their children's moral reasoning development. The parents' level of moral reasoning and styles of interaction during family discussions of both real and hypothetical moral problems were related to changes in the children's level of moral development between the point of initial assessment (Time 1) and the follow-up assessment two years later (Time 2). Kohlberg's Moral Judgement Interview was the measure used to assess the level of moral reasoning of each parent and child. The results showed that parents' level of moral reasoning performance in discussions was related to that of their child, that is, parents tended to accomodate their level of reasoning to that of their child by simplifying their own individual level of moral analysis in presenting comments to the child. In addition, the findings revealed that children's moral growth over time was best predicted by a parental discussion style that featured a Socratic form of questioning (e.g., eliciting child's opinion, asking for clarification, paraphrasing, checking for understanding), supportive interactions, and presentations of challenging, higher-stage moral reasoning. Such parenting behaviour is consistent with what is considered an "authoritative parenting style" (Boyes & Allen, 1993; Berkowitz et al., 1995). Finally, in addition to parental discussion style, the context that better predicted moral growth among the children in the study was the discussion of the child's real-life moral dilemma at Time 1, not the hypothetical moral dilemma (Walker

& Taylor, 1991). Taken together, these findings also suggest that parents may have a significant influence on the moral development of their children, in contrast to the views of Piaget and Kohlberg. Furthermore, parents appear to have the most positive influence in this respect when their interactions with their children are both supportive and stimulating.

In a study by Buck, Walsh, and Rothman (1981), one of the research issues addressed was the relationship between parental socialization method and children's moral judgment level. A total of 30 family triads, consisting of mother, father, and a son, participated in the study. The sons were approaching adolescence in age (10-13 years). Each family triad provided data on measures assessing moral reasoning, parents' child-rearing methods, and parent-child interaction during family discussions of a specific moral issue. Data gathered from the child-rearing interviews were analyzed for parents' use of reasoning, reinforcement, and reciprocity, while the data from the family discussions were examined for such variables as communication, warmth, and family tension. The results revealed that child-rearing method was correlated with the moral judgment stage of the son. Regardless of the parents' moral judgment level, the child-rearing methods that were associated with higher moral reasoning in the son were those that demonstrated role-taking ability, involvement, and respect for the child's independence; specifically, high encouragement and consideration of the child's point of view, high use of reasoning, compromise, warmth, nonintervention in private areas, and a democratic attitude towards family decision-making. Such child-rearing techniques have certainly been considered to be some of the defining characteristics of an authoritative parenting style (Boyes & Allen, 1993; Berkowitz et al., 1995).

The importance of the parenting dimension of warmth and involvement was also revealed in Hart's (1988) longitudinal study of adolescent socialization and adult moral judgment development. Using data from Kohlberg's (1958) longitudinal study of boys and men, Hart examined the relationships between boys' conscience strength, parental identification, and parental involvement during adolescence and their scores on moral

judgment at current, earlier, and older ages. Subjects whose fathers reported more affection and involvement during adolescence attained higher levels of moral judgment development during childhood, adolescence, and adulthood. In addition, boys' conscience strength and paternal identification during adolescence were also found to be related to moral judgment development, with the former being predictive of moral judgment level during adolescence and adulthood, and the latter being predictive of moral judgment level from childhood through early adulthood.

Taking a cross-cultural perspective on this issue, Parikh (1981) investigated the development of moral judgment and its relationship to family environmental factors in a sample of Asian Indian adolescents and their parents. The family environmental factors of interest were specifically those relating to role-taking opportunities in the family. Forty families met the socioeconomic and religious criteria to participate in the study. From each family, the mother, father, and one child were included in the sample. The children were divided into two age groups: 12-13 years and 15-16 years. Each participant's moral judgment level was determined by Kohlberg's Moral Judgment Interview, as adapted to Asian Indian society. Data pertaining to the extent to which parents use induction (use of reason and explanation of the consequences of child's actions for others) and the amount of opportunity they provided for the child to participate in a family moral discussion (that is, extent of encouragement) were also collected. The results supported Kohlberg's claim that the sequence and stages of moral development are universal. Furthermore, it was found that children's level of moral judgment was positively related to the extent of induction used by the mother. A similar relationship was also found between the extent of parents' encouragement and children's moral judgment level: parents who used high encouragement tended to have children who were more morally mature. However, this trend was statistically significant only for the group of older adolescents. The results were compared to those of studies with American samples, and the family environmental factors (i.e., use of encouragement, use of induction) which were found to be favourable for the

development of moral judgment of children in the American samples were also found to be positively associated with the moral development of the children in the Asian Indian sample.

An older study by Hoffman and Saltzstein (1967) also demonstrated the significant role that parental discipline plays in children's moral development. Assessments of moral reasoning development were made for a sample of 444 young adolescents (seventh grade) by written tests and ratings by parents, teachers, and peers. The child morality indices were related to measures of parental discipline, which were based on reports from the child and each of his parents. Parental disciplinary techniques were classified as involving power assertion (demonstrations of power and authority over child), induction, or love withdrawal (nonphysical expressions of disapproval, anger, etc.). The overall pattern of findings showed that the infrequent use of power assertive discipline and the frequent use of inductive techniques by mothers were associated with more advanced moral development among the children. Few significant findings were obtained for the fathers in the study, and love withdrawal as a disciplinary technique was infrequently related to the measures of moral development. Thus, the findings highlight the importance of inductive discipline, a parenting behaviour likely associated with aspects of an authoritative parenting style (e.g., Baumrind, 1971), in fostering the moral development of children.

From the above studies, it can be clearly seen that an authoritative parenting style and authoritative practices are both positively associated with children's moral reasoning development. A recent study by Hart and Fegley (1995) provides evidence that parenting also may be linked to youngsters' moral *behaviour* and their *sense of self,* two concepts which have been previously shown to be interconnected (e.g., Colby & Damon, 1982). In Hart and Fegley's (1995) study, the population of interest was inner-city Latin-American and African-American adolescents who had demonstrated unusually altruistic behaviour (termed "care exemplars"). The researchers' aim was to investigate how these care

exemplar adolescents understood their social worlds, and particularly their understanding of themselves. Participants were recruited through nominations by community leaders for their demonstrated exemplary commitments to care for others or the community at large. Various measures assessing self-understanding and self-conceptions were administered, including the Moral Judgment Interview (Colby & Kolhberg, 1987), to the group of "care exemplars" and to a comparison group of adolescents. Among the main results were the findings that "care exemplar" adolescents were more likely than the comparison adolescents to describe themselves in terms of moral personality traits, and to think of themselves as incorporating their ideals and their parents' values. In contrast, the comparison adolescents showed a greater tendency to think of themselves as incorporating the expectations and values of their best friend (peer). However, no differences were found between "care exemplars" and the comparison adolescents in actual stage of moral judgment. Therefore, this pattern of results suggested that the "care exemplar" adolescents had self-concepts that were more oriented toward moral traits, ideals, and parental values, whereas their counterparts seemed to have self-concepts in which the values of peers were more prominent, despite the lack of differences in moral reasoning levels between the two groups.

Although the studies discussed so far provide evidence for a relationship between parenting and the moral development of children, it is noteworthy that not all research finds support for this association. For example, Berkowitz, Giese, Begun, Mulry, and Zweben (1995) investigated whether the same parent characteristics that have been shown in prior research to promote moral *reasoning* development in children also promote moral *behaviour* development in children. Data on the variables of parents' moral reasoning, parenting style, family communication, child moral reasoning, and problem behaviour (substance abuse) were gathered from a sample of 190 adolescents, aged 12 to 19 years, and their parent(s). Parenting style was investigated through the use of a brief questionnaire adapted from the work of Dornbusch and his colleagues (1985). The

patterns of relations between these variables indicated that parenting style was *not* significantly related to adolescent moral reasoning. Family communication and family dynamics also did not significantly correlate with adolescent moral reasoning. Concerning the problem behaviour of substance abuse, family dynamics did significantly predict adolescent substance use. Both authoritarian and authoritative parenting were negatively related to substance use, whereas permissive parenting was positively related. Finally, adolescents' moral reasoning, but not that of their parents, predicted their use of cigarettes and illicit drugs, but not alcohol. Thus, in this particular study, several complicated patterns were observed in the data. The finding that is most pertinent to the current discussion is that parenting style was *not* significantly associated with adolescents' moral reasoning in the sample of adolescents in this study, although it was related to some specific aspects of their moral behaviour (substance abuse, in this case).

Thus, the existing literature on parenting and its relation to children's moral reasoning development is not entirely consistent. Some studies have found that moral development is related to parenting style and specific parenting practices. Other studies have found no relationship between these variables. However, one feature common to the majority of these studies is their focus on Western parenting attitudes and techniques. It would be interesting to examine parenting attitudes and practices in non-Western cultures and their relation to moral development among children in those cultures. Therefore, one purpose of the current investigation is to examine more closely, the role of parenting style in the moral development of young people from both Western and non-Western cultural backgrounds, specifically, the European-Canadian and Chinese-Canadian cultures.

Since this study involves a cross-comparison between the European-Canadian and Chinese-Canadian cultural groups, differences between these cultures with respect to parenting orientation and behaviour will be discussed next.

Cross-Cultural Differences Between Chinese and North American Parenting

As noted earlier, Baumrind's (1971) typology of parenting styles (authoritative, authoritarian, permissive) has been widely employed in developmental research. In general, the existing research has found consistent patterns of relations between parenting styles and children's cognitive and social developmental outcomes. However, these consistent findings have been documented, for the most part, in studies involving children and adolescents from Western cultures. Baumrind's typology, which clearly captures patterns of parenting behaviour in Western societies, may not be as appropriate for non-Western cultures. For example, Asian cultures do not appear to "fit" neatly into Baumrind's conceptualization of parenting styles and their associated patterns of child characteristics. Existing research on Asian (especially Chinese) parents and their offspring demonstrates that different child-rearing orientations (and practices) may prevail in this culture; culturally appropriate measures of parenting must be developed to illuminate the relationship between parenting and child outcomes in these ethnic groups.

To begin, in order to understand the socialization process in the Chinese family, one must recognize and explore the significant influence of Confucian principles on family interactions and relationships (e.g., Chao, 1983; Ho, 1986; Hsu, 1981). Following Confucius' teachings, Chinese families traditionally place great value on the virtues of filial piety, respect for elders, mutual dependence, group identification, harmony and the negation of conflict, and self-discipline. Family obligations and the importance of education are also greatly emphasized. These concepts are reflected in the nature of the relationships within and outside the family context. With regards to the parent-child relationship, specifically, Chinese parents traditionally stress their authority over their children and expect unquestioning obedience from them. On their part, children are expected to try to satisfy their parents' wishes in all circumstances. In Chinese society, the parenting role is viewed mainly as one of *teacher*. Chinese parents assume full responsibility for their children's development and typically are very involved in the

upbringing of their children. Parents desire their children to excel in all areas but tend to be especially concerned with child behaviour, discipline, and education. Furthermore, children are socialized to believe that the attainment of success, fulfillment, and happiness are possible and are within one's own control (e.g., Chao, 1994; Chiu, 1987).

Not surprisingly, traditional Chinese socialization practices have been characterized as "authoritarian," using Baumrind's terminology (e.g., Chao, 1994). However, the existing literature on the relation between parenting practices and child characteristics, particularly academic performance, suggests that Baumrind's typology may be culturally biased in this instance. Research on Western cultures has consistently demonstrated that children and adolescents who are raised in authoritative homes - where parents are warm, firm, and democratic - evidence higher levels of psychosocial competence and academic achievement than their peers from other familial environments. However, this consistent finding does not appear to account for ethnic differences in school performance that have been documented in recent studies of adolescent achievement (e.g., Dornbusch, Ritter, Leiderman, Roberts & Fraleigh, 1987). In general, the academic performance of Asian[4] students has tended to exceed that of White, African, and Hispanic students in urban America, but ethnic differences in the use of authoritative parenting do not adequately explain such differences in academic achievement among these groups.

For example, Dornbusch et al. (1987) studied the relation of parenting style to school performance in an ethnically diverse sample of American adolescents. They found that an authoritative parenting style was positively associated with higher academic achievement among all adolescents; however, this correlation was obtained most strongly for the Caucasian youngsters. Reports from Asian-American students, who showed the highest school performance, indicated that their parents were among the least authoritative on average. Furthermore, although African-American and Hispanic-American parents

[4] This was the term used in Dornbusch et. al's study to describe participants with ethnic backgrounds from various Asian countries.

were reported as being considerably more authoritative in comparison to Asian-American parents, their adolescent children performed considerably worse in school. These findings suggest that, at least in terms of facilitating academic success, authoritative parenting is less influential among youngsters from non-Caucasian backgrounds; however, authoritativeness still has considerable impact.

In a study specifically looking at ethnic differences in adolescent achievement, Steinberg, Dornbusch, and Brown (1992) examined different contexts in youngsters' lives in an attempt to explain the better school performance of Asian-American adolescents and the poorer performance of African- and Hispanic-American adolescents. Data previously collected from an ethnically diverse sample of 15,000 high school students were used for the purposes of this study. Various measures assessing family relationships, peer relations, demographics, extracurricular and work settings, and school environment had been administered to this sample. The outcome variables of interest were psychosocial adjustment, academic achievement, behaviour problems, and "internalizing" psychological distress.

Analyses of the data showed that authoritativeness in parenting was more common in White households than in ethnic households, confirming prior research (e.g., Dornbusch et al., 1987). Furthermore, with respect to the outcome variables not related to school, it was found that adolescents from authoritative households fared better than their peers from non-authoritative homes, regardless of ethnic group. Thus, when it comes to psychological development and mental health, exposure to more authoritative parenting seems to be most beneficial for adolescents. However, when considering scholastic success, a different picture emerges from the data set. Once again, Asian-American youngsters were shown to be the least likely to come from authoritative homes, but evidenced the highest school performance. In contrast, African-American adolescents tended to show the poorest school performance, regardless of parents' style of child-rearing. Of the ethnic groups represented, White and Hispanic-American youngsters

appeared to benefit most from authoritative parenting practices. Further analyses of students' beliefs about the relation between educational effort and life success demonstrated that most students, regardless of ethnicity, endorsed the view that doing well in school would enhance their occupational success. However, ethnic differences were found when students' beliefs about the negative consequences of doing poorly in school were examined. Asian-American students believed much more strongly in the negative repercussions following educational failure than the other ethnic groups, whereas the African- and Hispanic-American students were the most optimistic (Steinberg et al., 1992). Such attitudinal differences between the ethnic groups were also shown to be related to students' school performance and engagement and, thus, may help explain the discrepant academic achievement levels demonstrated by the different ethnic groups.

Another important finding of this study was the significant role that the students' peer group at school appears to play in moderating the effects of parenting practices on youngsters' academic performance. The general pattern of results revealed that White adolescents experience a combination of authoritative parenting and peer support for academic achievement more than do their minority counterparts, whereas Hispanic-American adolescents seem to suffer more from a combination of authoritarian parenting and low peer support. Among Asian-American students, strong peer support for academic success compensates for the possibly negative repercussions of authoritarian parenting. Finally, the positive influence of authoritative parenting for the African-American adolescents is undermined by low support from peers to strive for academic achievement (Steinberg et al., 1992). Together, these results illustrate the complexity of the processes by which the social contexts in which adolescents live influence their lives and achievement. Parenting style appears to have both direct and indirect roles to play in the psychological and academic adjustment of adolescents from minority groups. However, parenting style alone clearly does not adequately explain the academic performance of adolescents who are ethnic minorities.

The discrepant academic achievement levels between different ethnic minority groups have also been addressed in John Ogbu's (e.g., 1990) work. In his theory of success and failure, Ogbu asserted that there is a critical difference in mentality between immigrant minorities, such as the Chinese and Southeast Asians, and established minorities, such as African- and Hispanic-Americans. According to Ogbu, ethnic minorities who have recently immigrated to the U.S. are usually motivated to do so in order to attain a better life, and tend to hold the view that working hard will lead to eventual success. For these minorities, education is seen as a golden opportunity to get ahead. On the other hand, nonimmigrant minority groups, after having experienced years of discrimination, have come to develop a mentality of inferiority and self-defeat which discourages them from working hard to achieve success. They tend to view the discrimination against them as permanent and institutionalized, and the education system as untrustworthy. This difference in mentality between immigrant and nonimmigrant minorities may help explain why ethnic groups such as the Chinese and Southeast Asians tend to do better in school in comparison to their black and Hispanic peers.

Chao (1994) also addressed the paradox in the literature involving the parenting style of Asians. Although Chinese parenting has typically been described as "authoritarian" or "controlling," Chao asserts that Baumrind's concepts of authoritarian, authoritative, and permissive parenting are ethnocentric (i.e., reflect Western values and attitudes) and do not capture the important features of child-rearing in the Chinese culture fully, particularly for explaining children's academic success. In fact, Chao suggests that the concepts of "authoritarian" and "controlling" have a different meaning for the Chinese than for European-Americans. Specifically, Chinese parenting involves the notion of training (*chiao shun*) children in the behaviours that are appropriate in the Chinese culture, including the ability to perform well in school. This training takes place in the context of a "supportive, highly involved, and physically close mother-child relationship" (p. 1112). The notion of training and the close mother-child relationship can be further understood

by the Chinese concept of *guan*, meaning "to govern," which is an integral aspect of their child-rearing ideology. In Chinese culture, firm control and governance of the child are synonymous with parental care, concern, and involvement. Thus, the indigenous concepts of *chiao shun* and *guan*, which may be considered "authoritarian" and "controlling" within a superficial application of Baumrind's typology, have very positive connotations in Chinese culture, implying a very involved care and concern for the child. In contrast, the "authoritarian" notion of parenting style in Western culture is typically associated with hostile, rejecting, and somewhat uninvolved parenting behaviour (Chao, 1994).

In Chao's (1994) study, she investigated whether cultural concepts such as *chiao shun* and *guan* distinguish Chinese from European-American parents *beyond* the concepts of "authoritarian" and "restrictive." Fifty immigrant Chinese mothers and fifty European-American mothers of preschool-aged children were recruited for the study. Scales assessing parental control, authoritativeness, and level of authoritarian parenting were administered to the participants along with a questionnaire designed to index the extent to which the training ideology is endorsed. Analyses of the data showed that the Chinese mothers scored significantly higher on measures of parental control and authoritarian parenting than the European-American mothers, but not on the measure of authoritative parenting. Chinese mothers were also found to have significantly higher scores on the "training" ideologies than European-American mothers, even after accounting for their scores pertaining to authoritativeness, authoritarian parenting, and parental control. Thus, these findings indicate that there are pronounced differences between Chinese and European-American parents in child-rearing ideologies related to the notion of "training." Clearly, this concept of training holds some distinctive meaning for the Chinese and more adequately describes their parenting beyond the authoritarian concept. Furthermore, Chao (1994) suggested that this key difference between the Chinese and European-Americans may explain the paradox involving the parenting style of Chinese parents and children's success at school.

Hence, in the studies by Chao (1994) and Steinberg et al. (1992), it was concluded that the notion of authoritative and authoritarian parenting practices, as described in the Western literature (e.g., Baumrind, 1971), may be ethnocentric and may not be as relevant to the academic and social functioning of children in other cultures, such as the Chinese culture. However, Chen, Dong, and Zhou (1995) argue that this is not the case. These researchers assert that, although there may be cross-cultural differences between Chinese and North American parents in the average levels of authoritativeness and authoritarian parenting, the *meanings* of these parenting patterns are the same as those typically found in Western society (e.g., Baumrind, 1971). In other words, they postulated that an authoritarian parenting style would be associated with maladaptive social and academic development in Chinese children, while authoritative parenting would be positively related to children's social and academic competence. Data on academic achievement, peer acceptance, school honorship, sociability-competence, and shyness-inhibition were obtained for a sample of 304 second-grade children in Beijing, China. Parents, teachers, and the children themselves provided these data. It was found that authoritarian parenting was associated with negative social and academic child characteristics, specifically, peer rejection, aggression, and learning problems. Authoritative parenting, on the other hand, was positively associated with indices of social and academic adjustment among children. Children who had authoritative parents experienced greater peer acceptance, displayed greater social competence and honorship, and tended to do better academically than their peers from authoritarian homes. Thus, inconsistent with the arguments in the literature (e.g., Chao, 1994; Steinberg et al., 1992), the results of this study suggest that authoritarian and authoritative parenting styles *are* relevant to Chinese children's scholastic success and social adjustment in parallel ways to the findings with North American samples.

Some other studies which have compared the child-rearing practices of Chinese parents to those of Caucasian parents provide further evidence that there are differences in

child-rearing orientation and the parent-child relationship and that traditional Chinese socialization practices appear to be more restrictive and controlling than those common in North America. For example, Lin and Fu (1990) examined cultural variations in socialization practices among Taiwanese (Chinese), immigrant Chinese, and Caucasian-American parents. The mothers and fathers of 138 children (aged 6 to 7 years on average) from intact families in Taiwan and the United States comprised the sample. Each parent independently completed a questionnaire which focused on four child-rearing variables: parental control, encouragement of independence, expression of affection, and emphasis on academic achievement. It was found that Chinese and immigrant Chinese parents tended to rate higher on parental control and emphasis on achievement than Caucasian-American parents, results which confirmed some existing research. Unexpectedly, Chinese and immigrant Chinese parents also rated higher on encouragement of children's independence than their Caucasian-American counterparts, and no differences were found among the three groups on open expression of affection. These unexpected findings appear to counter, or at least complicate, the literature which asserts that Chinese parents are more "authoritarian" (e.g., Dornbusch et al., 1987), controlling (e.g., Chiu, 1987; Lin & Fu, 1990), and rejecting (e.g., Chiu, 1987). Overall, the results of this study do provide support for the position that traditional cultural values and practices have an important influence on how Chinese parents raise their children, even when they reside outside of their country of origin.

A comparison of the parenting techniques and goals of immigrant Chinese parents and Caucasian-American parents was also the focus of an investigation by Kelley and Tseng (1992). In their study, 38 immigrant Chinese mothers and 38 Caucasian-American mothers of 3- to 8-year-old children were given two questionnaires to complete. The Chinese mothers and the Caucasian-American mothers were comparable with respect to socioeconomic class, marital status, age, and education. One questionnaire tapped parenting dimensions related to support (nurturance, responsiveness to child input,

nonrestrictive attitude) and disciplinary practices and control (consistency, amount of control, type of control). The other questionnaire assessed parenting goals, that is, the importance that parents placed on encouraging or discouraging various characteristics in their children (e.g., morality, concern for others, self-reliance). Analyses of the data collected revealed that immigrant Chinese mothers reported a higher degree of physical control over their children as well as a greater frequency of yelling at their children, compared to Caucasian-American mothers. Caucasian-American mothers, on the other hand, scored higher on the dimensions of nurturance, nonrestrictiveness, consistency, responsiveness, and rule-setting relative to their immigrant Chinese counterparts. However, no cultural differences were observed in terms of child-rearing goals. Thus, these findings suggest that immigrant Chinese and Caucasian-American mothers may have similar parenting goals but rely on different methods of socialization to attain these goals.

On a slightly different note, Chiu (1987) compared the child-rearing *attitudes* among Chinese (Taiwanese), immigrant Chinese, and Anglo-American mothers. The sample consisted of 705 mothers (397 Taiwanese, 95 immigrant Chinese, 213 Caucasian), all of whom had at least one child of school age. Each mother was given a questionnaire which was designed to assess a wide variety of child-rearing attitudes. The results of this study showed that the Chinese mothers were more restrictive and controlling than the immigrant Chinese mothers, who in turn were more restrictive than the Anglo-American mothers. This particular finding is suggestive of a gradual change among immigrant Chinese mothers due to acculturation of their child-rearing values and practices to accomodate those patterns that are prevalent in America.

Overall, however, it appears that Chinese mothers, including those who have immigrated to the United States, are generally more authoritarian in their child-rearing attitudes, while Caucasian mothers are more permissive. Unexpectedly, results also showed that immigrant Chinese mothers were more likely to approve of the expression of hostility or rejection towards the child than either Chinese or Anglo-American mothers,

and that both the Chinese and immigrant Chinese mothers were more democratic and equalitarian in their child-rearing attitudes than the Anglo-American mothers. The latter finding is not consistent with the other results which seem to indicate that Chinese parents are more authoritarian in their attitudes toward child-rearing.

To summarize, the available literature reveals complex differences between Chinese parents and Anglo-American parents in how they socialize their children to be successful individuals in society. Within Baumrind's framework, Chinese parenting generally appears to be more authoritarian in style, while authoritative parenting tends to be more prevalent in Caucasian families. However, recent research also suggests that Baumrind's typology may not fully capture the child-rearing orientation and practices of the Chinese culture; there are some indigenous concepts, such as those discussed in Chao's (1994) study, that greatly influence the parent-child relationship and which are not taken into account within Baumrind's model of parenting style. The results of the research done in this area are mixed and, therefore, firm conclusions about the parenting orientations, attitudes, and practices of Chinese parents and the relation of these variables to academic and social outcomes in Chinese children cannot be confidently made at this point.

The main purpose of the present study is to investigate participants' construction of the contributions of parents to the moral development of adolescents and young adults, focusing on how these influences are reflected in the narratives that young people tell about their moral experiences. The predictions of interest are those regarding relations between parenting style and level of moral development, parenting style and presence of parent voice in narratives, and degree of parent voice in narratives and moral reasoning level. A second purpose of this study involves exploring these relationships within two cultural groups, Chinese-Canadian and European-Canadian, emphasizing how these relationships may differ between the two cultures.

Hypotheses

1. Parenting that is more authoritative in style should be associated with more sophisticated moral development among adolescents and young adults in Western culture (European-Canadian), as reflected in higher scores on the measure of moral reasoning stage/level. This relationship may not be found in the Chinese-Canadian culture, given that prior research (Chao, 1994) has indicated that Baumrind's typology of parenting style may not be as useful for describing variations in Chinese parenting.

2. Authoritative parenting should be positively linked to the level of parent voice displayed in the moral narratives of adolescents and young adults, following Pratt and Arnold (1995). Specifically, participants who rate their parents higher on authoritativeness are predicted to represent their parents' viewpoints to a greater degree in the stories that they tell about moral socialization.

3. Parents of Chinese-Canadians and European-Canadian parents should differ in levels of authoritarian parenting. In light of the research showing that Chinese parents tend to be more controlling and demanding (e.g., Lin & Fu, 1990), it is predicted that Chinese parents will be perceived and rated as having a more authoritarian parenting style than European-Canadian parents.

4. The degree of parent voice ought to be greater in the moral narratives of Chinese-Canadian youth than in similar narratives of European-Canadian youths. This hypothesis is derived from research that has shown a general tendency among Chinese parents to be highly involved in the parenting role, particularly in terms of guidance, in comparison with Western families (e.g., Chao, 1994).

5. The strength of parent voice in adolescents' narratives should be positively associated with level of moral reasoning development. This hypothesis is based on Pratt and Arnold's (1995) finding that adolescents who were more sophisticated in their moral reasoning also tended to display clearer appropriation of parental voice to a greater degree in their narratives about moral conflict.

Method

Participants

The sample for this study consisted of 102 adolescents and young adults, ranging from 17 to 26 years in age (M = 20.3 years). Sixty-two of these participants were of European-Canadian background (39 females, 23 males); the other forty participants were Chinese-Canadian (25 females, 15 males). "European-Canadian" was operationalized as having two parents of European or Canadian heritage. "Chinese-Canadian" was defined as having two parents of Chinese descent. Demographic information was collected from all participants (see Appendix A for the questions used to determine cultural background).

With respect to ethnic or cultural background, the European-Canadian participants reported descent from many different countries: Canada (57%), England/Scotland (23%), Germany (11%), Ireland (13%), Italy (8%), Austria (3%), Holland (3%), Belgium (2%), Ukraine (2%), Portugal (2%), and Finland (2%).[5] Within the Chinese-Canadian group, the following countries were represented: China (43%), Hong Kong (35%), Vietnam (10%), Taiwan (5%), Malaysia (5%), Laos (3%), and Mauritius (3%).

[5] The percentages reflect the proportion of participants reporting descent from each country. Participants who indicated more than one country (i.e., parents come from different countries) were included in the figures and counted twice.

Of those participants who responded to the question about religious affiliation, 81% of the European-Canadian students indicated affiliation with Christianity, or a Christian denomination (i.e., Roman Catholic or Protestant), compared to 40.5% of the Chinese-Canadian students. The remaining 19% of the European-Canadian participants reported that they did not affiliate themselves with any religion (i.e., responded "none" or "atheist"). Among the remaining Chinese-Canadian participants, 51.4% indicated that they had no religious affiliation while 8.1% reported affiliation with Buddhism.

The sample was recruited through the Psychology department and the Chinese Student Association at Wilfrid Laurier University. Participants were given the choice of receiving either one bonus course credit or $5 for their participation.

Measures

Of interest to the present study were a measure pertaining to parents' style of childrearing, an index of moral reasoning development, a measure of parents' voice in children's narratives about moral socialization, and a measure of parent influences on moral values.

Parenting style. A modified version of the measure developed by Lamborn, Mounts, Steinberg and Dornbusch (1991) was used to assess authoritativeness of parenting style in the present study (Cronbach's alpha = .87). Students provided responses to two scales, one tapping the warmth (responsiveness) dimension of parenting and the other assessing the strictness (demandingness) dimension of parenting. The warmth scale (alpha = .85) measured the extent to which the adolescent perceived his/her parents to be loving, responsive, and involved. A sample item from this 10-item scale is "When my parents wanted me to do something, they explained why." Prior research by the author (Mar, 1994) has shown that the warmth scale is correlated with late adolescents' social adjustment, specifically, reported loneliness (r = -.41) on the UCLA Loneliness Scale (Russell, Peplau, & Cutrona, 1980) and social satisfaction (r = .26) on

the Student Adaptation to College Questionnaire (Baker & Siryk, 1989). The strictness scale measured the extent of parental monitoring and supervision, as perceived by the adolescent. A sample item from this 8-item scale is "My parents knew exactly where I was most afternoons after school." This scale has been correlated with adolescents' reported loneliness ($r = -.19$) in previous research (Mar, 1994). In this investigation, the last two items of the original strictness scale (Lamborn et al., 1991) were dropped from the analyses due to their low correlation with the other items in the scale. The internal reliability for the remaining 6 items included in the strictness scale was acceptable (alpha = .82). The items that comprised the warmth and strictness scales can be found in Appendix B.

The warmth and strictness scales themselves were moderately positively intercorrelated, $r\ (100) = .47$, $p < .001$, similar to the results of Lamborn et al. (1991). For both scales, participants were required to refer back to when they were living at home with their parents in making responses to the items. The response format for each scale was a 9-point Likert-type scale, ranging from -4 (very strongly disagree) to +4 (very strongly agree). An overall index of parental authoritativeness versus neglect was created by summing the Z scores on the warmth and strictness scales. Similarly, an index of level of authoritarian parenting style was also created by subtracting the standardized warmth scale from the strictness scale.

In addition, participants were grouped according to type of parenting style. This was accomplished by doing a median split of both the warmth and strictness subscales; scores above the median of each subscale were classified as "high," while scores below the median were classified as "low." Participants who scored high on both warmth and strictness subscales were put into the **authoritative** parenting style group, while those scoring low on both subscales were placed in the **neglecting** parenting style group. The **authoritarian** parenting style group consisted of participants who had high scores for

parental strictness but low scores for parental warmth, while the permissive group consisted of participants scoring low on parental strictness but high on parental warmth.

Moral reasoning. The short version of the Defining Issues Test (DIT) by Rest (1979) was used as a measure of moral judgment preferences. Participants were presented with 3 moral dilemmas, one of which was the classic story of Heinz and the drug (Kohlberg, 1969). Each dilemma consisted of a vignette describing a moral situation, followed by a list of 12 different statements concerning the issues of the moral dilemma. This list consisted of various statements representing moral thinking at the six different stages of Kohlberg's model, general attitudes, and irrelevant ideas (see Appendix C for the moral dilemmas and issue-statements used in this measure). Participants were required to indicate on a 5-point rating scale how important each issue-statement was in their decisions concerning what ought to be done in the dilemma. For example, concerning the Heinz dilemma, one of the issue-statements was "Whether a community's laws are going to be upheld." After rating the importance of each issue-statement, participants were then required to rank the four most important issues from the set of twelve listed.

Each of the four issue-statements chosen in each dilemma was coded according to which type of statement it represented (i.e., an attitude, a meaningless item, or a stage of moral development). A "P index" (the relative importance that a participant gives to Stage 5 and 6 items, reflecting principled considerations in the Kohlbergian system) was then obtained for each dilemma by calculating the percentage of top rankings given to Stage 5 and 6 issue-statements, following standard procedures (Rest, 1979). The P indices for all three moral dilemmas were then summed to create an overall index of level of moral reasoning preference. Four participants who selected at least one irrelevant or meaningless statement across all three dilemmas were eliminated from data analyses involving this measure.

With respect to reliability, the DIT has been shown to have internal reliability in the range of .70s to .80s (Rest, 1983). Furthermore, the DIT has been found to be correlated

with Kohlberg's measure of moral judgment, with correlations as high as the .70s in heterogeneous samples, but lower in more homogeneous samples (Rest, 1983).

Influences on Moral Values. To obtain additional information concerning parents' influences on adolescents'/young adults' moral values, an adaptation of the Moral Self Task (Arnold, 1993) was used. This measure involved presenting subjects with a list of 10 qualities/values that are generally considered to be important by most people (e.g., polite and courteous, trustworthy). Participants were required to choose the 3 qualities that were most important to them in terms of the kind of person they wanted to be. After making their selections, participants were asked to rate the extent to which their parents had influenced the importance that they attached to each of these 3 values. The rating scale ranged from +1 (not at all) to +5 (very much so) for each. Scores for the 3 values were summed to provide an overall index of parent influence on values, ranging from 5 to 15. A description of this measure is provided in Appendix D.

Moral Narratives. To assess the extent to which the adolescent/young adult resonated with the parents' beliefs and values (i.e., the presence of parental voice) concerning morality, the protocol developed by Pratt and Arnold (1995) for obtaining moral narratives was employed. Essentially, this protocol involved asking the adolescent/young adult to identify the three values (from a set of 10) that he/she believed to be most important and then to tell a story about a past incident when his/her parents had taught him/her about the importance of one of those values. The instructions and probes used to elicit these moral narratives are shown in Appendix E.

These narratives were transcribed and coded according to a set of criteria formulated by Pratt and Arnold (1995), which described the strength of parent voice present in a narrative (see Appendix F). The categories of voice strength ranged from 1 (weak) to 5 (strong). More specifically, a category of "1" indicated that the child completely failed to describe the parents' voice, or actively rejected it. A categorization of "2" indicated that there was minimal evidence of the parents' voice, and it was either

passively resisted or simply complied with. For a category "3" classification to be made, there had to be clear evidence of parents' voice (e.g., references to dialogue with the parent). However, explicit agreement with parents' viewpoints was not readily apparent. A categorization of "4" indicated that parents' voice was clearly evident and that there was also explicit endorsement or responsiveness to it. At the same time, however, there was also a sense that parents' input or support had not been reformulated as the child's *own* thinking. Lastly, a category "5" classification indicated that parents' voice was clearly internalized, that there was articulated co-construction signalled by the "message" being rephrased in the child's own words (Tappan, 1991), or a demonstrated capacity to differ respectfully from the parent. The inter-rater reliability for this coding scheme was .85 for a sample of 16 protocols in Pratt and Arnold (1995). In the present study, inter-rater reliabilities of .85 - .89 were achieved on a sample of 12 transcripts among three independent raters. The scores of the primary rater, "blind" to moral and parenting style data, were used in all analyses. Excerpts from narratives that were coded as 1, 3, and 5 are provided as examples in Appendix G.

Procedure

Students who had signed up for this study through the Psychology Department or the Chinese Student Association at WLU were contacted by phone to arrange an individual appointment for participation. Upon arrival, each participant was placed in a quiet room and given a written introduction to read (see Appendix J). There were two modes of data collection in this study: a short interview session and a written questionnaire session. After signing the consent form, participants were given a questionnaire (see Appendices A - E) and instructed to complete only the first measure (i.e., moral values measure), after which the narrative measure ("the interview") was administered. The narratives generated by the participants were recorded on audiotape for later transcription and analysis. Following the narrative measure, the participants were

instructed to complete the remainder of the questionnaire, that is, the parenting style and DIT measures. Upon completion of the questionnaire, a feedback form explaining the nature and purpose of the study was provided to each participant. Participants were given either course credit or $5 for their participation.

Results

The means and standard deviations for the main variables of interest in this study, are presented separately by culture and gender in Table 1 below. Results of the tests of significance for each of the hypotheses will be discussed later on.

Table 1

Mean Scores For Chinese- and European-Canadians On Various Study Measures

	Chinese-Canadian			European-Canadian		
Measure	Males	Females	Overall	Males	Females	Overall
Defining Issues Test	7.20 (4.13)	8.63 (3.36)	7.92	9.19 (3.74)	8.84 (4.45)	9.02
Voice	4.07 (.62)	3.92 (1.15)	4.00	4.35 (.49)	4.26 (.69)	4.31
Warmth	61.93 (9.50)	60.56 (15.34)	61.25	69.26 (9.89)	76.56 (8.69)	72.91
Strictness	35.47 (7.30)	36.08 (9.89)	35.78	38.35 (9.01)	45.15 (7.82)	41.75
Authoritativeness	97.40 (15.14)	96.64 (21.20)	97.02	107.61 (14.26)	121.72 (13.07)	114.67

Note: Standard deviations are shown in the parentheses.

In the overall sample, Pearson correlations indicated that participant age was not significantly related to performance on measures of moral development, parental authoritativeness, parental influence on moral values, and parents' voice. Age was significantly correlated with authoritativeness of parenting style in the European-Canadian sub-sample only, r (62) = -.28, p < .05. Length of residence in Canada was not significantly correlated with these same variables, except for parental authoritativeness. Specifically, length of residence was negatively associated with parental authoritativeness, r (62) = -.28, p < .05 in the European-Canadian group as well as in the overall sample, r (102) = .33, p < .005; no such association was found within the Chinese-Canadian group. Since age and length of residence did not correlate consistently with the various outcome variables, these potential control variables were excluded from further analyses. Correlations which involve the age and length of residence variables are summarized in table form in Appendix H.

The construct validity of the parenting measures used in this study was examined through correlational analyses of these measures with the degree of participants' ratings of parental influence on their chosen moral values. Indeed, construct validity for the measures was demonstrated in that students' ratings of degree of parental influence were significantly positively associated with authoritativeness of parenting style, r (99) = .48, p < .001, and also with a greater degree of rated internalization of parents' voice in moral narratives, r (98) = .25, p < .05.

In hypothesis #1, it was predicted that reports of parental authoritativeness would be positively associated with moral reasoning development among older adolescents and young adults. Contrary to expectations, however, correlational analyses of the overall data set did not reveal a significant relationship between participants' reports of parental authoritativeness and their scores on the Defining Issues Test, r (96) = .05, ns. Analyses conducted separately for the European-Canadian and Chinese-Canadian groups also did

not reveal any significant correlations between parental authoritativeness and participants' preferences for principled moral reasoning, r (57) = -.07, ns, and r (37) = .08, ns, respectively.

In hypothesis #2, the prediction was that greater parental authoritativeness would be linked to a greater degree of internalization of parents' voice by older adolescents and young adults. As expected, a significant positive correlation was found between students' reports of parental authoritativeness and the degree of internalization of parent voice in their moral narratives, r (98) = .43, $p < .001$. With respect to the two subscales in the parenting style measure, parental warmth was associated with the voice measure, r (98) = .42, $p < .001$, as was parental strictness, r (98) = .30, $p < .01$. To illustrate this finding that parental authoritativeness was positively associated with the level of parent voice represented in participants' moral narratives, excerpts from two stories that differed in degree of reported parental authoritativeness and also in level of voice displayed are presented below. Story A was coded as "3" on the voice scale and was told by a participant who reported a moderate level of parental authoritativeness (classified as an authoritarian parenting style). Story B was coded as "5" on the voice scale (i.e., high) and was provided by a participant who reported a high level of parental authoritativeness.

Story A

[Can you tell me about the situation and what happened exactly?]

"In my OAC year, I was very ill with mono. I was ill for three-quarters of the year. And...very competitive household. And, I always have above 90's grades, but this time I did not have above 90. I had, like, 85. Not bad marks, although lower than what I would've liked. And, obviously hard to achieve when you're at home and you're learning it by yourself - and this was a calculus mark. And, so, I think it was a 83 I had in calculus. And, my father was less than impressed...and, my father's 'That's not good enough. If you're going to make it anywhere in this world, you have to be consistent with your marks, grades.' And, that's the ambitious, hardworking. And, so it really did instill in me that I should work hard. I know I should've done it for myself rather than for my father,

but...I had to be higher than that, and eventually, I did what was really hard, considering it was really hard."

[How do you feel about that experience now?]

"I'm sort of...I don't have the best opinion of my father. He shouldn't have pushed me. Like, I find myself really enjoying university life because of that. Just...I'm angry at him for forcing that sort of...in a way, I'm...I don't know. I don't think I would say I'm grateful because it was just the wrong way to go about it. I mean, I already had a very high standard and...(he) shouldn't have treated me that way I felt at the time. But, still, the hardworking's there."

Story B

[Could you tell me about the situation and what happened exactly?]

"Well...trustworthy. Well, an illustration could be...the most recent would be, like, 'cause a couple of years ago when I started working at the bank as a teller. And, to be trustworthy, like, I always, my parents always taught trustworthy is the most important thing because you keep your promises, which means you're a reliable person, right. And, also, you're honest because you promise somebody you're going to do that and you're going to do that. So, keep your words. And, well, working with the bank, it's even more than anything because people, you're dealing with people's money. And, of course, people trust you with their money. And, we're talking about large sums of money, okay. It's cash, so obviously you have to be really careful and you have to be reliable. You have to be honest in order to get the cash balance all made up and you get your customers' trust, too."

[How were your parents involved in this?]

"I guess they always taught me to be, do what I said and keep my promises from when I was a little kid 'til now. And, I think that's the most important, like, principle to bring in life and it does help in your future especially when you go to work and things like that."

A two-way ANOVA, with parenting style type[6] and gender as independent variables, supported the above finding for hypothesis #2. A significant main effect for parenting style type was found, $F(3, 92) = 5.68$, $p < .005$. The level of parent voice in moral narratives was highest among participants from authoritative and permissive families ($M = 4.42$ and $M = 4.60$, respectively) and lowest among those from authoritarian and neglecting homes ($M = 3.94$ and $M = 3.81$, respectively). Table 2 below provides a summary of the mean voice scores across parenting style group and gender. Neither gender alone nor the interaction of gender and parenting style type proved to be significant factors predicting the degree of voice in this analysis of the moral socialization narratives told by participants.

Table 2

Parenting Style and Gender Differences in Mean Level of "Voice" Displayed in Moral Narratives

	Authoritative	Authoritarian	Permissive	Neglecting	Total (Unweighted mean)
Males	4.50 (0.55) n = 6	4.22 (0.44) n = 9	4.38 (0.52) n = 8	4.07 (0.62) n = 14	4.29
Females	4.40 (0.56) n = 30	3.63 (0.52) n = 8	4.86 (0.38) n = 7	3.61 (1.24) n = 18	4.13
Total (Unweighted mean)	4.45	3.93	4.62	3.84	

Note: Standard deviations are shown in parentheses.

[6] Parenting style groups were created by doing a median split on the warmth and strictness scales. Please note that these groups do not hold any absolute value, but were simply based on participants' scores relative to one another in the sample.

Some parallel evidence regarding parental influence was found in an ANOVA which examined students' ratings of parental influence on their moral values in relation to the variables of parenting style and gender. This analysis revealed a significant main effect for parenting style, $F(3, 93) = 11.45$, $p < .001$, but not for gender, $F(1, 93) = 1.15$, ns. Table 3 summarizes parenting style and gender differences in participants' mean ratings of parental influence on moral values.

Table 3

Parenting Style and Gender Differences in Mean Levels of Reported Parental Influence

	Authoritative	Authoritarian	Permissive	Neglecting	Total (Unweighted Mean)
Males	12.50 (1.64) n = 6	10.39 (2.26) n = 9	12.25 (1.28) n = 8	10.00 (1.80) n = 14	11.29
Females	13.13 (1.38) n = 31	11.00 (2.27) n = 8	12.50 (1.94) n = 7	10.28 (2.16) n = 18	11.73
Total (Unweighted Mean)	12.82	10.70	12.38	10.14	

Note: Standard deviations are shown in parentheses.

With regards to hypothesis #3, Chinese-Canadian students were expected to rate their parents as being more authoritarian than would European-Canadian students. Support for this hypothesis was found. A two-way ANOVA, with culture and gender as the independent variables, revealed that level of authoritarian parenting, as reported by the participants on the index of strictness minus warmth, was significantly different between the two cultures, $F(1, 98) = 5.42$, $p < .05$. The Chinese-Canadian participants rated their

parents as being more authoritarian ($M = -25.22$, $SD = 12.45$) than did their European-Canadian counterparts ($M = -31.23$, $SD = 10.94$). However, results indicated that the reported level of authoritarian parenting did not significantly differ between male and female participants. There was also no evidence of a significant interaction between culture and gender.

In addition, although it was not a main hypothesis, the relationships among culture, gender, and parental authoritativeness were tested. An ANOVA, with culture and gender as the independent variables and authoritativeness as the dependent variable, showed that there was a significant effect for the interaction between culture and gender, $F(1, 98) = 4.94$, $p < .05$. There were also significant main effects for culture and gender, $F(1,98) = 27.8$, $p < .001$ and $F(1,98) = 3.98$, $p = .049$, respectively. The interaction effect indicates that there were significant differences between males and females in the European-Canadian culture with regards to their ratings of parental authoritativeness and almost no differences between males and females in the Chinese-Canadian sample. An examination of the means shows that within the European-Canadian group, females reported their parents as significantly more authoritative than did males ($M = 121.7$ and $M = 107.6$, respectively). Within the Chinese-Canadian group, females and males did not significantly differ in their ratings of parents' authoritativeness ($M = 96.64$ and $M = 97.40$, respectively). Concerning the main culture effect, the results showed that the Chinese-Canadian participants rated their parents as being less authoritative ($M = 96.93$, $SD = 18.95$), on average, than did the European-Canadian participants ($M = 116.48$, $SD = 15.06$). Lastly, the main effect due to gender indicated that females in general reported their parents as being significantly more authoritative than did males ($M = 109.18$, $SD = 17.14$ and $M = 102.50$, $SD = 14.70$, respectively).

In hypothesis #4, it was predicted that the degree of parent voice would be greater in the moral narratives of Chinese-Canadian youths than in similar narratives of European-Canadian youths. A two-way ANOVA with culture and gender being the independent

factors was employed to test this hypothesis. Analyses revealed marginal evidence of a significant difference between the two cultural groups with respect to the degree of internalization of parent voice in their moral narratives, $F(1, 96) = 3.43$, $p = .067$, but the pattern of results was in the opposite direction than what had been predicted. As reported earlier, the mean score for parent voice in the narratives told by the European-Canadian participants was actually higher ($M = 4.30$, $SD = .86$) than the mean score for voice in the narratives told by their Chinese-Canadian counterparts ($M = 3.97$, $SD = .99$). Excerpts from narratives told by a Chinese-Canadian participant (Story C) and a European-Canadian participant (Story D) are provided below for illustration.

Story C (coded as "3" on voice scale)

[Could you tell me about the situation and what happened exactly?]

"...this was when I got back. I went to France for the summer. And, then, I came back. And my family isn't very expressive, so I know that. And, I came back, and things were fine. So, they took us out to dinner. And, we went to some Chinese restaurant down the street, downtown, and went in and we looked. I noticed that at the next table that there were people we knew, like, friends and relatives and stuff there. So, we had gone over there and I went over there to their table to talk - with my sister - to talk to them. And, I said "hi", kind of shy, sort of "hi". When I came back to our table, my mom got mad at me. She was quite upset that I hadn't acknowledged my elders. She has a really big thing about that - respecting your elder and being polite and courteous in acknowledging them. And, she got really upset. And, I just thought, like, I didn't think it was such a big deal. I said "hi". But, I guess she expected me to go on, (e.g.) 'how are you doing?', blah, blah, blah. And, I thought that was enough. Like, I've grown up here most of my life, so that's, you know what I mean. That's how I've always been accustomed to greeting people. And, I guess that offended her. She said it was really rude and it showed disrespect on my part and the fact that they...like, they were my parents, so it reflected on them."

[How do you feel about this experience now?]

"Well, I think about it and I guess she's right. I should've...it's just I felt awkward. I didn't know how to communicate well with them and...but, she was right. I agree, but she didn't have to be so harsh about it."

[Do you agree with the way that she was trying to teach you about being polite and courteous?]

"I agree with the fact that you should respect your elders, you should listen to them, you know, you don't talk back to them, blah, blah, blah. I don't think she should've approached me the way that she did. I mean, she started screaming at me. It's just, I don't know. But, that incident did stay in my mind, though."

Story D (coded as "4" on voice scale)

[Could you tell me about the situation and what happened exactly?]

"I was probably about 4 years old and I was in a Shopper's Drug Mart. And, I asked my mother to buy a package of green Gatorade gum. And, she said 'no'. So, I went back and I guess I stole it. I can't remember how 'cause I was in a buggy. But, she didn't realize 'til I got home that I was chewing gum. She drove me back down there and made me apologize to the lady who was working at the cash. And, the lady said I'd be arrested if I did it again. And, my mom somehow made me earn the money. I'm not sure how, but she made me pay her back 'cause she paid the storeowner back and I had to go and apologize."

[How do you feel about that experience now?]

"Well, now, I feel it was good. 'Cause I understood that if I did things, that there would be consequences and that I wouldn't be able to get away with it."

[Why do you think your mother responded in the way that she did?]

"Probably because my mom's really big with honesty and if it's not yours, don't take it unless you pay for it. I guess she just didn't want me, you know, thinking it was okay so I would keep doing it, and she wanted to teach me a lesson."

With reference to the above findings for hypothesis #4, an analysis of parental influence by culture showed a similar pattern of results. A two-way ANOVA revealed that participants' ratings of the degree of parental influence on their moral values were marginally different between the two cultures, with this finding approaching statistical significance, $F(1, 97) = 3.49$, $p = .065$. The European-Canadian students tended to rate

their parents as being more influential on their moral values ($M = 11.98$), while the Chinese-Canadian students tended to rate their parents as somewhat less influential ($M = 11.06$).

Lastly, the prediction in hypothesis #5 was that participants' level of moral reasoning would be positively associated with the strength of parent voice in the moral narratives that they told. A correlational analysis of the overall sample to test this hypothesis revealed evidence of a significant (albeit weak) relationship between participants' scores on the Defining Issues Test and the degree of parent voice observed in their moral narratives, $r\ (94) = .20$, $p < .05$. When analyses were conducted separately for the two cultural groups, a significant correlation was found for the Chinese-Canadian group, $r\ (36) = .28$, $p < .05$, but not for the European-Canadian group, $r\ (56) = .12$, $p = .18$. A Fisher Z-test did not find these two correlations to be significantly different ($Z = 0.81$, n.s.).

A series of supplementary analyses was also carried out to further investigate the data set regarding possible gender and culture differences in participants' values, as assessed by the moral values task. With respect to gender differences, no significant findings were obtained. A summary of the patterns of differences among male and female participants in selection of moral values is provided in Appendix I.

Concerning cultural differences, it was found that the Chinese-Canadian participants selected "polite/courteous" as being an important moral value to them significantly more often (30%) than did their European-Canadian counterparts (10%), $F\ (1, 98) = 6.88$, $p < .05$.[7] The moral value of "careful/cautious" also appeared to be more important in the Chinese-Canadian group: 15% of the Chinese-Canadian participants chose this value as one of the most important to them, whereas none of the European-Canadian participants chose this value, $F\ (1, 98) = 10.31$, $p < .005$. On the

[7] Cultural differences in moral values were tested in a 2x2 ANOVA on the proportions of people choosing a particular moral value.

other hand, a much greater percentage of European-Canadian students selected "honest/truthful" as being an important moral value to them (60%) compared to the percentage of Chinese-Canadian students choosing this value (30%), $F(1, 98) = 4.38$, $p < .05$. Table 4 below presents the differences in value choices between the two cultures.

Table 4

Differences Between European- and Chinese-Canadians In Choice of Moral Values

Moral Value	European-Canadians (%)	Chinese-Canadians (%)
polite/courteous	9.7	30.0*
honest/truthful	59.7*	30.0
careful/cautious	0	15.0*
fair/just	32.3	17.5
trustworthy	27.4	30.0
ambitious/hardworking	46.8	62.5
independent	41.9	37.5
sharing	6.5	10.0
be open/communicate	19.4	20.0
kind/caring	58.1	47.5

Note: percentages reflect proportion of participants choosing the value as one of the three most important values

* $p < .05$

Discussion

The main purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between parenting style and moral development in older adolescents and young adults within two different cultural contexts: Chinese-Canadian culture and European-Canadian culture. In terms of moral development, a primary focus of this investigation was on the study of moral narratives as a way of tapping morality in individuals.

The reliability and validity of the novel measure of parent voice proved to be reasonably high in most instances. The narrative measure of morality assessed the degree of internalization of parental voice in participants' stories about moral learning experiences. The mean score for voice obtained for participants' narratives was 4.17 (on a scale of 1 to 5), which is reasonable given that a mean score of approximately 3.40 was obtained for the same measure with a younger group of adolescents in Pratt and Arnold's (1995) study. Some developmental trend toward more sophisticated representation of parent voice would be expected with increasing age. The measure of moral values required participants to select the 3 moral values that are most important to them from a list of 10 moral values and then to rate the extent to which their parents had influenced these values. Analyses showed that these ratings of parents' influence were correlated with the level of parent voice represented in participants' moral narratives, $r(100) = .25$, $p < .05$ and, thus, lent support for the validity of this novel voice measure.

With regards to the findings of this study, there was evidence to support some of the hypotheses, but not others. In the first hypothesis, it was predicted that authoritativeness of parenting style would be positively associated with children's moral reasoning development. Contrary to expectations, however, support was not found for a relationship between parents' style of childrearing and the moral development of older adolescents and young adults, as assessed by the measure of moral reasoning preferences employed in this study (the Defining Issues Test). This result is in line with the findings of Berkowitz, Giese, Begun, Mulry and Zweben (1995). In their investigation of parenting style and children's moral reasoning and behaviour, Berkowitz et al. (1995) did not find a significant association between parents' childrearing style and adolescents' moral reasoning development. However, this particular finding is also not consistent with some previous research which has found evidence for a positive relationship between an authoritative parenting style and moral development (Boyes & Allen, 1993), and between

specific "authoritative" parenting practices and children's moral reasoning development (e.g., Walker & Taylor, 1991).

The lack of consistency in the existing literature with respect to the findings concerning parenting style and its relation to moral development makes it difficult to interpret the results obtained in the present study for hypothesis #1. As discussed in the literature review, there are very few studies which have specifically investigated the relationship between parents' childrearing styles and behaviour and children's moral outcomes. To complicate matters, these existing studies (e.g., Berkowitz et al., 1995; Boyes & Allen, 1993; Walker & Taylor, 1991) differed from the present study in the samples studied and the measures employed to examine parenting and moral development. Boyes and Allen (1993) used the Child Report of Parental Behaviour (Schaefer, 1965) to determine parenting style in their study, which included both high school and first-year university students. They also employed the standard version of the DIT, which is comprised of 6 moral dilemmas, instead of the shorter version of the DIT used in this study. In Walker and Taylor's (1991) longitudinal investigation of 7- to 15-year-old children and their families, a standard interview measure (Moral Judgment Interview - Colby & Kohlberg, 1987) was employed to study moral reasoning. Furthermore, Walker and Taylor (1991) did not focus on parenting style per se, but rather family interaction style, using the Developmental Environments Coding System (Powers,1988). Similarly, Berkowitz et al. (1995) used a different parenting style measure (an adaptation of the parenting style measure developed by Dornbusch et al., 1985), and the Moral Judgment Interview (Colby & Kohlberg, 1987) in their study of adolescents, aged 12-19 years, with problem behaviour.

Hence, given the differences in participant samples and measures employed across different studies, the results found in the present study concerning parenting style and moral development may not be directly comparable to the existing research in this area.

Additional studies are needed to elucidate the role of parents' style of childrearing in children's moral development more fully, and to provide a context for the present findings.

Interestingly, when moral influence was investigated via narratives elicited from participants about their moral learning experiences, the role of parenting style appeared to be more visible. In hypothesis #2, it was predicted that parental authoritativeness would be positively correlated with degree of appropriation of parents' voice (i.e., parental viewpoints) by older adolescents and young adults. As hypothesized, participants who rated their parents as being more authoritative in childrearing style demonstrated greater levels of internalization of parental voice in their moral narratives, as rated independently. This result is consistent with a prior finding that greater authoritativeness in parenting style was significantly related to a greater degree of representation of parents' voice in the moral narratives of younger adolescents (Pratt & Arnold, 1995). Thus, it appears that parenting style may have a role to play in children's moral development, at least with respect to the degree of internalization of parents' viewpoints on moral values. These results also clearly support the utility of the parental voice measure derived from students' narratives as an index of family influence on moral development.

With respect to cultural differences, several significant findings were revealed by this study. In hypothesis #3, it was predicted that Chinese-Canadian participants would rate their parents as more authoritarian compared to European-Canadian participants. Consistent with this hypothesis and with existing literature on differences between the Chinese-Canadian and European-Canadian cultural groups in parenting orientation and behaviour (e.g., Kelley & Tseng, 1992; Dornbusch et. al., 1987; Chiu, 1987), data analyses indicated that the Chinese-Canadian students perceived and rated their parents as more "authoritarian" in comparison to the ratings of parents provided by their European-Canadian counterparts. On the other hand, the European-Canadian students rated their parents higher on our index of "authoritativeness" than did their Chinese-Canadian peers overall, a finding which has been documented in prior studies examining cultural

differences in childrearing style and its relation to school achievement in the United States (e.g., Dornbusch et al., 1987; Steinberg et al., 1992). However, the significant interaction effect which found that females reported their parents as more authoritative compared to males within the European-Canadian group only was unexpected. From the means obtained, it appears that females within this cultural group perceive their parents as more authoritative than do the males, but it would be difficult to interpret this particular result without further investigation.

In addition, the finding that reported level of authoritarian parenting was higher in the Chinese-Canadian group than in the European-Canadian group in this investigation must be interpreted carefully. Chao (1994) found that Chinese immigrant mothers were more authoritarian than European-American counterparts on Baumrind's measures, but more importantly, Chao also raised the issue of whether an "authoritarian" parenting style has the same meaning in Chinese culture as it does in Western society. Chao argued that parenting attitudes and practices that are classified as "authoritarian" within Baumrind's typology of parenting style have negative connotations within the Western culture. However, these same parenting attitudes and behaviour reflect the indigenous childrearing concepts of *chiao shun* (training) and *guan* (to govern), and are actually viewed positively within the Chinese culture. Hence, Chao (1994) suggested that Baumrind's model may be not be appropriate for studying parenting in non-Western cultures. With respect to the present investigation, Chao's (1994) work serves as a reminder that authoritarian parenting, as measured here, may not reflect the same parenting values in the Chinese-Canadian sample as it does in the European-Canadian sample.

Given that Chinese parents are typically perceived as more 'authoritarian' in parenting style than European-Canadian parents, the prediction for hypothesis #4 was that the degree of parent voice should be stronger in the moral socialization narratives of the Chinese-Canadian participants than in similar narratives told by their European-Canadian counterparts. Perhaps surprisingly, the reverse pattern was found. The narratives

provided by the European-Canadian participants tended to show a greater degree of representation of parents' viewpoints than the narratives told by the Chinese-Canadian participants. Consistent with this trend, the European-Canadian participants also tended to rate parental influence on their moral values somewhat more highly than did the Chinese-Canadian participants.

This unexpected finding of a marginally weaker representation of parents' viewpoints and influence among the Chinese-Canadian participants may be related to the process of acculturation. Most of the Chinese participants in the sample have been residing in Canada on their own for at least several years, or come from families who have been residents of Canada for at least several years. It is plausible that, as the children of these Chinese families have slowly become more exposed to and changed by the values of the society that they are currently living in (i.e., North America), there is greater 'conflict' which develops between the children and parents with respect to issues such as what constitutes culturally acceptable moral values, attitudes, and behaviour. Within this context, it would not be unreasonable to also expect that the Chinese-Canadian adolescents and young adults may represent their parents' viewpoints to a lesser degree than their European-Canadian peers and also be less willing to acknowledge parental influence on their moral values.

This particular explanation appears to be plausible, given the findings of a recent study by Greenberger and Chen (1996). In their investigation of perceived parent-adolescent relationships and depressed mood among European- and Asian-Americans in early and late adolescence, there was evidence to show that the Asian-American college students consistently reported more conflict with parents than did their European-American peers, though this was not the case within their early adolescent group. The conflict reported by the Asian-American college-aged group appeared to be somewhat more common and intense in their relationships with mothers than with fathers, and tended to center around issues of autonomy. Given the evidence found by Greenberger and Chen

(1996) of increased autonomy struggles with parents among Asian-Americans in this relatively late stage of adolescence, it is plausible that the Chinese-Canadian students in the present investigation may also have been experiencing such conflict in their relationships with their parents. Assuming that this were the case, the finding in this study that the Chinese-Canadian participants endorsed and represented their parents' viewpoints and influence on moral values to a lesser degree than did their European-Canadian counterparts is a very reasonable one.

In this study, it was also hypothesized that the measure of moral development (i.e., the Defining Issues Test) and the narrative measure, a tool used to assess the degree of responsiveness to parent influence on moral values, would be correlated, since they both assess morality, albeit two different aspects and from two different theoretical perspectives. Specifically, hypothesis #5 predicted that participants' level of moral reasoning development would be positively associated with the strength of parental voice displayed in participants' moral narratives. Individuals who are more advanced in their moral reasoning development should also be able to represent their parents' voice in more sophisticated terms. Evidence to support this hypothesis was found for the overall sample. Separate analyses by culture revealed a significant, modest correlation for the Chinese-Canadian group but not for the European-Canadian group.

The moral values that were selected as most important represented another interesting difference between the Chinese-Canadian and European-Canadian cultural groups in this study. For the Chinese-Canadian participants, the values of "polite/courteous" and "careful/cautious" appeared to have greater importance, and these values were selected significantly more often by the Chinese-Canadian participants than by their European-Canadian peers. This finding serves to reinforce past research which has documented the strong influence that Confucian philosophy traditionally has upon family interactions and relationships within the Chinese culture (e.g. Ho, 1986; Chao, 1983). The

values of "polite/courteous" and "careful/cautious" certainly fit in with the virtues of filial piety, respect for elders, and harmony that are greatly valued within Chinese culture.

The value of "honest/truthful" seemed to have greater importance within the European-Canadian group than within the Chinese-Canadian group, being chosen much more frequently by the European-Canadian students than by their Chinese-Canadian counterparts in this study. One possible explanation for this cultural difference could be that this specific value is not promoted or emphasized as much within Chinese culture as it typically is in Western culture. Indeed, in this study, the value of "honest/truthful" was defined in part as "telling the truth," a definition which connotes the ideas of complete self-expression and individuality. It is possible that this quality is not quite as compatible with the values of respect for elders, mutual dependence, harmony, and the negation of conflict, which are strongly endorsed within traditional Chinese culture.

In drawing conclusions from these results, it is important to keep in mind that there are, of course, limitations to this study. One limitation involves the issue of language. All measures were administered in the English language, due to time and cost concerns. Chinese-Canadian participants who were not fully fluent in English were thus put at a disadvantage with respect to performance on the various measures. In particular, the collection and transcription of moral narratives from the Chinese-Canadian participants was problematic in some cases in that their ability to express themselves in English was sometimes limited. Hence, the data obtained from the sample of Chinese-Canadian adolescents and young adults may not be as fully accurate in capturing their true competencies on the various measures administered in this study, especially those that are heavily dependent on language comprehension or production. Nevertheless, it is important to note that the more verbal measures of "parent voice" taken from the narratives tended to parallel the results found with simple rating scales of parental influence which were less language-dependent.

Another potential weakness of this study is the measure of moral reasoning development that was employed. Analyses of the data suggest that the Defining Issues Test may not have been a sufficiently discriminating measure of moral reasoning development. There was low variability in participants' overall scores across the three moral dilemmas in the measure. In addition, the DIT was not correlated with age, and it was only very modestly correlated with the voice measure. Hence, the DIT may not have been able to provide a completely accurate assessment of each participant's level of moral reasoning development in the present investigation.

As with all studies with correlational data, this investigation is also limited with regards to the conclusions that can be drawn. Since none of the independent variables in this study were experimentally manipulated, statements about causality cannot be made. Because this investigation is cross-sectional, that is, data were collected from a sample at one point in time, it is impossible to say with any certainty that the parenting orientations and practices investigated in this study have caused or even preceded the moral outcomes assessed. For example, it could be the case that adolescents and young adults who internalize their parents' viewpoints ("voice") to a greater degree elicit more authoritativeness from their parents. Although this "reverse causality" cannot be discounted in this case, this explanation does not seem convincing in light of the finding that participants who displayed greater representation of parental voice also rated their parents as having greater influence on their moral values. It seems more plausible that young people respond favourably to parents who demonstrate authoritativeness in their childrearing by internalizing and appropriating parental viewpoints into their own moral thinking. However, because of the design of this study, one can only confidently conclude that a particular variable is *related* in some way to another specific variable. In order to more clearly determine the direction of the relationship between parenting style and children's moral development, longitudinal research would need to be done.

Another potential problem which should be mentioned concerns the issue of social desirability. All of the measures that were used in this study required that participants provide responses reflecting their own points of view. It is possible, however, that some of the participants may have responded according to what they thought were the "best" or "right" answers, or the answers they thought the examiner was looking for. Such data would be misleading and inaccurate as far as the constructs under investigation are concerned. Unfortunately, there were no specific measures set in place to assess social desirability in the present study. It is argued here that it would have been difficult to detect and control for this potential problem, since the very nature of the measures required that the participants give ratings of particular items or produce a narrative of their own choice.

Lastly, this study is limited by the nature of the sample. The participants recruited for this investigation represented a very specific segment of the population, that is, individuals of European-Canadian and Chinese-Canadian cultural backgrounds who are between 17 and 26 years of age and attending university, limiting the generalizability of the findings. In addition, the Chinese group within the sample consisted of individuals who had been residing in Canada for different lengths of time. Some Chinese students were born and raised in Canada, some had immigrated to Canada quite a few years ago, and still others had only recently arrived in Canada for post-secondary studies. Thus, the degree to which acculturation may have influenced values and performance on the measures within the Chinese-Canadian group of participants may have been variable, and as such, it is possible that the Chinese-Canadian data did not clearly represent traditional Chinese culture with respect to parenting style and practices, moral reasoning, and values.

Indeed, it will be the task of future researchers to improve upon this study and shed light on these issues. Certainly, the role of parenting style in the moral development of children from childhood through late adolescence ought to be explored further, as the data available on the relationship between these variables are very limited. One suggestion

is that the current study be replicated in future research with a longitudinal design, which would help clarify the direction of the relationship between parenting style and moral reasoning development. To be more culturally sensitive, it may also be desirable to adapt measures from the perspective of the Chinese culture. For example, the moral dilemmas and probes used in the DIT could be modified to include details (e.g., names) and scenarios more common to the ethnic group studied. Alternatively, a more extensive structural measure of moral development, such as the Moral Judgment Interview, could be employed in future studies instead of the DIT, which did not appear to be sufficiently discriminating in terms of participants' performance in the present investigation.

Several issues in particular appear to be important for future cross-cultural research which involves the Chinese population in North America: pilot work, language, and acculturation. In preparing for a cross-cultural investigation, it is recommended that a pilot study be carried out initially in order to evaluate the effectiveness of the proposed measures, and any modifications to these measures, for studying the variables of interest in the Chinese culture. Taking this step would ensure that culturally relevant data are being obtained in the actual study and facilitate the interpretation of any cultural differences found. Concerning language, it is suggested that measures be admininistered in the language of communication predominant in the culture being studied. This would help ensure that the data being collected is accurate and demonstrates cultural sensitivity in research. For example, in samples from Hong Kong and China, the language of administration should, of course, be Chinese.

To address the question of acculturation and its potential influence on values and performance, it is recommended that this variable be controlled for more fully and more closely examined in future studies involving this ethnic group. With reference to the present study, an ideal endeavour for future researchers would be the collection of parallel data from independent samples in China (where there is little or no acculturation to North American society and values), Hong Kong (where there is some acculturation to Western

values due to British rule), and Canada (where there is a great degree of acculturation among the Canadian-born Chinese) to investigate the possible impact of acculturation on the empirical relationships explored in this study.

The impact of culture should be addressed as well in future studies within the domain of moral development. It is important for researchers to be aware of cultural differences and how these differences may affect the variables and relationships they are proposing to investigate. The sample in this study represented only two cultural groups: Chinese-Canadian and European-Canadian. To better understand how parenting attitudes and practices may influence moral development among children in other cultures, studies similar to the current investigation should be undertaken with samples of participants from different cultures.

Finally, there are several areas which were not directly examined in the present investigation but which would be interesting for future researchers to study. First, the individualism/collectivism distinction should be further investigated in the cross-cultural context. It is possible that the cultural differences which were found in this study could be partially explained by the fact that Chinese society is described as collectivistic in nature while North American society is considered individualistic. Perhaps, the notion of individualism/ collectivism could be incorporated into the measures used in future cross-cultural studies which look at the relationship between parenting style and moral development.

Second, although the demographic information collected on participants' religious affiliations was not analyzed in this study, it would be interesting for future researchers to investigate the role of religion in parenting and children's moral development in different cultures. Religious affiliation may have an influence on parents' childrearing orientation and practices, and the moral values that are taught to children.

Third, the present study did not investigate the indigenous concepts of *chiao shun* and *guan* which were studied by Chao (1994) and which are central to Chinese

childrearing ideology. These concepts were observed in some of the moral narratives provided by the Chinese participants in this study. For example, the notions of training and firm governance are apparent in the following excerpt from a narrative told by a Chinese participant:

> "And, so, in the final exam, I failed. I failed, so my parents are really angry. They scold me and, anyway, I worked hard in mathematics. And, also, they spend a lot of money and time on finding a good tutorial teacher to help me. And, at last, I got really good in mathematics.....Yeah, my parents also always concentrate on hardworking."

It is suggested that future comparative research involving the Chinese culture should further study these indigenous concepts by incorporating them into measures of parenting style and practices.

Lastly, according to Tappan and Brown (1989), individuals learn to develop their own moral perspectives in life by internalizing and assimilating the viewpoints, or "voices," of many people in their environment. The "voice" of interest in the present study was that of parents. It is recommended that future researchers also examine the representation of other voices, such as peer voice, in children's moral thinking, as expressed through narrative.

In conclusion, the present study makes several contributions to the literature on parenting and moral development. It is the first investigation to examine the relationship between parenting style and moral development across different cultures, which were represented in this study by the European-Canadian and Chinese-Canadian cultural groups. Although evidence to support a significant role for parenting style in adolescents' moral reasoning development per se was not found, the results did reveal that parental authoritative-ness was significantly, positively associated with the degree of influence adolescents perceived their parents to have on their moral values, and with the degree to which adolescents represented their parents' viewpoints in their narratives about moral

learning experiences. With respect to moral values, the data showed that there are differences in the kinds of moral values that are considered more important within each culture, with the Chinese-Canadians emphasizing "polite/courteous" and "careful/cautious" and the European-Canadians more inclined to emphasize "honest/ truthful." Lastly, the results of the present investigation also provide support for the potential usefulness of studying morality through narratives.

References

Baker, R. W., & Siryk, B. (1989). Student Adaptation to College Questionnaire (SACQ). Los Angeles, CA: Western Psychological Services.

Baumrind, D. (1971). Current patterns of parental authority. Developmental Psychology Monograph, 4, 1-103.

Berkowitz, M., Giese, J., Begun, A., Mulry, G., & Zweben, A. (1995). Family dynamics and adolescent moral development. Paper presented at the 2nd International Conference on Moral Education, Chiba-Ken, Japan.

Boyes, M., & Allen, S. (1993). Styles of parent-child interaction and moral reasoning in adolescence. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 39, 551-570.

Boyes, M., & Walker, L. (1988). Implications of cultural diversity for the universality claims of Kohlberg's theory of moral reasoning. Human Development, 31, 44-59.

Bruner, J. (1986). Actual minds, possible worlds. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Buck, L., Walsh, W., & Rothman, G. (1981). Relationship between parental moral judgment and socialization. Youth and Society, 13, 91-116.

Candee, D. & Kohlberg, L. (1987). Moral judgment and moral action: A reanalysis of Haan, Smith, and Block's (1968) Free Speech Movement Data. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52, 554-564.

Chao, R. (1994). Beyond parental control and authoritarian parenting style: Understanding Chinese parenting through the cultural notion of training. Child

Development, 65, 1111-1119.

Chen, X., Dong, Q., & Zhou, H. (1995). Authoritative and authoritarian parenting practices and school performance in Chinese children. (Unpublished manuscript).

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

Colby, A., & Damon, W. (1992). Some do care: Contemporary lives of moral commitment. New York: Free Press.

Colby, A., & Kohlberg, L. (1987). The measurement of moral judgment (Vol. 1). NewYork: Cambridge University Press.

Colby, A., Kohlberg, L., Candee, D., Gibbs, J., Hewer, A., & Speicher, B. (1987). The measurement of moral judgment: Vol. II. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Dornbusch, S., Ritter, P., Leiderman, P., Roberts, D., & Fraleigh, M. (1985). Family Survey. Stanford, CA; Stanford Center for the Study of Youth Development.

Dornbusch, S., Ritter, P., Leiderman, P., Roberts, D., & Fraleigh, M. (1987). The relation of parenting style to adolescent school performance. Child Development, 58, 1244-1257.

Fleras, A., & Elliott, J. L. (1992). Multiculturalism in Canada. Toronto: Nelson Canada.

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.

Hart, D. (1988). A longitudinal study of adolescents' socialization and identification as predictors of adult moral judgment development. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 34, 245-260.

Hart, D., & Fegley, S. (1995). Prosocial behaviour and caring in adolescence: Relations to self-understanding and social judgment. Child Development, 66, 1346-1359.

Ho, D. Y. F. (1986). Chinese patterns of socialization: A critical review. In M. H. Bond (Ed.), The psychology of the Chinese people (pp. 1-37). Hong Kong: Oxford University Press.

Hoffman, M., & Saltzstein, H. (1967). Parent discipline and the child's moral development. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 5, 45-57.

Hsu, F. L. K. (1981). Americans and Chinese: Passage to differences (3rd ed.). Honolulu: University Press of Hawaii.

Kelley, M., & Tseng, H. (1992). Cultural differences in child rearing: A comparison of immigrant Chinese and Caucasian American mothers. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 23, 444-455.

Kohlberg, L. (1969). Stage and sequence: The cognitive-developmental approach to socialization. In D.A. Goslin (Ed.), Handbook of socialization theory and research (pp. 347-480). Chicago: Rand McNally.

Kohlberg, L. (1976). Moral stages and moralization: The cognitive-developmental approach. In T. Lickona (Ed.), Moral development and behaviour: Theory, research and social issues (pp. 31-53). New York: Holt, Reinhart & Winston.

Lamborn, S., Mounts, N., Steinberg, L., & Dornbusch, S. (1991). Patterns of competence and adjustment among adolescents from authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent, and neglectful families. Child Development, 62, 1049-1065.

Lei, T., & Cheng, S. (1984). An empirical study of Kohlberg's theory and scoring system of moral judgment in Chinese society. Unpublished manuscript, Harvard University, Center for Moral Education, Cambridge, MA.

Lin, C., & Fu, V. (1990). A comparison of child-rearing practices among Chinese, immigrant Chinese, and Caucasian-American parents. Child Development, 61, 429-433.

Lind, G. (1986). Cultural differences in moral judgment competency? A study of West and East European university students. Behaviour Science Research, 20, 208-225.

Maccoby, E., & Martin, J. (1983). Socialization in the contexxt of the family: Parent-child interaction. In E. Mavis Hetherington (Ed.), Handbook of Child Psychology: Vol. IV. Socialization, personality, and social development (4th ed.). New York: Wiley.

Mar, W. (1994). Parenting style and social adjustment to university: Parental agreement as a moderating factor. Unpublished research project, Wilfrid Laurier University.

Moon, Y. (1984). A review of cross-cultural studies on moral judgment development using the Defining Issues Test. Behaviour Science Research, 20, 147-177.

Niemczynski, A., Czyzowska, D., Pourkos, M., & Mirski, A. (1988). The Cracow study with Kohlberg's moral judgement interview: Data pertaining to the assumption of cross-cultural validity. Polish Psychological Bulletin, 19, 43-53.

Ogbu, J. (1990). A theory of success and failure. Teacher Magazine, 1, 40-45.

Oliner, S., & Oliner, P. (1988). The altruistic personality. New York: Free Press.

Parikh, B. (1980). Development of moral judgment and its relation to family environmental factors in Indian and American families. Child Development, 51, 1030-1039.

Piaget, J. (1932). The moral judgment of the child (M. Gabain, Trans.). London: Routledge & Keegan Paul.

Powers, S. I. (1988). Moral judgement development within the family. Journal of Moral Education, 17, 209-219.

Pratt, M. & Arnold, M. (1995). Narrative approaches to moral socialization across the lifespan. Moral Education Forum, 20, 13-22.

Rest, J. (1979). Revised manual for the Defining Issues Test: An objective test of moral judgment development. Minneapolis: Minnesota Moral Research Projects.

Rest, J. (1983). Morality. In P. Mussen (Ed.), Handbook of Child Psychology, Vol. 3. Cognitive Development (4th ed.). Toronto: J. Wiley & Sons.

Rest, J. (1986a). Moral development: Advances in theory and research. New York: Praeger.

Rest, J. (1986b). The Defining Issues Test (3rd ed.): Manual. University of Minnesota, Minneapolis.

Rosen, H. (1980). The development of sociomoral knowledge. New York: Columbia University Press.

Rosenhan, D. (1970). The natural socialization of altruistic autonomy. In J. Macaulay & L. Berkowitz (Eds.), Altruism and helping behaviour. New York: Academic Press.

Russell, D., Peplau, L., & Cutrona, C. (1980). The revised UCLA Loneliness Scale: Concurrent and discriminant validity evidence. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 39, 472 - 480.

Schaefer, E. S. (1965). Children's reports of parental behaviours: An inventory. Child Development, 36, 413-424.

Snarey, J. (1985). Cross-cultural universality of social-moral development: A critical review of Kohlbergian research. Psychological Bulletin, 97, 202-232.

Snarey, J. (1995). In a communitarian voice: The sociological expansion of Kohlbergian theory, research, and practice. In W. Kurtines and J. Gewirtz (Eds.), Moral development: An introduction (pp. 109-133). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Snarey, J., & Keljo, K. (1991). In a *Gemeinschaft* voice: The cross-cultural expansion of moral development theory. Handbook of moral behaviour and development: Vol. 1. Theory (pp. 395-424). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Steinberg, L., Dornbusch, S., & Brown, B. (1992). Ethnic differences in adolescent achievement: An ecological perspective. American Psychologist, 47, 723-729.

Tappan, M. (1991). Narrative, authorship, and the development of moral authority. New Directions for Child Development, 54, 5-25.

Tappan, M. & Brown, L. (1989). Stories told and lessons learned: toward a narrative approach to moral development and moral education. Harvard Educational Review, 59, 182-205.

Triandis, H. (1993). Collectivism and individualism as cultural syndromes. Cross-Cultural Research, 27, 155-180.

Vasudev, J., & Hummel, R. (1987). Moral stage sequence and principled reasoning in an Indian sample. Human Development, 30, 105-118.

Walker, L., & Taylor, J. (1991). Family interactions and the development of moral reasoning. Child Development, 62, 264-283.

White, H. (1981). The value of narrativity in the representation of reality. In W. Mitchell (Ed.), On narrative. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Windmiller, M., Lambert, N., & Turiel, E. (1980). Moral development and socialization. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Appendix A

Demographic Information Form

Background Information:

For the purposes of this study, please provide us with the following information about yourself. (This information will be kept strictly confidential.)

Age _______ Sex (M/F) _______ Place of Birth ____________________

What is your cultural or ethnic background? ____________________

Where are your parents from? ____________________

How long have you been living in Canada? ____________________

What religious affiliation do you consider yourself to have? ____________________

Appendix B

Parenting Style Measure

Think back to when you were in high school. Who did you live with?
I lived with:

_______ both my mom and dad
_______ only one of my parents
_______ someone else (e.g., grandmother, aunt)

Please answer the following questions with reference to the time period when you were in high school living at home. To what extent do you agree with each of the following statements as applied to your parents (or the authority figure you were living with)?

-4 = very strongly disagree	**+4 = very strongly agree**	
-3 = strongly disagree	**+3 = strongly agree**	**0 = precisely neutral**
-2 = moderately disagree	**+2 = moderately agree**	
-1 = slightly disagree	**+1 = slightly agree**	

1. _____ I could count on them to help me out, if I had some kind of problem.
2. _____ They kept pushing me to do my best in whatever I did.
3. _____ They kept pushing me to think independently.
4. _____ They helped me with my school work if there was something I didn't understand.
5. _____ When they wanted me to do something, they explained why.
6. _____ When I got a poor grade in school, my parents encouraged me to try harder.
7. _____ When I got a good grade in school, my parents praised me.
8. _____ My parents really knew who my friends were.
9. _____ My parents spent time just talking with me.
10. _____ My family did fun active things together.
11. _____ My parents TRIED to know where I went at night.
12. _____ My parents REALLY knew where I went at night.
13. _____ My parents TRIED to know what I did with my free time.
14. _____ My parents REALLY knew what I did with my free time.
15. _____ My parents TRIED to know where I was most afternoons after school.
16. _____ My parents REALLY knew where I was most afternoons after school

Please check the appropriate answer for the two questions below, with the reference point being the time period when you were in high school and living at home.

In a typical week, the latest my parents let me stay out

On **school nights** (Monday-Thursday) was:

___ Not allowed out
___ Before 8:00 p.m.
___ 8:00 to 8:59 p.m.
___ 9:00 to 9:59 p.m.
___ 10:00 to 10:59 p.m.
___ 11:00 to 11:59 p.m.
___ As late as I want

On **Friday or Saturday** nights was:

___ Not allowed out
___ Before 9:00 p.m.
___ 9:00 to 9:59 p.m.
___ 10:00 to 10:59 p.m.
___ 11:00 to 11:59 p.m.
___ 12:00 to 12:59 a.m.
___ 1:00 to 1:59 a.m.
___ As late as I want

Appendix C

Measure of Moral Development (DIT)

Opinions About Social Problems

This measure is aimed at understanding how people think about social problems. Different people often have different opinions about questions of right and wrong. We would like you to tell us what you think about several problem stories. Here is a story as an example.

Frank Jones has been thinking about buying a car. He is married, has two small children and earns an average income. The car he buys will be his family's only car. It will be used mostly to get to work and drive around town, but sometimes for vacation trips also. In trying to decide what car to buy, Frank Jones realized that there were a lot of questions to consider. Below there is a list of some of these questions.

If you were Frank Jones, how important would each of these questions be in deciding what car to buy?

Instructions for Part A: (Sample Question)

On the left hand side check one of the spaces by each statement of a consideration. (For instance, if you think that statement #1 is not important in making a decision about buying a car, check the space on the right.)

IMPORTANCE:

Great	Much	Some	Little	No	
				✓	1. Whether the car dealer was in the same block as where Frank lives. (Note that in this sample, the person taking the questionnaire did not think this was important in making a decision.)
✓					2. Would a *used car* be more economical in the long run than a *new car*. (Note that a check was put in the far left space to indicate the opinion that this is an important issue in making a decision about buying a car.)
		✓			3. Whether the color was green, Frank's favorite color.
				✓	4. Whether the cubic inch displacement was at least 200. (Note that if you are unsure about what "cubic inch displacement" means, then mark it "no importance.")
✓					5. Would a large, roomy car be better than a compact car.
				✓	6. Whether the front connibilies were differential. (Note that if a statement sounds like gibberish or nonsense to you, mark it "no importance.")

Instructions for Part B: (Sample Question)

From the list of questions above, select the most important one of the whole group. Put the number of the most important question on the top line below. Do likewise for your 2nd, 3rd and 4th most important choices. (Note that the top choices in this case will come from the statements that were checked on the far left-hand side—statements #2 and #5 were thought to be very important. In deciding what is the *most* important, a person would re-read #2 and #6, and then pick one of them as the *most* important, then put the other one as "second most important," and so on.)

MOST	2ND MOST IMPORTANT	3RD MOST IMPORTANT	4TH MOST IMPORTANT
5	2	3	1

HEINZ AND THE DRUG

In Europe a woman was near death from a special kind of cancer. There was one drug that doctors thought might save her. It was a form of radium that a druggist in the same town had recently discovered. The drug was expensive to make, but the druggist was charging ten times what the drug cost to make. He paid $200 for the radium and charged $2,000 for a small dose of the drug. The sick woman's husband, Heinz, went to everyone he knew to borrow the money, but he could only get together about $1,000, which is half of what it cost. He told the druggist that his wife was dying, and asked him to sell it cheaper or let him pay later. But the druggist said, "No, I discovered the drug and I'm going to make money from it." So Heinz got desperate and began to think about breaking into the man's store to steal the drug for his wife.

Should Heinz steal the drug? (Check one)

_____Should steal it   _____Can't decide   _____Should not steal it

IMPORTANCE:

Great	Much	Some	Little	No	
					1. Whether a community's laws are going to be upheld.
					2. Isn't it only natural for a loving husband to care so much for his wife that he'd steal?
					3. Is Heinz willing to risk getting shot as a burglar or going to jail for the chance that stealing the drug might help?
					4. Whether Heinz is a professional wrestler, or has considerable influence with professional wrestlers.
					5. Whether Heinz is stealing for himself or doing this solely to help someone else.
					6. Whether the druggist's rights to his invention have to be respected.
					7. Whether the essence of living is more encompassing than the termination of dying, socially and individually.
					8. What values are going to be the basis for governing how people act towards each other.
					9. Whether the druggist is going to be allowed to hide behind a worthless law which only protects the rich anyhow.
					10. Whether the law in this case is getting in the way of the most basic claim of any member of society.
					11. Whether the druggist deserves to be robbed for being so greedy and cruel.
					12. Would stealing in such a case bring about more total good for the whole society or not.

From the list of questions above, select the four most important:

Most important_____   Second most important_____

Third most important_____   Fourth most important_____

ESCAPED PRISONER

A man had been sentenced to prison for 10 years. After one year, however, he escaped from prison, moved to a new area of the country, and took on the name of Thompson. For 8 years he worked hard, and gradually he saved enough money to buy his own business. He was fair to his customers, gave his employees top wages, and gave most of his own profits to charity. Then one day, Mrs. Jones, an old neighbor, recognized him as the man who had escaped from prison 8 years before, and whom the police had been looking for.

Should Mrs. Jones report Mr. Thompson to the police and have him sent back to prison? (Check one)

____Should report him ____Can't decide ____Should not report him

IMPORTANCE:

Great	Much	Some	Little	No	
					1. Hasn't Mr. Thompson been good enough for such a long time to prove he isn't a bad person?
					2. Everytime someone escapes punishment for a crime, doesn't that just encourage more crime?
					3. Wouldn't we be better off without prisons and the oppression of our legal systems?
					4. Has Mr. Thompson really paid his debt to society?
					5. Would society be failing what Mr. Thompson should fairly expect?
					6. What benefits would prisons be apart from society, especially for a charitable man?
					7. How could anyone be so cruel and heartless as to send Mr. Thompson to prison?
					8. Would it be fair to all the prisoners who had to serve out their full sentences if Mr. Thompson was let off?
					9. Was Mrs. Jones a good friend of Mr. Thompson?
					10. Wouldn't it be a citizen's duty to report an escaped criminal, regardless of the circumstances?
					11. How would the will of the people and the public good best be served?
					12. Would going to prison do any good for Mr. Thompson or protect anybody?

From the list of questions above, select the four most important:

Most important______ Second most important______

Third most important______ Fourth most important______

THE DOCTOR'S DILEMMA

A lady was dying of cancer which could not be cured and she had only about six months to live. She was in terrible pain, but she was so weak that a good dose of pain-killer like morphine would make her die sooner. She was delirious and almost crazy with pain, and in her calm periods, she would ask the doctor to give her enough morphine to kill her. She said she couldn't stand the pain and that she was going to die in a few months anyway.

What should the doctor do? (Check one)

____He should give the lady an overdose that will make her die ______Can't decide ______Should not give the overdose

IMPORTANCE:

Great	Much	Some	Little	No	
					1. Whether the woman's family is in favor of giving her the overdose or not.
					2. Is the doctor obligated by the same laws as everybody else if giving her an overdose would be the same as killing her.
					3. Whether people would be much better off without society regimenting their lives and even their deaths.
					4. Whether the doctor could make it appear like an accident.
					5. Does the state have the right to force continued existence on those who don't want to live.
					6. What is the value of death prior to society's perspective on personal values.
					7. Whether the doctor has sympathy for the woman's suffering or cares more about what society might think.
					8. Is helping to end another's life ever a responsible act of cooperation.
					9. Whether only God should decide when a person's life should end.
					10. What values the doctor has set for himself in his own personal code of behavior.
					11. Can society afford to let everybody end their lives when they want to.
					12. Can society allow suicides or mercy killing and still protect the lives of individuals who want to live.

From the list of questions above, select the four most important:

Most important______ Second most important______

Third most important______ Fourth most important______

Appendix D

Moral Values Task

The following is a list of 10 qualities that people might think are important for them in terms of the kinds of persons that they want to become. For each quality, we've listed a short explanation of what we mean by it too. Please look over this list, and choose the 3 qualities that you consider to be the <u>most</u> important for you in terms of the kind of person that you want to be in your life. Write the 3 qualities that you have chosen on the lines below the list, in order of importance to you.

- **Polite & Courteous** - remember my manners wherever I am
- **Honest/Truthful** - tell the truth; don't cheat or steal from others
- **Careful/Cautious** - so I don't get hurt; don't put myself in danger
- **Fair & Just** - treat all people equally; don't put people down
- **Trustworthy** - do the things I say I'll do; keep promises
- **Ambitious/Hardworking** - try to do my best in the things I do
- **Independent** - stand on my own two feet; have my own opinions even if others disagree
- **Sharing** - share things with others; don't be selfish or greedy
- **Be Open and Communicate** - talk to others about how I feel; discuss problems openly and ask for advice when needed
- **Kind and Caring** - respond to the needs of others; listen to their problems and help them when I can

Three most important qualities to me:	**Parents' Influence:**
1. ______________________________	______
2. ______________________________	______
3. ______________________________	______

Parents are often influential in instilling certain moral values in their children. Please look at the above 3 qualities that you have selected to be most important for you, and give a rating of the extent to which *your* parents have influenced your views of each of these qualities. Use the following scale to give your ratings.

1 <--> 5
not at all   very much so

Appendix E

Protocol for obtaining moral narratives

(To be conducted after the moral values task and before the parenting style measure)

Script: That's really great. Thanks for your help with that. Now what I want you to do is to refer to the three values that you just selected as being most important to you. Could you take a few minutes and think about a specific situation or incident in the past when your parents taught you about the importance of one of those values?

(Pause for participant to think of incident. If he/she appears confused, ask: Do you understand what I mean?)

Could you tell me about this situation and what happened exactly?

How do you feel about this incident or experience now?

(Probe if unclear: How does this story illustrate the quality ______________?)

How were your parents involved in this incident?

Why do you think your parents responded in the way that they did?

Do/Did you agree with them?

Appendix F

Coding scheme used to score moral narratives

The "voice" dimension describes the extent to which the child resonates with the parents' beliefs and values - i.e., the extent to which the child takes up and builds on the "voices" of the parents.

Possible indicators of parental voice might include:

- Literal evidence - i.e., explicit references to parents' beliefs, values, etc. ("My father has always said..." vs. no such references)
- Statements that corroborate or contradict parents' beliefs, values, parenting styles ("My mother has always given me really good advice about..." vs. "I don't usually like the way my mother..")
- Emotional/affective overtones, such as pleasure/satisfaction with family life or avoidance of issues and/or sense of loneliness and yearning for parent ("I know I can always count on my parents to..." vs. "My parents aren't around all that much, so we don't often talk about things like this")

Specific categories are summarized as follows:

1 The child completely fails to articulate parents' voice, or actively resists or rejects it in strong terms.

2 Minimal (if any) indication of parents' voice, but it's either passively resisted or complied with; sense that there's a lack of parental investment or support.

3 Clear evidence of parents' voice (direct statements or references to dialogue), but only implicit accommodation to it; sense that parents' input or support isn't very consistent or strong.

4 Clear evidence of parents' voice and explicit accommodation or responsiveness to it, but it's not truly internalized or not an exemplary case.

5 Parents' voice is clearly internalized; articulated co-construction; sense of shared investment; capacity to differ from parents, respectfully.

Adolescent narrative - voice scale:

Weak...Strong
1 3 5

Appendix G

Examples of Coded Narratives

Excerpts from a narrative coded as '1'

[Could you tell me about the situation and what happened then?]

"The first time I was dating, and my mom didn't like the guy. But, she didn't, like, tell me she didn't like him and she just go to my uncle and tell him, like, why she didn't like the guy and what's she feel. And, then, my uncle called me and just, like, say I'm wrong and I did something wrong and make my mom very angry. And, I was very upset because I think that she should talk to me instead. She should, like, tell me what she feel...So, I think, like, communicate is very important."

[So, how do you feel about that incident now, looking back?]

" ...before she understand a person or she know a person, she just, like, make many comments on the person, so I didn't like that. So, sometimes, I just, like, didn't want to tell her anything happening to me. But, I still think that communication is very important, but I seldom communicate with her."

[Do you agree with the way she handled it?]

"No."

Excerpts from a narrative coded as '3'

[Could you tell me about the situation and what happened exactly?]

" Okay. Well, this summer, I was hanging around with a group of kids that, well, my parents would consider bad kids. Like, I would go over to their apartment - not every night but often - and they're like, I guess most of them don't do well at school or basically quit school or kicked out of school. And, you know, they drink a lot. They do drugs and...So, like we got into some big arguments and they took away my car privilege. And, so basically I couldn't drive anywhere that I wanted to."

[How does this story illustrate 'careful and cautious'?]

" ...and, well, my dad doesn't really know how to talk to us. He basically just yells at you. And, a lot of times, I just yell back at him. So, it doesn't really get anywhere."

[So, do you agree with the fact that they were trying to encourage you to be careful and cautious?]

" Yeah, yeah. I just don't really like the way, like, my dad approaches things. Like, well, he still thinks, like, I'm a kid or something, you know."

Excerpts from a narrative coded as '5'

[How does this story illustrate the quality ambitious and hardworking to you?]

"Well, to me, I guess...Like, it showed us that, he taught us that part, like the achievement, I think. To be a good hockey player, to be the best you can be, you have to work hard at it. You can't just go out, play games, and think you're gonna be the best person, like, the best athlete out there. You really have to work at it and build up your skills, and even when you want to give up, you should keep on going. Like, if you're studying, studying late, and you want to go to bed, but you just have to stay up to learn it for your exam, type thing. So, it works in all aspects."

[Do you agree with the way your dad instilled that value?]

"Oh, yeah. I definitely agree. I think that was a major factor in, all through...Like, I have a sister, too, and three of us have always been involved in sports and we all do well in school. And, we're all in university and my brother went on to play Junior A hockey, too. So, I guess it all paid off.

Appendix H

Table of Correlations Involving Age and Length of Residence

Ethnicity	Control Variables	Study Measures			
		Authoritativeness	Voice	DIT	Parental Influence
Chinese-Canadian	Age	.16	-.01	-.01	-.10
	Length of Residence	-.05	.19	.02	.07
European-Canadian	Age	-.28*	-.19	.14	-.15
	Length of Residence	-.28*	-.19	.13	-.15
Overall Sample	Age	-.11	-.11	.07	-.15
	Length of Residence	.33*	.22	.11	.16

Note: * $p < .05$

Appendix I

Gender Differences In Selection of Moral Values

Moral Value	Males (%)	Females (%)
polite/courteous	21.1	15.6
honest/truthful	39.5	53.1
careful/cautious	10.5	3.1
fair/just	28.9	25.0
trustworthy	39.5	21.9
ambitious/hardworking	55.3	51.6
independent	42.1	39.1
sharing	7.9	7.8
be open/communicate	13.2	23.4
kind/caring	42.1	60.9

Note: Percentages reflect proportion of participants who selected the value as one of three most important

Appendix J

Introduction to Study

Thank you for your interest in this study, which is a research project designed to measure the way adolescents and young adults think about issues of right and wrong, and how this may be influenced by family background and culture. This project is being conducted by Wanna Mar and Dr. Michael Pratt of the Psychology Department at Wilfrid Laurier University.

If you choose to participate in this study, we will be asking you to complete a questionnaire and a short interview. The entire procedure will only take about 45 minutes to an hour of your time. The questionnaire will contain several measures, which include questions concerning moral values, how your parents approach child-rearing, and moral reasoning. For the interview, you will be asked to remember and tell a story about an instance when your parents tried to teach you about the importance of a particular moral value. Your story will be tape-recorded. You should bear in mind that there are no right or wrong answers in responding to any of the questions on the questionnaire or interview. We are simply interested in the views that you have about your upbringing and moral issues in general.

Please be assured that all of the information obtained in this research project will be treated confidentially. No names will be used on any of the questionnaires or on any of the tape recordings. You will not be identified by name anywhere in the study. The interview tapes will be erased once they have been transcribed for the purposes of data analysis. Please understand that participation is entirely up to you. You are also free to discontinue participation in this study at any time, or refuse to answer any particular question, without loss of benefits. If you do choose to participate, we will provide an honorarium of $5 to you in recognition of your participation, or 1 bonus credit.[8]

If you have decided to participate, please read and sign the attached consent form.

---

[8] For Chinese-Canadian participants recruited through the Chinese Student Association, this sentence read: "If you choose to participate, we will provide an honorarium of $5 on your behalf to your association."