

[Barry University](#)  
[Institutional Repository](#)

[Theses and Dissertations](#)

2017

The effects of culture on parenting styles and psychological well-being: American versus Saudi Arabian students

Salwa Bazaid

Barry University

The Effects of Culture on Parenting Styles and Psychological Well-Being:  
American versus Saudi Arabian Students

By

Salwa Bazaid, B.A

A THESIS

Submitted to the Faculty of  
Barry University in Partial fulfillment  
of the requirements for the degree of  
Master of Science

Miami Shores, Florida

December 6, 2017

## **Acknowledgments**

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to Gad who provided me with the strength to finish my master's thesis. Thanks to Dr. Koncsol who helped me a lot during my journey. I cannot thank enough my family for all kinds of support especially my husband who always encourages me and cares about me, and my parents who provided me with the opportunity to complete this chapter of my life. Also, I would like to thank my brothers for supporting me all the time. My greatest appreciation to my husband, my baby, my parents, my brothers for everything that they have done for me. I cannot imagine my life without them. whatever I say, I cannot express my feelings and love for them.

## شكر وتقدير

أنتقدم بالشكر والامتنان لله سبحانه وتعالى الذي امدني بالقوة لانهي رساله الماجستير. اشكر د. كونسول على مساعدته المستمرة لي خلال رحلتي العلمية. لن استطيع تقديم الشكر الكافي لعائلتي الذين قدموا لي جميع أنواع الدعم خاصة زوجي الذي دائما مايشجعني ويهتم لأمرى و والدي الذين اتاحوا لي الفرصة لإنهاء هذا الفصل من حياتي. ولن انسى شكر أخواني على دعمهم لي طوال الوقت. امتناني العظيم لزوجي وابني ووالدي واخواني على كل شيء قدموه لي. لا أستطيع تخيل حياتي بدونهم. مهما قلت لن أستطيع التعبير عن مشاعري وحبى لهم.

The Effects of Culture on Parenting Styles and Psychological Well-Being:  
American versus Saudi Arabian Students

### **Introduction**

Parents are the major influence on their children's lives. Parents raise and teach their children the rules of life by using a parenting style. Parenting styles are constructed of psychological attitudes resulting in specific strategies that parents use while raising their children. Parenting styles are complicated and require many different skills that work in concert to influence a child's behavior. Parental responsibilities start after the birth of the child, and go on to impact the child's entire life. Parents develop their parenting styles mostly based on their cultures. Culture influences social norms including the way parents socialize their children. Parenting behaviors and actions that are appropriate in one culture might be inappropriate in another culture.

Diane Baumrind was one of the first psychologists who defined parenting styles and created a new system for classifying them. Diana Baumrind's theory (1991) about parenting identifies three distinctive styles that cover different parenting techniques worldwide. She named these styles: authoritarian, authoritative, and permissive. Authoritarian parents interact with their children with low warmth and utilize a strict disciplinary style. In contrast, authoritative parents interact with their children with a high warmth and utilize non-punitive discipline. Also, authoritative parents share reasons behind rules with their children. Permissive parents interact with their children with a high acceptance i.e., low discipline and utilize low parental supervision. Permissive parents are usually consulting with children about how discipline should be exercised. It

has been speculated that the choice of parenting style determines parenting behavior (Baumrind, 1966).

People from different cultures use different parenting styles. Some cultures tend to use an authoritarian parenting style predominantly while other cultures tend to exhibit an authoritative parenting style. Interestingly authoritative parenting style differs across cultures. In Western countries, authoritative parenting has certain democratic practices, such as taking children's preferences into account when making family plans, or encouraging children to express their own opinions. However, a cross-cultural study of parenting styles in four countries found that authoritative parents in China and Russia did not take their children's preferences into account when making family plans and did not encourage children to state their own opinions (Robinson, et al 1996).

Recently, researchers have become interested in factors that affect individuals' psychological well-being. Certainly, parenting style has its long-term effects on physical as well as psychological development. One long term effect of psychological development among others is psychological well-being. One of the most important factors that affects individuals' psychological health and well-being is the parenting style individuals are raised under. Psychological health is dependent on positive aspects such as positive cognitions and emotions. According to Ryff (1989a) psychological well-being is a dynamic concept that includes subjective, social, and psychological dimensions, as well as, health-related behaviors. Ryff crafted six dimensions of psychological well-being and developed a research scale that is used by people who are interested in studying psychological well-being. Ryff's dimensions of positive psychological health are: self-

acceptance, positive relations with others, autonomy, environmental mastery, purpose in life, and personal growth (Ryff, 1989b).

It is essential to study the impact of differing parenting styles across cultures and whether these differences affect children's psychological well-being. Discovering these effects will increase the understanding of the influence of parenting practices on children's psychological well-being. Research supports how different parenting styles might affect different emotional outcomes in children. However, there is not enough research on how different parenting styles across cultures affect children's psychological well-being. Therefore, the focus of this study is to explore the relationship between culture, perceived parenting style, and psychological well-being.

The remainder of this section critically reviews the literature on parenting styles in an attempt to help formulate an understanding of their effects on children's psychological well-being. A review of contemporary by cross cultural studies regarding how child-centrism affects parental well-being also follows. Studies are reviewed regarding certain key factors that affect psychological well-being, such as: family environment, attachment style, resultant self-esteem, and resultant life satisfaction. The literature review contains a summary and critique of past literature, followed by a discussion of the specific research questions and hypotheses requiring future research suggested by the lack of current research on the relationship between parenting styles and psychological well-being across cultures.

## Literature Review

### Parenting Styles and Psychological Well-Being

In 2011, Lavasani, Borhanzadeh, Afzali, and Hejazi conducted a study aimed at examining the relationship between parenting styles, the conception of perceived parenting, and social support on teenagers' psychological well-being using Baumrind's theory (1991) of parenting styles. The participants were 398 female students from a high school in Tehran, Iran. The study used three scales: *Questionnaires of Parenting Styles* (Baumrind, 1991), *Social Support Questionnaire* (Vaux et al., 1988), and *Ryff's Psychological Well-Being Scale* (Ryff, 1989b). First, the *Questionnaires of Parenting Styles* (Baumrind, 1991) was adopted based on Baumrind's theory of permissive, authoritarian, and authoritative behavioral models. This scale has 30 items, each of the three styles has ten items. Second, the *Social Support Questionnaire* (Vaux et al., 1988) has 23 items and three sub-scales (Vaux et al., 1988). The sub-scales focus on family and friends and have seven items each. The remaining questions measure social support. This scale has good reliability and validity.

Third, the *Ryff's Psychological Well-Being Scale* (Ryff, 1989b) was used to review the teenagers' psychological well-being. This scale contains 84 items with 6 minor scales. The minor scales have a 6-point Likert-scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. Each scale has 14 items where the psychological well-being is measured using Ryff's model which includes: self-acceptance, environmental mastery, positive relationship with others, purpose in life, personal growth and autonomy subscales. The researchers found a negative relationship between having authoritarian and permissive parenting styles and psychological well-being. In contrast, there was a

positive relationship between authoritative parenting style and psychological well-being (Lavasani et al., 2011).

In 2012, Han and Grogan-Kaylor conducted a study aimed at examining the relationship between parenting practices, youth psychological well-being, and an array of adolescent psychological outcomes in South Korea. This study used longitudinal information that investigated some of the key variables related to the mental health of Korean students. The study used archival data from five waves of the *Korea Youth Panel Survey (KYPS)* (Khang, Cho, Yang, & Lee, 2005). The researchers used 3,263 youth (13,121 time–youth observations). This study was made by the National Youth Policy Institute in South Korea (2012). The original survey included 3,449 second-year middle school students and their parents using stratified multi-staged cluster sampling. Participants were observed for five years from 2003 until 2008. The main survey, the prospective panel survey, had information on youth demographics, career aspirations, risk-taking behavior, family SES and parenting, mental conditions, school performance, and neighborhood conditions.

The researchers used five scales that were created by the National Youth Policy Institute in South Korea: Confidence/Self-Esteem, Depressive/Anxious Symptoms, Aggressive Behavior, School Adaptability, and Collective Efficacy (Han & Grogan-Kaylor, 2012). First, the Confidence/Self-Esteem scale had six sub-questions that measured positive self-perception, self-worth, and self-confidence for youth. This scale had 5 point options (1 = strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree). An example item is “I think that I am a competent person.” Second, the Depressive/Anxious Symptoms scale had six items that measure negative self-perception and internalizing problems that

affected the youth's internal psychological environment. An example item is "I am often indifferent or uninterested in anything." Third, the Aggressive Behavior scale had six questions that measure the performance of youth aggressive behaviors. An example item is "I may hit other people when I feel annoyed." Fourth, the School Adaptability scale has five items that measure the youth's adaptation in school. This scale has a response of 5 point options (1 = very untrue and 5 = very true). Examples included "I am in good terms with friends at school," "I am in good terms with school teachers". Fifth, the Collective Efficacy scale had four questions that measure trust, closeness, as well as the relationship between neighbors. This scale had a 5-point option. An example is "My neighbors trust each other." Results indicated that parental warmth protected children from engaging in aggressive behaviors or feeling depressed and made them raise their self-confidence. However, hateful parenting was related to aggressive behaviors and the symptoms of depression. Positive self-perception was a result of parents' motoring. Finally, the environmental factors such as schools or neighborhoods had a relationship with the youth mental health in South Korea.

In 2013, Ashton-James, Kushlev, and Dunn conducted a study that aimed at examining the relationship between "child-centric" parenting and psychological well-being (positive affect and negative affect and meaning) that parents derived from their children. The term child-centric in this study meant that parents were motivated to maximize their child's well-being and were willing to give the allocation of their temporal, emotional, financial, and attentional resources to their children rather than themselves. There were two studies that investigated the relationship between child-centrism and the psychological well-being that parents derived from their children. The

first study wanted to provide validation for a newly developed child-centrism scale and test the relationship between child-centrism and global happiness and the sense of meaning in life that parents derive from parenthood. The second study used the day reconstruction method (DRM; Kahneman et al., 2004) to examine the relationship between child-centrism and parents' happiness and the meaning that they experienced while taking care of their children.

The participants in the first *Child-Centrism Scale* development study were 136 parents with at least one child 18 years old living with them. The parents completed a survey online. This study used four scales: *Child-Centrism Scale* (Ashton-James, Kushlev, & Dunn, 2013), *Behaviors Reflecting Investment and Sacrifice Scale* (Ashton-James, Kushlev, & Dunn, 2013), *Highly Involved Parenting Styles* (Nelson, 2010), and *Parental Well-Being Scale* (Lyubomirsky & Lepper, 1999). First, the *Child-Centrism Scale* (Ashton-James, Kushlev, & Dunn, 2013) had 7 items which reflect attitudes and behaviors characteristic of child-centric parents as conceptualized in the present research. Second, *Behaviors Reflecting Investment and Sacrifice Scale* (Ashton-James, Kushlev, & Dunn, 2013) measured the time that the parents spend with their children. The scale also asked the parents what they would do if their children were away for a week. In addition, the scale measured the financial commitment, and the parents' sacrifice for their children. Third, *Highly Involved Parenting Styles Scale* (Nelson, 2010) had statements that measure "the frequency of helicopter", "little emperor", "tiger moms", or "concerted cultivation" parenting styles. Finally, the *Parental Well-Being Scale* tested the overall happiness and meaning that the parents feel with their children. The results of the study indicated that there was a relationship between the time the parents spent with their

children (e.g. thinking and talking about them) and the financial resources that parents reported dedicating to their children. Also, there was a positive relationship between child-centrism, helicopter parenting and little emperor parenting. A significant correlation was found between child-centrism, subjective happiness and the sense of meaning in life reported by parent.

The second study had a total of 186 parents with at least one child 18 years old living with them. A total of 66 participants completed the survey about their daily experiences in person at public places in British Columbia, Canada, and 120 participants did the survey about parenting and happiness online. In this study, a modified version of the day reconstruction method DRM (a survey method for characterizing daily life experience) was used to capture parents' experiences of happiness and meaning in life while taking care of their children (DRM; Kahneman et al., 2004). First, parents were shown a film with parent-child activities. They were then asked how they would promptly handle the activities depending on the film. After that, participants indicated the type of activity they engaged in with their children and how each participant affected the meaning in their life. By asking participants to rate the extent to which they felt happy and warm during the scenario, researchers measured Positive Affect (PA). Next, the researchers took the average of the ratings of the frustrated or annoyed, hassled or pushed around, depressed or blue, worried or anxious, angry or hostile scenario, this average measured the Negative Affect (NA). They asked the participants to rate the extent to which they felt a sense of purpose and meaning in life during the negative activity in order to measure life meaning. The result was child-centric parents reported high levels of Positive Affect (PA) when taking care of their children, but not through the rest of the

day. The result showed a negative relationship between child-centrism and the Negative Affect (NA) that the parents experienced when taking care of children. Child-centric parents reported higher levels of meaning when taking care of their children, whereas child-centrism was not significantly associated with the average level of meaning parents experienced throughout the rest of their day (Ashton-James, Kushlev, & Dunn, 2013)

In 2014, Schiffrin, Liss, Miles-McLean, Geary, Erchull, and Tashner conducted a study that aimed at examining the effect of parenting styles (over-controlling and supportive) on the psychological well-being of college students. The participants were 297 undergraduate students from a public liberal arts college in the Mid-Atlantic region of the United States. Participants' ages ranged between 18 to 23 years old. They were from different races. The participants were in three groups. Participants who did the survey in the university lab were from a general psychology course. Other students were from the higher level psychology courses, and earned extra credit. The last group was college students who did the survey in the social media network. This study used self-determination theory SDT (Deci & Ryan 2008; Ryan & Deci 2000; Soenens & Vansteenkiste 2010). SDT states the three important things that humans need for developing healthy lives are: autonomy, competence, and relatedness. Individuals would be life satisfied if they meet all three needs. However, parents over-controlling behaviors can affect these needs negatively.

In this study, the five scales were used: the *Helicopter Parenting and Autonomy Supportive Behaviors Scale* (Bronson & Merryman, 2009), the *Basic Needs Satisfaction in General Scale* (Deci & Ryan n.d.; Johnston & Finney 2010), the *Satisfaction with Life Scale* (Diener et al. 1985), the *Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale*

(Radloff, 1977), and the *Anxiety Subscale of Depression the Hospital Anxiety Scale* (Zigmond & Snaith, 1983). First, the *Helicopter Parenting and Autonomy Supportive Behaviors Scale* (Bronson & Merryman, 2009) has 7-point Likert agreement scrod which students should use to answer statements about their mother's parenting behaviors. Second, the *Basic Needs Satisfaction in General Scale (BNSG-S)* (Deci & Ryan n.d.; Johnston & Finney 2010) has 21 items used to measure students' autonomy, competence, and relatedness needs (Deci & Ryan n.d.; Johnston & Finney 2010). Third, the *Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS)* (Diener et al. 1985) has five statements that measure the students' life satisfaction (Diener et al. 1985). Fourth is the *Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale (CES-D)* (Radloff, 1977) that has 20 items about depressive symptoms in non-clinical populations (Radloff, 1977). Fifth, the *Anxiety Subscale of the Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale (HAD)* (Zigmond & Snaith, 1983) has seven items which are used to measure the general state of students' anxiety (Zigmond & Snaith, 1983). The results indicated that there was a relationship between the over-controlling parents and high levels of anxiety and depression and less life satisfaction. This study found that the negative result of helicopter parenting on the students' well-being was the result of the consistent violation of the students' basic psychological needs for autonomy and competence (Schiffrin et al., 2014).

### **Parenting Styles across Cultures**

In 2011, Bornstein, Putnick, and Lansford conducted a study aimed at evaluating similarities and differences between parents' attributions and attitudes in nine countries. The participants were 1133 mothers and fathers of children from 7 to 10 years old from nine countries: 239 from China, 108 from Colombia, 177 from Italy, 112 from Jordan,

100 from Kenya, 95 from the Philippines, 77 from Sweden, 87 from Thailand, and 138 from the United States. Parents completed a demographic questionnaire that was translated into their language. The questionnaire assessed two parenting measures and social desirability bias.

The researchers focused on the differences in cultural attributions and attitudes using the *Parent Attribution Test* (Bugental & Shennum, & Shaver, 1984), *Parental Modernity Inventory* (Schaefer & Edgerton, 1985), and *Social Desirability Scale* (Reynolds, 1982). The *Parent Attribution Test* (Bugental & Shennum, & Shaver, 1984) has 24 items that measure how parents lead their children to succeed or fail. Participants respond to items by using a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1(not at all important) to 7 (very important) on how important factors, such as the child's disposition and the parent's behavior were in determining the quality of the interaction. Each item presents a statement, such as "Suppose you took care of a neighbor's child one afternoon, and the two of you had a really good time together." This measurement has four subscales: attributions regarding uncontrollable success, such as "how lucky you were in just having everything work out well"; attributions regarding adult-controlled failure, such as "whether you used the wrong approach for this child"; attributions regarding child-controlled failure and, such as "the extent to which the child was stubborn and resisted your efforts"; and perceived control over failure (Bugental & Shennum, & Shaver, 1984).

The *Parental Modernity Inventory* (Schaefer & Edgerton, 1985) measures the parents' attitudes about childrearing and education. It has 30 statements. Participants respond to items using a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree). This instrument has three subscales: progressive attitudes, such as

“Children have a right to their own point of view and should be allowed to express it.”; authoritarian attitudes, such as “The most important thing to teach children is absolute obedience to their parents.”; and modernity of childrearing attitudes, calculated as the difference between the progressive attitudes score and the authoritarian attitudes score (Schaefer & Edgerton, 1985). Finally, in order to assess parents’ possible social desirability bias, the *Social Desirability Scale* (Reynolds, 1982) was used. It has 13 items, such as “I’m always willing to admit when I make a mistake,” which are rated as true or false (Reynolds, 1982).

The results indicated that mothers of all cultures had progressive parenting attitudes and modernity of childrearing attitudes. In contrast, fathers of all cultures had authoritarian attitudes. Only in Italy, did mothers have uncontrollable success attributions more than fathers, while in Sweden and the United States, mothers had adult-controlled failure attributions less than fathers. (Bornstein, Putnick, & Lansford, 2011)

In 2012, a study was conducted by Soenensa, Parkb, Vansteenkistea, and Mouratidisc which aimed at examining the association between perceived dependency-oriented psychological control (DPC) and achievement-oriented psychological control (APC) dimensions of personality and their relationship to parents from two cultures were used Korea versus Belgium vulnerability to depression. Dependency-oriented psychological control is using pressure to make children remain within close emotional and physical proximity. Parents who have high scores high on dependency-oriented psychological control (DPC) use psychologically controlling tactics when children distance themselves too much from them. On the other hand, achievement-oriented psychological control (APC) is using pressure to push children to excel in performance-

relevant situations. Parents who have high scores on APC engage in intrusive tactics when their children do not set high standards for achievement or fail to achieve those standards. This research used the cognitive theory of Moshe M. Blatt (Blatt & Homann, 1992). Blatt's theory is based on the study of parent-child interactions and considers how particular types of parent-child interaction patterns can create a vulnerability to depression in adulthood, with the assumption that disruptions of the attachment relationship with parents can lead to impaired mental representations of the care-giving relationships. These impaired cognitive schemas are thought to interact with particular current psychological experiences and life events, which then immediately causes or precipitates depression. When parents pressure children to be dependent, by withdrawing their love, children are likely to become insecure about their ability as independent persons. Instead, they may become worried about losing other people's approval and love, and engage in a clinging interpersonal style to keep people close to them. Similarly, when parents pressure children to achieve high standards, children are likely to develop a self-critical orientation to their personality (Blatt & Homann, 1992).

The participants in the Belgian sample were 290 high-school students. Their ages ranged between 14 and 18 years old. Participants in the South Korean sample were 321 high-school students. Their ages ranged between 15 and 18 years. The materials used in this study were translated from English to Dutch and Korean. The researchers used four scales: *Psychological Control Scale* (Soenens et al., 2010), the *Depressive Experiences Questionnaire for Adolescents* (Blatt, Schaffer, Bers, & Quinlan, 1992), *Psychological Control Scale-Youth Self-Report Scale* (Barber, 1996), and the *Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale* (Radloff, 1977).

First, the *Psychological Control Scale* (Soenens et al., 2010) has nine items. An example item on the dependency-oriented psychological control DPC sub scale is “My mother or father is only friendly with me if I rely on her or him instead of on my friends”. An example item on the achievement-oriented psychological control APC sub scale is “My mother /father makes me feel guilty if my performance is inferior”. Participants respond to items using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) (Soenens et al., 2010). Second the *Psychological Control Scale-Youth Self-Report Scale* (Barber, 1996) has eight items. Participants respond to items using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) A sample item reads: “My mother/father is always trying to change how I feel or think about things” (Barber, 1996). Third, the *Depressive Experiences Questionnaire for Adolescents* (Blatt, Schaffer, Bers, & Quinlan, 1992) has 66 items that measure tapping into dependency self-criticism, and efficacy. Participants respond to the items using a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (totally disagree) to 7 (totally agree). An example item is: “Without support from others who are close to me, I would feel helpless” (Blatt, Schaffer, Bers, & Quinlan, 1992). Fourth, the *Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale* (Radloff, 1977), has 20 items in the original, but in this study, the researchers used the brief 12-item version (Radloff, 1977). An example items is “I felt depressed.” Participants indicated how many times they felt the depressive symptoms during the past week. Participants respond to items using a 4-point Likert scale ranging from 0 (none of the time) to 3 (most of the time) (Radloff, 1977; Roberts & Sobhan,1992).

The results of a path analysis showed that the two samples have similar relationships between the domains of psychological control, depressive symptoms, and

depressive personality. There were few differences between the countries in rating parents' expressions of psychological control. A perception of dependency-oriented psychological control DPC was related to dependency and a perception of achievement-oriented psychological control APC was related to self-criticism. On the other hand, dependency and self-criticism had associations with depression and represented significant intervening variables in association with perceived parenting and adolescent depressive symptoms. The results showed that the mechanisms and developmental processes associated with the two expressions of psychological control operate in similar ways across cultures. Also, the researchers supported the hypothesis that psychologically controlling parenting affects basic and fundamental human needs for relatedness, competence, and autonomy. In short, the findings are in line with the notion that the developmental effects of psychological control generalize across cultures (Soenens et al., 2012).

In 2012, a study was conducted by Akhtar aimed at examining the effect of parenting styles on the attachment styles of the undergraduate students. The participants were 200 undergraduate students from India (100 male and 100 female). Their ages ranged between 15 to 18 years old. This research was based on Baumrind's theory (1971) of three parenting styles: authoritarian, permissive, and authoritative. This study used two scales: the *Parental Authority Questionnaire* (Buri, 1991) and the *Adults Attachment Scale* (Collins & Reed, 1990).

First, the *Parental Authority Questionnaire* (Buri, 1991) has 30 items that measure parenting style in terms of authority and disciplinary practices from the child's point of view. Participants respond to items using a 5-point Likert-type format: 1-strongly

disagree, 2- disagree, 3-undecided, 4-agree, 5-strongly agree. The 30 items were divided to three subscales. Each has 10 statements (Buri, 1991). Second, the *Adult Attachment Scale* (Collins & Reed, 1990) has 18 items which measure three dimensions of attachment styles: secure, anxious, and avoidant. Participants respond to items using a 5-point Likert-type format: 1-strongly disagree, 2- disagree, 3-undecided, 4-agree, 5-strongly agree (Collins & Reed, 1990). The results indicated that there was a significant relationship between authoritarian parenting style of parents and anxious attachment style of students. Permissive parenting style of fathers and mothers had a significant relationship with avoidant and anxious attachment style. There was no significant relationship between authoritative parenting style and any of the attachment styles (Akhtar, 2012).

### **Attachment Style and Psychological Well-Being**

Psychological well-being has been examined in the literature in a myriad of ways. In 2010, a study by Galea, aimed at testing the relationship between the family environment and the impact of childhood abuse on the island of Malta. The study attempted to determine consequences of abuse trauma on one's subjective well-being. This study used John Bowlby's attachment theory which indicates that the reason for psychological avoidance is child abuse (Bowlby, 1969). Children need attachment throughout their lives. Failure of attachment is related to family conflicts. Childhood maltreatment seems to have a greater amount to family system in Western countries.

The family system in Western countries is associated with childhood maltreatment. A total of 800 undergraduate students from the Mediterranean island of

Malta participated in this study. There were 214 female and 98 male. Their ages range from 18 to 25 years old.

The researcher used three scales: the *Family Environment Scale* (Moos & Moos, 1986), the *Satisfaction with Life Scale* (Diener, Emmons, Randy & Griffin, 1985), and the *Childhood Trauma Questionnaire* (Bernstein et al., 1994). First, the *Family Environment Scale (FES)* (Moos & Moos, 1986) has 90 items that measure the social and environmental characteristics of families (Moos & Moos, 1986). This questionnaire has three subscales: Relationship, which measures supporting family members; Personal Growth, which measures independence, and System-Maintenance Dimension, which measures the structure in planning family activities and responsibilities. Secondly, the *Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS)* (Diener, Emmons, Randy & Griffin, 1985) has five items that measure life satisfaction and cognitive well-being (Diener, Emmons, Randy & Griffin, 1985). Third, the *Childhood Trauma Questionnaire* (Bernstein et al., 1994), which contains 28 items, and measures the history of child abuse (Bernstein et al., 1994). It contains five subscales: emotional abuse, physical abuse, sexual abuse, emotional neglect, and physical neglect. The participants were randomly selected, and received the questionnaire by mail. The study found that families with a history of child abuse were: less loving, less socially integrated, less organized, and had many conflicts. It also showed that the family environment plays an important role in children's holistic development and psycho-emotional well-being (Galea, 2010).

In 2010, Öztürk and Mutlu conducted a study aimed at examining the relationship between subjective well-being, attachment style, happiness in a relationship, and social anxiety between university students. A scanning model (Brown and Weiner, 1985) was

used in this research. According to Brown and Weiner(1985), the environmental scanning is model defined as "a kind of radar to scan the world systematically and signal the new, the unexpected, the major and the minor signals. Participates were 305 students from Eskiúehir Osmangazi University in Turkey. This study used three scales: *Interaction and Audience Anxiousness Scale* (Öztürk, 2009), the *Subjective Well-Being Scale* (Dost, 2006), and the *Relationship Happiness Questionnaire* (Çelik, 2004). First, *Interaction and Audience Anxiousness Scale* (Öztürk, 2009) has 15 items that measure social anxiety levels of university students. Participants respond to items using a 5-point Likert-type format: 1- not at all, 2- slightly, 3-moderately, 4-very, 5-extremely characteristic of me. An example item is "I often feel nervous even in casual get-togethers" (Öztürk, 2009). Second, the *Subjective Well-Being Scale* (Dost, 2006) has 46 items that measure the subjective well-being of the students. Participants respond to items using a 5-point Likert-type format: 1- disagree, 2- somewhat agree, 3-agree, 4- mostly agree, 5-fully agree (Dost, 2006).

Third, the *Relationship Happiness Questionnaire* (Çelik, 2004). has six items that measure the perceptions of : love, happiness, relationship stability, seriousness of problems, and general satisfaction. Participants respond to items using a 7-point Likert-scales ranging from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree." An example item is "My relationship with my partner makes me happy" (Çelik, 2004).

Results indicated that there was no significant relationship between social anxiety and happiness in relationships. Also, there were negative relationships between subjective well-being and social anxiety, and subjective well-being and interaction anxiety. There was a positive correlation between subjective well-being and happiness in relationships.

Moreover, preoccupied, fearful and dismissing attached students' social anxiety level is higher than secure attached students' social anxiety level. Lower levels of subjective well-being were found among the socially anxious students (Öztürk & Mutlu, 2010).

In 2011, Yamawaki, Nelson, and Omori conducted a study aimed at testing the mediating roles of self-esteem and life satisfaction in the relationship between parental bonding and psychological well-being in Japanese young adults. The participants were 682 undergraduate students from private universities in Japan (358 women and 324 men). Their ages range between 18 to 40 years old. The materials that were used in this study were translated from English to Japanese.

This study used four scales: the *Parental Bonding Instrument* (Parker et al., 1979), the *Rosenberg's Self-Esteem Scale* (RSES; Rosenberg, 1965), the *Satisfaction with Life Scale* (Diener et al., 1985), and the *General Health Questionnaire-12* (Doi & Minowa, 2003). The *Parental Bonding Instrument (PBI)* (Parker et al., 1979) has 25 items with two subscales: care and over-protection. Twelve items measured the care subscale, and thirteen items measured the over-protection subscale (Parker et al., 1979). Participants answered the questions about how their parents treat them. Respondents answer on a 7-point scale from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (7). A high score on the over-protection subscale indicates that parents are over-controlling. Second, the *Rosenberg's Self-Esteem Scale* (RSES; Rosenberg, 1965) contains 10 items that have five degrees of agreements (RSES; Rosenberg, 1965). The high score means that the person has a high level of self-esteem. Third, the *Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS)* (Diener et al., 1985) has five items that assess the cognitive-judgmental component of subjective well-being (Diener et al., 1985). Respondents answer on a 7-point scale from strongly

disagree (1) to strongly agree (7). A high score indicates a high level of life satisfaction. Fourth, the *General Health Questionnaire-12 (GHQ-12)* (Doi & Minowa, 2003) has 12 items used to measure non-psychiatric disorders, general mental health, and levels of happiness, depression, anxiety, and sleep disturbance (Doi & Minowa, 2003). The participants evaluated their psychological well-being for the past month. A high score means the person has a high level of psychological stress.

Participants were told by the researchers the purpose of the study, and they would remain anonymous. Then they were asked to answer the questionnaires. Most of them completed the questionnaires in 40 minutes. The results indicated that self-esteem and life satisfaction mediate the relationship between parental care and general mental health in Japanese college students. Also, low parental care was associated with low self-esteem. Low life satisfaction was associated with poor psychological well-being. There was a relationship between self-esteem, optimal bonding (high parental care/low overprotectiveness) and general mental health. However, life satisfaction did not mediate to the relationship between over-protectiveness and general mental health (Yamawaki, Nelson, & Omori, 2011).

### **Individualism versus Collectivism**

Groundbreaking research on cultural differences began in the 1980s under Hans C Triandis (Triandis 1983). Initially Triandis created the terms *idiocentrism* and *allocentrism* to describe two opposing cultural belief systems manifested by two personality types (Triandis, Leung, Villareal & Clack, 1985). Triandis would change the terminology individualism (*idiocentrism*) collectivism (*allocentrism*) to describe two cultural belief systems. *Idiocentrism* described people who give priority to the goals of

their personal goals over the goals of their group, such as their own emotions and beliefs. In contrast, *allocentrism* described people who give priority to their in-groups goals (Triandis, Leung, Villareal & Clack, 1985).

Individuals in individualist cultures, such as those of North and Western Europe and America usually choose elements of the personal self (independent from their in-groups). On the other hand, individuals in collectivistic cultures, such as those of Asia, Africa, and South America select elements of the collective self (independent within their in-groups) (Triandis, 1989).

Idiocentric cultures usually have less levels of ethnocentrism than allocentric cultures (Triandis, 2001). Another difference between idiocentric and allocentric is that idiocentric turn toward dominance. In contrast, allocentric turn toward norms (Markus, Suh, & Deasulniers, 1994). The most important element in collectivistic cultures is adjusting to the needs of others, suppression of the individuals' needs and motives. However, the crucial element in individualistic cultures is concentrating in on the individuals' needs and competencies including the ability to endure social pressure (Markus & Kitayama, 1991). Triandis (1995), stated that individuals in collectivist cultures have some difficulties when they have to get into new groups, whereas individuals in individualistic cultures have skills and experiences to get into new groups, and they usually treat people in superficial ways.

In the theoretical framework of Triandis (2001), ecology shapes cultures. In his framework there are two kinds of cultures, *loose* and *tight* cultures. There is a tolerance of normative deviation in loose cultures. The tolerance of deviation from norms is found in most heterogeneous communities. Heterogeneous communities are places that have

several normative group which coexist and individuals don't depend on each other. The population density is usually low in loose cultures, so the chance of surveillance will be low too. The United States would be an example of the loose culture. Loose cultures are very individualist. However, tight cultures are usually in isolated societies that tend to be densely populated. In tight cultures, individuals have ideas about what the appropriate attitudes and behaviors should be, and they don't accept other cultural norms China would be an example of a tight culture. *Tight* cultures are high on collectivism (Triandis, 2001).

It follows that these two appearing opposing perspectives on culture would influence developmental processes. Being raised in an individualistic culture would be very different than being raised in a collectivistic culture.

In individualist cultures, child rearing concentrates on independence, creativity, exploration, and self-reliance. On the other hand, with in collectivistic cultures, child rearing concentrates on obedience, reliability, and safety (Triandis, 2001).

The different child rearing cultural styles would be the origin of the development of the opposing belief systems and their subsequent influence on all perspectives within these two types of cultures.

#### **Individualistic and Collectivistic Cultures: American versus Saudi Culture.**

Al-Zahrani & Kaplowitz (1993), conducted a study on attribution biases in individualistic and collectivistic cultures. The authors examined how attribution patterns are different across cultures. They used the United States as their individualistic culture population; they used a population of individuals from Saudi Arabia as their collectivistic culture. They tested six variables: interdependentec, self-serving bias, intergroup bias, in-

group-serving bias, out-group derogating bias, and the ethnocentric bias in order to measure attribution biases across different cultures.

According to Al-Zahrani & Kaplowitz (1993), Americans (individualistic) exhibited more in-group attributions and showed more family-serving bias while Saudis (collectivistic) showed more out-group-derogating and exhibited more intergroup bias.

According to Trindis (2001), one would predict that American culture would be more individualistic with more internal attribution while the Saudis would be predicted to be more collectivistic and negatively out (other) group biased.

### **Saudi Parenting Styles**

In Saudi Arabia, like in other countries, many factors influence the parenting style. Some studies have reported that parental education, economic level, and urbanization influence Saudi parenting styles and practices. An inverse relationship between socioeconomic class and a harsh authoritarian style of parenting may best describe the parenting style in Saudi Arabia. More educated parents are less controlling and less authoritarian than less educated parents in Saudi Arabia (Al-Mutalq, 1981). A study conducted by Dwairy, Achoui, Abouserie, Farah, Sakhleh, Fayad, & Khan (2006) found that the socioeconomic level of the family had a positive correlation with permissive and authoritative parenting styles and a negative correlation with the authoritarian style.

In many Arab countries, boys and girls are treated differently. The parenting style applied to girls tends to be more authoritative and less authoritarian than the style applied to boys. Although the Arab society treats adult women more strictly than men, male children undergo more physical punishment than female children in Saudi Arabia (Achoui, 2003).

Also, parenting in rural areas tends to be more authoritarian across both genders in Saudi Arabia.

Parents usually treat first-born children in a different way. First-born children experience less authoritarian and more permissive parenting styles than other late born children across genders because they carry the parents' hopes and aspirations and receive more positive attention than children born later.

### **Significance and rationale**

The purpose of this research was to examine the relationship between parenting styles and psychological well-being among American versus Saudi Arabian undergraduate students. The research will also explore which type of parenting style leads to the greatest sense of psychological well-being in young adults. This study addressed the question of whether an authoritarian parenting style negatively affects an adult individual's psychological well-being. Moreover, the study tried to find whether or not a loose, permissive parenting style allows the individual to develop a parent level of psychological well-being as an adult. Furthermore, this study also addressed the issue of the effect of culture on parenting styles. In particular, whether or not there is a difference in parenting styles between American (individualistic) and Saudi (collectivistic) cultures.

Understanding the relationships between parenting styles and cultural values will help professionals work with students from different cultures. The home environment is where children develop their psychological well-being under their parents' supervision. Later, the relationship teenagers have with their parents will affect many aspects in their developing lives, especially their psychological well-being as young adults (Akhtar, 2012).

Psychologists have shown an association between psychological well-being and life satisfaction (Akhtar, 2012) Professionals who work with people from different cultures will be able to do their job more effectively when they know how different parenting styles affect people across cultures and satisfaction as it relates to their life. Also, knowing the relationship between parenting styles and psychological well-being will help psychologists understand college students' behaviors, normal and abnormal. In order to help students to maintain a healthy sense of psychological well-being, psychologist must know the determinants leading up to it.

### **Hypotheses**

H1: Saudi college students will report significantly higher levels of collectivism compared to American college students.

H2: Saudi college students will report significantly higher levels of perceived authoritarian parenting style compared to American college students.

H3: American college students will report significantly higher levels of perceived authoritative parenting styles compared to Saudi college students.

H4: American college students will report significantly higher levels of perceived permissive parenting styles compared to Saudi college students.

H5: Saudi male college students will report significantly higher levels of perceived authoritarian parenting style compared to Saudi female college students.

H6: American college students will have significantly higher levels of psychological well-being compared to Saudi college students.

H7: There will be a significant negative correlation between perceived authoritarian parenting style and psychological well-being across cultures in both American and Saudi students.

H8: There will be a significant positive correlation between perceived authoritative parenting style and psychological well-being across cultures in both American and Saudi students.

H9: There will be a significant positive correlation between psychological well-being and satisfaction with life across cultures in both American and Saudi students.

## **Method**

### **Participants and Procedure**

A total sample of 332 participants were recruited, ages ranging from 18 to 36 years old. The total sample included 159 Saudi students recruited through online surveys that were sent by the Saudi Arabian Cultural Mission (SACM) in Washington D.C, and 173 American students recruited by online surveys that were sent by the Department of Psychology at Barry University, Miami, Florida. Participants were taken to an online survey approved by Barry University's Institutional Review Board. After reading a cover letter, which confirmed their consent for participating in the study, participants were asked to answer five questionnaires: a demographic questionnaire, Horizontal and Vertical Individualism and Collectivism Scale (VHIC; Triandis & Gelfand, 1998), Parental Authority Questionnaire (PAQ; Buri, 1991), Ryff's Psychological Well-Being Scale (PWB; Ryff's, 1998), and Satisfaction With Life Scale (SWLS; Diener et al., 1985). Barry University students were compensated with extra course credit for their participation.

## Materials

**Demographic Questionnaire.** A demographic questionnaire was created for the study: The demographic questionnaire obtained data on: age, gender, culture, place of birth, educational levels, marital status, occupation, religiousness, generation, first language, type of family structure, and birth order. See appendix C

***Horizontal and Vertical Individualism and Collectivism Scale (VHIC).*** This scale was established by Triandis and Gelfand, (1998) to measure the type and level of individualism and collectivism. The VHIC is a 16-item scale consisting of four dimensions and each dimension consists of four exclusive statements: Horizontal Collectivism (HC), includes a sample item such as: "I feel good when I cooperate with others." Vertical Collectivism (VC), includes an example of a sample item such as: "It is my duty to take care of my family, even if I have to sacrifice what I want." Horizontal Individualism (HI) includes an item like: "I would rather depend on myself than others." Vertical Individualism (VI) includes an item like: "When another person does better than I do, I get tense and aroused." Responses for each statement are made on a 9-point Likert-type scale, ranking items from 0 = strongly disagree to 9 = strongly agree. This scale has been validated in many cross-cultural studies, and was concluded to be accurate across diverse samples (Strunk & Chang, 1999; Lee & Choi, 2005). Due to the multidimensional quality of this scale, it provides more views about individualism and collectivism than the classical uniform dimensional approach. In the current study, horizontal and vertical dimensions was combined into one score for the principal constructs of individualism and collectivism. See appendix D

***The Parental Authority Questionnaire (PAQ).*** This scale was created by John Buri, 1991 to measure the style of parenting employed by fathers and mothers. The

questionnaire contains 30 items developed to measure the permissive, authoritarian, and authoritative parenting types established by Baumrind (1971). The questionnaire contains 30 items that provide parental authority scores for each style based on the phenomenological appraisal by the respondent: 10 authoritarian items includes an item like: "While I was growing up my mother felt that in a well-run home the children should have their way in the family as often as the parents do.", 10 permissive items includes an item like: "As I was growing up, my father seldom gave me expectations and guidelines for my behavior.", and 10 authoritative items includes an item like: "My father gave me direction for my behavior and activities as I was growing up and he expected me to follow his direction, but he was always willing to listen to my concerns and to discuss that direction with me." The Parental Authority Questionnaire has two forms, one pertaining to mothers' parental authority, and the other to fathers' parental authority. Each form consists of thirty items. Participants rate statements using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree. This scale provides six separate scores for each participant; mother's permissiveness, mother's authoritarianism, mother's authoritativeness, father's permissiveness, father's authoritarianism, and father's authoritativeness. The scores can range from 10-50, with higher scores indicating that the parent is perceived as sharing more characteristics of the particular parenting style. Buri (1991) established test-retest reliability over a two week period with reliabilities of .81 for mother's permissiveness, .86 for mother's authoritarianism, .78 for mother's authoritativeness, .77 for father's permissiveness, .85 for father's authoritarianism, and .92 for father's authoritativeness. Chronbach's alphas suggest high

levels of internal consistency ranging from .75 to .87 for each of the six scales for student samples (Buri, 1991). Overall, reliability was found to be high for the instrument.

Discriminant-related validity was established through divergence in PAQ scores with intercorrelational data expressing inverse relationships of hypothesized divergence in PAQ scores, indicating that those parenting styles thought to have a negative relationship with each other, did. Mother's authoritarianism was inversely related to mother's permissiveness ( $r = -.38; p < .0005$ ) and to mother's authoritativeness ( $r = -.48; p < .0005$ ). Father's authoritarianism was inversely related to father's permissiveness ( $r = -.50; p < .0005$ ) and to father's authoritativeness ( $r = -.52; p < .0005$ ). Mother's permissiveness was not significantly related to mother's authoritativeness ( $r = .07; p > .10$ ) and father's permissiveness was not significantly correlated to father's authoritativeness ( $r = .12; p > .10$ ) (Buri, 1991). See appendix E.

*The Ryff Scales of Psychological Well-Being (PWB).* This scale was designed by Ryff, 1998 to measure multiple facets of psychological well-being. These facets include: self-acceptance, the establishment of quality ties to other, a sense of autonomy in thought and action, the ability to manage complex environments to suit personal needs and values, the pursuit of meaningful goals and a sense of purpose in life, and continued growth and development as a person. This straightforward inventory is easy to access and administer. This scale consists of 42 series of statements reflecting the six areas of psychological well-being: autonomy includes an item like: "I have confidence in my opinions, even if they are contrary to the general consensus.", environmental mastery includes an item like: "In general, I feel I am in charge of the situation in which I live.", personal growth includes an item like: "I think it is important to have new experiences

that challenge how you think about yourself and the world.”, positive relations with others includes an item like: “People would describe me as a giving person, willing to share my time with others.”, purpose in life includes an item like: “Some people wander aimlessly through life, but I am not one of them.”, and self-acceptance includes an item like: “I like most aspects of my personality.”. Respondents rate statements on a scale of 1 to 6, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 6 indicating strong agreement. For each category, a high score indicates that the respondent has a mastery of that area in his or her life. However, a low score shows that the respondent struggles to feel comfortable with that particular concept. See appendix F.

*Satisfaction With Life Scale (SWLS)*. This scale was created by Ed Diener, Robert Emmons, Randy Larsen and Sharon Griffin, 1985 to measure global cognitive judgments of satisfaction with one's life. The SWLS is a short 5-item instrument that usually requires only about one minute of a respondent's time includes an item like: “In most ways my life is close to my ideal.” Responses for each statement are made on a 7-point Likert-type scale, ranking items from 1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree. Translations of the SWLS into various languages are available. See appendix G.

## **Results**

The data collected resulted from participants' completion of one online survey that included five questionnaires as described above. The data was analyzed to examine the association between cultural values (individualism, collectivism) and perceived parenting styles and psychological well-being in a sample of 173 American and 159 Saudi adult men and women. This study attempted to identify differences in perceived parenting styles and psychological well-being between two diverse cultures and the correlations between perceived parenting styles and psychological well-being for Saudi

versus American students on the basis of individualism-collectivism theory (Triandis, 1988). SPSS version 21 (2012) statistical package was used to analyze the quantitative data. The data was collected from participants anonymously through Psychdata online survey platform and then exported onto an SPSS spreadsheet for analysis. All questionnaires were presented in English.

The data collected from the author constructed Demographic Questionnaire was descriptively analyzed and indicated that the majority of participants were between the ages of 18 — 25 years (61.7%). A total sample size of 332 included proportionately about the same percentage of males and females. However, for Saudis 159 participants (109 males, 50 females) ratio of males to females was 68.6 % males, 31.4% females. For the Americans 173 participants (32 males, 141 females) there was the inverse ratio of males to females, 18.5% males, 81.5% females. The data showed that for ethnicity, the majority of the Saudis identified as Arab (100%), Americans identified as Hispanic (36.2%), AfricanAmerican (33.7%), Caucasian (8%), White (17.2%), Asian (3.1%),and other (1.8 %). See Appendix I.

Six independent sample *t*-tests were conducted to evaluate the hypotheses H1, H2, H3, H4,H5,and H6. Pearson Product Moment correlations were used to test the relationship between perceived authoritarian and authoritative parenting style, psychological well-being, and satisfaction with life across cultures in both American and Saudi students. ChiSquare analyses were conducted to determine specific cultural relationships between the demographic questionnaire variables.

H1 : Hypothesis 1 stated that Saudis would be significantly more collectivistic than Americans. For H1, Table 1 revealed that Saudis ( $M = 109.45$ ,  $SD = 13.56$ ) had higher levels of collectivism compared to Americans ( $M = 93.80$ ,  $SD = 18.05$ ). A *t*-test

was conducted on the scores from the VHIC to statistically compare the levels of collectivism for Saudis versus Americans. The analysis revealed that Saudis had significantly higher levels of collectivism compared to Americans,  $t(257) = 7.35, p < .0001$ . See Table 1.

Table 1.

Means and Standard Deviations of all Variables: Individualism and Collectivism for American versus Saudi students.

Variable	Americans		Saudis		<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>			
1. Individualism	86.822	16.70	86.01	13.76	.399	257	.676
2. Collectivism	93.79	18.05	109.44	13.56	7.35	257	.000*

Note. Americans  $n = 163$ , Saudis  $n = 96$ . \* $p < .01$ .

H2: Hypothesis 2 stated that Saudis would have higher levels of perceived authoritarian parenting style versus Americans. For H2, Table 2 indicates that Saudis authoritarian father parenting style ( $M = 31.32, SD = 4.79$ ) and for Americans authoritarian father parenting style ( $M = 31.64, SD = 7.35$ ). A t-test analysis of the scores from the authoritarian father parenting style revealed that there was no significant difference between Saudis versus Americans regarding authoritarian father parenting style  $t(257) = -0.38, p = .67$ . Saudis authoritarian mother parenting style ( $M = 32.36, SD = 3.33$ ). and for Americans authoritarian mother parenting style ( $M = 33.11, SD = 6.74$ ). A t-test analysis of the scores from the authoritarian mother parenting style revealed that there was no significant difference between Saudis versus Americans regarding authoritarian mother parenting style  $t(257) = -1.01, p = 0.23$ . See Table 2.

H3: Hypothesis 3 stated that Americans would have higher levels of perceived authoritative parenting styles versus Saudis. For H3, Table 2 indicates that Saudis authoritative father parenting style ( $M = 33.87, SD = 4.32$ ) and for Americans authoritative father parenting style ( $M = 31.95, SD = 7.07$ ). A *t*-test analysis of the scores from the authoritative father parenting style revealed that there was a significant difference between Saudis versus Americans regarding authoritative father parenting style  $t(257) = 2.39, p < .01$ . Saudis authoritative mother parenting style ( $M = 35.31, SD = 3.11$ ). and for Americans authoritative mother parenting style ( $M = 34.88, SD = 6.74$ ). A *t*-test analysis of the scores from the authoritative mother parenting style revealed that there was no significant difference between Saudis versus Americans regarding authoritative mother parenting style  $t(257) = 0.60, p = .47$ . See Table 2.

H4: Hypothesis 4 stated that Americans would have higher levels of higher levels of perceived permissive parenting styles versus Saudis. For H4, Table 2 indicates that Saudis permissive father parenting style ( $M = 29.54, SD = 4.40$ ). and for Americans permissive father parenting style ( $M = 28.14, SD = 5.60$ ). A *t*-test analysis of the scores from the permissive father parenting style revealed that there was a significant difference between Saudis versus Americans regarding permissive father parenting style. The mean of permissive father parenting style for Saudis was significantly higher than Americans.  $t(257) = 2.10, p = .03$ . Saudis permissive mother parenting style ( $M = 29.57, SD = 3.36$ ). and for Americans permissive mother parenting style ( $M = 28.34., SD = 6.01$ ). A *t*-test analysis of the scores from the permissive mother parenting style revealed that there was no significant difference between Saudis versus Americans regarding permissive mother

parenting style. The mean of permissive mother parenting style for Saudis was significantly higher than Americans.  $t(257) = 1.85, p = .04$ . See Table 2.

Table 2.

Means and Standard Deviations of all Study Variables: Individualism, Collectivism, Authoritarian Father and Mother Parenting Style, Authoritative Father and Mother Parenting Style, and Permissive Father and Mother Parenting Style.

Variable	Americans		Saudis		<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>			
1. authoritarian father	31.64	7.35	31.31	4.79	-.386	257	.668
2. authoritarian mother	33.11	6.74	32.36	3.33	-1.01	257	.233
3. authoritative father	31.95	7.07	33.86	4.32	2.39	257	.008*
4. authoritative mother	34.88	6.43	35.30	3.11	.606	257	.425
5. permissive father	28.13	5.60	29.54	4.40	2.10	257	.026*
6. permissive mother	28.34	6.01	29.57	3.36	1.85	257	.035*

Note. Americans  $n = 163$ , Saudis  $n = 96$ . \* $p < .05$ .

H5: Hypothesis 5 stated that Saudi male students would have higher levels of perceived authoritarian parenting style versus Saudi female students. For H5, Table 3 indicates that Saudi male students perceived authoritarian father parenting style ( $M = 32.04$ ,  $SD = 4.21$ ), and for Saudi female students perceived authoritarian father parenting style ( $M = 29.64$ ,  $SD = 5.64$ ). A  $t$ -test analysis of the scores from the authoritarian father parenting style revealed that Saudi male students did not have significant higher levels of perceived authoritarian father parenting style versus Saudi female students.  $t(161) = 0.29$ ,  $p = 0.73$ . Saudi male students perceived authoritarian mother parenting style ( $M = 32.62$ ,  $SD = 2.90$ ), and for Saudi female students perceived authoritarian mother parenting style ( $M = 31.76$ ,  $SD = 4.16$ ). A  $t$ -test analysis of the scores from the authoritarian mother parenting style revealed that there was a significant difference between Saudi males versus Saudi female regarding authoritarian mother parenting style.  $t(257) = -1.66$ ,  $p = .04$ . See Table 3.

Table 3

Means and Standard Deviations of Authoritarian Father and Mother Parenting Style for Saudi Male versus Saudi Female Students.

Variable	Saudi male		Saudi female		<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>			
1. Authoritarian father	30.04	4.21	29.64	5.64	-.295	94	.731
2. Authoritarian mother	32.62	2.90	31.76,	4.16	-1.66	94	.042*

Note. Males  $n = 67$ , Females  $n = 29$ . \* $p < .05$ .

H6 : Hypothesis 6 stated that Americans would have significantly higher levels of psychological well-being than Saudis. For H6, Table 4 revealed that Saudis Autonomy subscale score of psychological well-being ( $M = 27.90$ ,  $SD 3.03$ ) compared to Americans ( $M = 28.72$ ,  $SD 5.45$ ). A t-test was conducted on the scores from the Autonomy psychological well-being subscale to statistically compare the levels of psychological well-being for Saudis versus Americans. The analysis revealed that there were no significant differences in levels of psychological well-being between Saudis and Americans,  $t(257) = -1.35$ ,  $p = 0.12$ . Saudis the Environmental Mastery subscale score of psychological well-being ( $M = 27.37$ ,  $SD = 2.30$ ) was compared to Americans ( $M = 27.73$ ,  $SD 4.20$ ). A t-test was conducted on the scores from Environmental Mastery the psychological well-being subscale to statistically compare the levels of psychological

well-being for Saudis versus Americans. The analysis revealed that there was no significant difference in Environmental Mastery levels of psychological well-being between Saudis and Americans,  $t(257) = -0.775, p = 0.337$ . Saudis Personal Growth subscale score of psychological well-being ( $M = 30.28, SD 3.50$ ) was compared to Americans ( $M = 31.36, SD 5.81$ ). A  $t$ -test was conducted on the scores from Personal Growth the psychological well-being subscale to statistically compare the levels of psychological well-being for Saudis versus Americans. The analysis revealed that there were no significant differences in Personal Growth levels of psychological well-being between Saudis and Americans,  $t(257) = -1.64, p = .064$ . Saudis Positive Relationship subscale score of psychological well-being ( $M = 29.15, SD 3.00$ ) was compared to Americans ( $M = 29.66, SD 5.98$ ). A  $t$ -test was conducted on the scores from Positive Relationship the psychological well-being subscale to statistically compare the levels of psychological well-being for Saudis versus Americans. The analysis revealed that there was no significant difference in Positive Relationship levels of psychological well-being between Saudis and Americans,  $t(257) = -0.784, p = .036$ . Saudis Purpose in Life subscale score of psychological well-being ( $M = 29.93, SD 2.89$ ) was compared to Americans ( $M = 30.63, SD 5.87$ ). A  $t$ -test was conducted on the scores from Purpose in Life the psychological well-being subscale to statistically compare the levels of psychological well-being for Saudis versus Americans. The analysis revealed that there was no significant difference in Purpose in Life levels of psychological well-being between Saudis and Americans,  $t(257) = -1.10, p = 0.198$ . Saudis Self-Acceptance subscale score of psychological well-being ( $M = 28.87, SD = 2.68$ ) was compared to Americans ( $M = 28.77, SD = 5.58$ ). A  $t$ -test was conducted on the scores from Self-Acceptance the

psychological well-being subscale to statistically compare the levels of psychological well-being for Saudis versus Americans. The analysis revealed that there was no significant difference in Self-Acceptance levels of psychological well-being between Saudis and Americans,  $t(257) = 0.172, p = 0.84$ . See Table 4.

Table 4

Means and Standard Deviations of all Variables: the six subscales of psychological well-being: Autonomy, Environmental Mastery, Personal Growth, Positive Relations, Purpose in Life, and Self Acceptance for American versus Saudi students.

Variable	Americans		Saudis		<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>			
<i>Scores</i>							
1. Autonomy	28.71	5.45	27.89	3.03	-1.35	257	.122
2. Environmental Mastery	27.73	4.20	27.37	2.30	-.775	257	.373
3. Personal Growth	31.36	5.81	30.28	3.50	-1.64	257	.064
4. Positive Relations	29.66	5.98	29.15	3.00	-.784	257	.360
5. Purpose in Life	30.63	5.87	29.93	2.89	-1.10	257	.198
6. Self Acceptance	28.77	5.58	28.87	2.68	.172	257	.840

Note: Americans  $n = 163$ , Saudis  $n = 96$ . \* $p < .05$ .

H7: Hypothesis 7 stated that a significant negative correlation would exist between perceived authoritarian parenting style and psychological well-being across

cultures for both American and Saudi students. For H7, Table 5 indicates that there were no significant correlations between the Authoritarian parenting styles for fathers across cultures in any psychological well-being subscales. Autonomy  $r(161), =.113, p >0.05$ , Environmental Mastery  $r(161), =.089, p >0.05$ , Personal Growth  $r(161), =.082, p >0.05$ , Positive Relations  $r(161), =.025, p >0.05$ , Purpose in Life  $r(161), =.105, p >0.05$ , Self Acceptance  $r(161), =.031, p >0.05$ . However, there were significant positive correlations between the Authoritarian parenting styles for mothers across cultures in all psychological well-being subscales. Autonomy  $r(161), =.218, p >0.005$ , Environmental Mastery  $r(161), =.243, p <0.002$ , Personal Growth  $r(161), =.244, p <0.00$ , Positive Relations  $r(161), =.216, p <0.05$ , Purpose in Life  $r(161), =.305, p <0.00$ , Self Acceptance  $r(161), =.268, p <0.01$ . See Table 5.

H8: Hypothesis 8 stated that there would be a significant positive correlation between perceived authoritative parenting style and psychological well-being across cultures for both Americans and Saudis. For H8, Table 5 indicates that there were significant positive correlations between the Authoritative parenting styles for Fathers across cultures in all psychological well-being subscales except Autonomy, Positive Relations, Purpose in Life. Autonomy, and Self Acceptance. Autonomy  $r(161), =.076, p >0.05$ , Environmental Mastery  $r(161), =.334, p <0.00$ , Personal Growth  $r(161), =.209, p <0.00$ , Positive Relations  $r(161), =.211, p <0.00$ , Purpose in Life  $r(161), =.137, p >0.05$ , Self Acceptance  $r(161), =.135, p >0.05$ . See Table 5.

There were significant positive correlations between the Authoritative parenting styles for Mothers across cultures in all psychological well-being subscales. Autonomy  $r(161), =.431, p <0.00$ , Environmental Mastery  $r(161), =.333, p <0.00$ , Personal Growth  $r(161),$

$=.369, p < 0.00$ , Positive Relations  $r(161), =.425, p < 0.00$ , Purpose in Life  $r(161), =.419, p < 0.00$ , Self Acceptance  $r(161), =.393, p < 0.00$ . See Table 5.

H9: Hypothesis 9 stated that there would be a significant positive correlation between psychological well-being and satisfaction with life across cultures for both Americans and Saudis. For H9, Table 5 indicates that there were significant negative correlations between the psychological well-being in all subscales and satisfaction with life across all cultures. Autonomy  $r(161), = -.151, p > 0.05$ , Environmental Mastery  $r(161), = -.259, p < 0.00$ , Personal Growth  $r(161), = -.267, p < 0.00$ , Positive Relations  $r(161), = -.179, p < 0.05$ , Purpose in Life  $r(161), = -.295, p < 0.00$ , Self Acceptance  $r(161), = -.362, p < 0.00$ . See Table 5.

Table 5

Correlation Coefficients for Authoritarian father and mother parenting style, Authoritative Father and Mother Parenting Style, the Six Subscales of Psychological Well-Being: Autonomy, Environmental Mastery, Personal Growth, Positive Relations, Purpose in Life, and Self Acceptance, and Satisfaction with Life scores for American versus Saudi students.

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1. authoritarian father	—										
2. authoritarian mother	.000**	—									
3. authoritative father	.677	.249	—								
4. authoritative mother	.993	.012*	.000**	—							
5. Autonomy subscale	.152	.005*	.337	.000**	—						
6. Environmental Mastery	.259	.002*	.000**	.000**	.000**	—					
7. Personal Growth	.300	.002*	.007*	.000**	.000**	.000**	—				
8. Positive Relations	.756	.006*	.007*	.000**	.000**	.000**	.000**	—			
9. Purpose in Life	.181	.000**	.080	.000**	.000**	.000**	.000**	.000**	—		
10. Self Acceptance	.697	.001*	.085	.000**	.000**	.000**	.000**	.000**	.000**	—	
11. satisfaction with life	.040*	.362*	.107	.296	.055	.004*	.001*	.023*	.000**	.000**	—

Note. Americans  $n = 163$ , Saudis  $n = 96$ . \* $p < .05$ , \*\* $p < .001$

### **Understanding Missing Values**

To understand the analysis needed for missing values, the data set was segmented into 3 types of respondents; completers, partial respondents and non-completer.

Completers are defined as respondents who answered all 141 survey questions, partial respondents answered between 47 and 109, and completers answered all survey questions. For the purposes of this study, analysis should be conducted for the Completers and Partial Respondents. Also, analysis should be

segmented by survey instead of one complete analysis. In the dataset a variable was created to label cases completer, partial and non-completer and another variable denotes the number of questions missing. A summary of the data are in Table 6.

Saudi Arabian and American students were identified by self-selected ethnicities. A variable was created to label respondents Saudi Arabian or American using their ethnicity where Saudi Arabian =Arab and African America, Asian, Hispanic, Caribbean, White and Other = American. Differences in variability were significant between groups. In fact for completers only 23 respondents were identified as Arab whereas 140 were identified as American. Since the missing values were not at random, other measures were taken to account for the missing values.

Missing Values for non-Completers were not included in the analysis, however partial were included and imputed using means within variables. Since mean is used in the analysis for subscales the mean replacement for missing data would not skew the data but make it difficult for finding correlations between subgroups.

Table 6

Respondent Type	Number of Missing Survey Questions	Count of Respond	% of Total	Survey Completed				
				Indiv vs Control	Parent Authority-Father	Parent Authority-Mother	Ryffs	SWLS
Completer	0	166	49.7%	x	x	x	x	x
Partial	47	16	4.7%	x	x	x		
Partial	78	21	6.3%	x	x			
Partial	109	58	17.4%	x				
Non Completer	141	73	21.9%					
<b>Total Valid Respondents</b>				<b>261</b>	<b>203</b>	<b>182</b>	<b>166</b>	<b>166</b>

Note. Americans  $n = 173$ , Saudis  $n = 159$ .

## Discussion

Data collected for the first hypothesis indicated that there was a significant difference in higher collectivism scores for the Saudi students compared to the American students. Our hypothesis was supported, Saudis were more collectivistic.

H2 data from the Parental Authority Questionnaire did not confirm hypothesis 2 that Saudis were perceived to be more authoritarian neither for fathers nor for mothers. Data collected from Parental Authority Questionnaire did not confirm hypothesis 3 that Americans were perceived to be more authoritative than Saudis. In fact, the data showed that Saudi fathers not Saudi mothers were perceived to be more authoritative than Americans fathers. From the demographic data, Saudi students had higher levels of education, and it maybe inferred that their families had higher levels of education too. Therefore, more educated parents would probably be more authoritative. Data from the

demographic questionnaire shows that Saudis have higher levels of education than Americans, 80% Saudis versus 13% American had college educated.

Data from Parental Authority Questionnaire did not confirm hypothesis 4 that Americans were perceived to use more permissive parenting than Saudis. In fact, data shows that Saudi students perceived more permissive parenting than Americans in both fathers and mothers. It is possible that socio-economic status may have contributed to this finding. In this study, because Saudis participants had higher economic statuses than Americans participants. Such higher levels of income may correlate with more advantaged (permissive) parenting since more economic resources exist. Data from the demographic questionnaire shows that Saudis had higher levels of social economic statuses than Americans, 14% Saudis versus 7% Americans had over 50,000\$ annual income.

Data from Parental Authority Questionnaire did not confirm hypothesis 5 that Saudi males perceived more authoritarian parenting style than Saudi females. In fact, data showed Saudi males perceived significantly higher levels of authoritarian parenting style from their mothers compared to Saudi females. In Muslim culture, mothers do 80% to 90% of the parenting. Saudi mothers are more authoritarian with their sons than daughters. In Muslim families, the father is the head of the household to which the wife acquiesces, but she is the disciplinarian of the children when the father is not present. In many families the father is working and gone most of the day, and the mother is taking care of the children most of the time. Sons and daughters are treated differently and are allowed different degrees of freedom and responsibility (Binghalib, 2007). Boys are raised more strictly.

Data from the Ryff Scales of Psychological Well-Being did not confirm hypothesis 6 that Americans were perceived to have higher levels of psychological well-being compared to Saudis. As the Saudi students did not have significantly higher levels of perceived authoritarian parenting style compared to Americans, there would not be predicted a significant difference in psychological well-being between Saudis and Americans.

Data from Parental Authority Questionnaire and the Ryff Scales of Psychological Well-Being did not confirm hypothesis 7 that there would be a significant negative correlation between authoritarian parenting style and psychological well-being in both cultures for fathers. The data from the Parental Authority Questionnaire did not confirm our hypothesis that Saudis were more authoritarian therefore, we would not expect hypothesis 7 to be confirmed either. However, data from the Parental Authority Questionnaire and the Ryff Scales of Psychological Well-Being indicated that authoritarian mother parenting style has a significant correlation with psychological well-being across cultures. It is possible that authoritarian mother parenting style is different than authoritarian father parenting style, and authoritarian mothering leads to psychological well-being.

In Muslim culture authoritarian mothers believe that children are, by nature, strong-willed and self-indulgent. Authoritarian Muslim mothers see their primary job to be bending the will of the child to that of authority. Willfulness is seen to be the root of unhappiness, bad behavior, and sin. Thus a loving mother is one who tries to break the will of the child. However, mothers at the same time are always caring with their children and promote their future happiness (Baumrind, 1966).

Data from Parental Authority Questionnaire and the Ryff Scales of Psychological Well-Being confirmed hypothesis 8 that there would be a significant positive correlation between authoritative parenting style and psychological well-being across cultures.

Data from the Ryff Scales of Psychological Well-Being and Satisfaction with Life Scale did not confirm hypothesis 9 that there would be a significant positive correlation between psychological well-being and satisfaction with life across cultures. In fact, there was a significant negative correlation between psychological well-being and satisfaction with life across cultures. the only explanation that we have for this finding is that our data was not reliable due to many cases of missing data.

### **Limitations**

The current study was aimed at understanding how culture influences perceived parenting styles and psychological well-being among American versus Saudi Arabian college students. There are some limitations which need to be considered when interpreting the result of the current study. First, many cases of missing data. Differences in variability were significant between American and Saudi Arabian. In fact, only 23 of Saudi students completed the survey whereas 140 of American completed the survey. Other measures were taken to account for the missing values because the missing values were not at random. Partial of the missing values were included and imputed using means within variables. However, it made it difficult for finding correlations between subgroups. Second, since the study used a Saudi Arabian sample who studied in the United States, it is difficult to generalize the data beyond this population.

### **Future research**

Saudi parenting styles have changed over time. Twenty years ago (1990), many parents were strict and authoritarian to their children, especially their older children. However, parents now tend to understand their children's emotional needs. Currently, Saudi children perceive an authoritative parenting style more than before; as a result, they tend to have higher academic achievement and stronger connections with their family members than children raised by authoritarian parents with a lower income. In the past the reason that parenting styles have changed from authoritarian to authoritative is parents' education. The age of the parents also affects the parenting styles. When the parents get old, they have more difficulties with their teenagers. Also, they treat their older children differently than their younger children because they do not have the same energy that they had when they were young and the generations are different.

Today Saudi parents are not having children until their later years. They are having fewer children and better educating them. Future research needs to address itself to the changing parenting styles in Muslim culture in general, and in Saudi culture in particular. Parenting values incorporated from the West are clearly changing Eastern cultures all around the world. Future research must be directed at understanding how the assimilation of cultures affects parenting styles, for better or for worse. Our Saudi students were collectivistic, but their parents were not necessarily authoritarian as we predicted. The phenomena of parenting styles is changing in the face of technology. Such changes need further investigation. Also, the role of female parenting in Muslim culture is worthy of investigation. Little if any research has been done in this area. This has serious implications for the development of feminism in the Islamic world.

## References

- Akhtar, Z. (2012). The Effect of Parenting Style of Parents on the Attachment Styles of Undergraduate Students. *Language in India, 12*(1).
- Al-Zahrani, S. S. A., & Kaplowitz, S. A. (1993). Attributional biases in individualistic and collectivistic cultures: A comparison of Americans with Saudis. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 223-233*.
- Ashton-James, C. E., Kushlev, K., & Dunn, E. W. (2013). Parents reap what they sow: Child- centrism and parental well-being. *Social Psychological and Personality Science, 4*(6), 635-642. doi: 10.1177/1948550613479804
- Barber, B. K. (1996). Parental psychological control: Revisiting a neglected construct. *Child Development, 67*, 3296–3319.
- Baumrind, D. (1971). Current patterns of parental authority. *Developmental psychology, 4*(1p2).
- Baumrind D. (1966). Effects of authoritative parental control on child behavior. *Child Development, 37*(4), 887-907.
- Baumrind, D. (1991).the influences of parenting style on adolescent competence and substance use. *Journal of Early Adolescence, 11*,56-95.
- Bernstein, D. P., Fink, L. Handelsman, L., Foote, J. Lovejoy, M., Wenzelf, K., Sapareto E.& Ruggiero, J. (1994).Initial Reliability and Validity of a New Retrospective Measure of Child Abuse and Neglect, *American Journal of Psychiatry, 151*(8),1132-1136.
- Binghalib, Yasmine. 2007. Family Dynamics Between Arab Muslim Parents, Western Parents and Their Bi-Ethnic Children. MA Thesis, California State University,

*Sacramento, CA.*

Bronson, P., & Merryman, A. (2009). *Nurture shock: New thinking about children.* New York, NY: Twelve.

Blatt, S. J., Schaffer, C. E., Bers, S. A., & Quinlan, D. M. (1992). Psychometric properties of the depressive experiences questionnaire for adolescents. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 59*, 82.

Blatt, S. J., & Homann, E. (1992). Parent-child interaction in the etiology of dependent and self-critical depression. *Clinical Psychology Review, 12*, 47 –91.

Bornstein, M. H., Putnick, D. L., & Lansford, J. E. (2011). Parenting attributions and attitudes in cross-cultural perspective. *Parenting, 11*(2-3), 214-237. doi:10.1080/15295192.2011.585568

Bowlby, J. (1969). *Attachment and loss.* New York: Basic Books.

Bugental, D. B., Shennum, W. A., & Shaver, P. (1984). "Difficult" children as elicitors and targets of adult communication patterns: An attributional-behavioral transactional analysis. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 49*(1), 1-81.

Buri, J. R. (1991). Parental authority questionnaire. *Journal of personality assessment, 57*(1), 110-119.

ÇELİK, Ş. (2004). *The effects of an attachment-oriented-psychoeducational-group-training on improving the preoccupied attachment styles of university students* (Doctoral dissertation, Middle East Technical University).

Collins, N. L., & Read, S. J. (1990). Adult attachment, working models, and relationship quality in dating couples. *Journal of personality and social psychology, 58*(4), 644.

- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2008). Facilitating optimal motivation and psychological well-being across life's domains. *Canadian Psychology, 49*, 14–23.  
doi:10.1037/0708-5591.49.1.14
- Diener, E., Emmons, R. A., Larsen, R. J., & Griffin, S. (1985). The satisfaction with life scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 49*(1), 71–75.  
doi:10.1207/s15327752jpa4901\_13
- Doi, Y., & Minowa, M. (2003). Factor structure of the 12-item General Health Questionnaire in the Japanese general adult population. *Psychiatry and Clinical Neurosciences, 379*-383.
- Dost, M. T. (2006). Subjective well-being among university students. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 31*(31).
- Dwairy, M., Achoui, M., Abouserie, R., Farah, A., Sakhleh, A. A., Fayad, M., & Khan, H. K. (2006). Parenting Styles in Arab Societies A First Cross-Regional Research Study. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 37*(3), 230-247. Chicago
- Galea, M. (2010). Does child maltreatment mediate family environment and psychological well-being? *Psychology, 1*(2), 143. doi:10.4236/psych.2010.12019
- Han, Y., & Grogan-Kaylor, A. (2012). Parenting and youth psychosocial well-being in south korea using fixed-effects models. *Journal of Family Issues, 34*(5), 689-715.  
doi: 10.1177/0192513X12440091
- Johnston, M. M., & Finney, S. J. (2010). Measuring basic needs satisfaction: Evaluating previous research and conducting new psychometric evaluations of the Basic Needs Satisfaction in General Scale. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 35*, 280–296. doi:10.1016/j.cedpsych.2010.04.003.

- Lavasani, M., Borhanzadeh, S., Afzali, L., & Hejazi, E. (2011). The relationship between perceived parenting styles, social support with psychological well-being. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 1852-1856.
- Lyubomirsky, S., & Lepper, H. S. (1999). A measure of subjective happiness: Preliminary reliability and construct validation. *Social Indicators Research*, 46, 137–155.
- Khang, Y. H., Cho, S. I., Yang, S., & Lee, M. S. (2005). [Socioeconomic differentials in health and health related behaviors: findings from the Korea Youth Panel Survey]. *Journal of preventive medicine and public health= Yebang Uihakhoe chi*, 38(4), 391-400.
- Moos, R. H., & Moos, B. S. (1986). Family Environment Scale, *Consulting Psychologists Press*.
- Öztürk, A., & Mutlu, T. (2010). The relationship between attachment style, subjective well-being, happiness and social anxiety among university students'. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 9, 1772-1776. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.12.398
- Öztürk, A. (2009). Social anxiety levels and future expectations of teacher candidates. *The International Journal of Learning*, 16(10), 191-205.
- Parker, G., Tupling, H., and Brown, L.B. (1979). A Parental Bonding Instrument. *British Journal of Medical Psychology*, 52, 1-10.
- Radloff, L. S. (1977). The CES-D Scale: A self-report depression scale for research in the general population. *Applied Psychological Measurement*, 1, 385–401.  
doi:10.1177/014662167700100306
- Reynolds, W. M. (1982). Development of reliable and valid short forms of the Marlowe-

- Crowne Social Desirability Scale. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 38, 119–125.
- Roberts, R. E., & Sobhan, M. (1992). Symptoms of depression in adolescence: a comparison of Anglo, African, and Hispanic Americans. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 21, 639–651.
- Robinson CC, Hart CH, Mandleco BL, and Olsen SF. (1996). Psychometric support for a new measure of authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive parenting practices: Cross-cultural connections. Paper presented in Symposium: New measures of parental child-rearing practices developed in different cultural contexts, XIVth Biennial International Society for the Study of Behavioral Development Conference, Quebec City, Canada, August 12-16, 1996.
- Ryff, C. D. (1989a). Beyond Ponce de Leon and life satisfaction: New directions in quest of successful aging. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 12, 35–55.
- Ryff, C.D.(1989b). Happiness is everything, or is it? Explorations on the meaning of psychological well- being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57, 1069 –1081.
- Schaefer, E. S., & Edgerton, M. (1985). Parent and child correlates of parental modernity. *Parental belief systems: The psychological consequences for children*, 287-318.
- Schiffirin, H. H., Liss, M., Miles-McLean, H., Geary, K. A., Erchull, M. J., & Tashner, T. (2014). Helping or hovering? the effects of helicopter parenting on college students' well-being. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 23(3), 548-557.  
doi:10.1007/s10826-013-9716-3
- Soenens, B., Vansteenkiste, M., & Luyten, P. (2010). Toward a domain-specific approach to the study of parental psychological control: distinguishing between

dependency-oriented and achievement-oriented psychological control. *Journal of Personality*, 78, 217–256.

Soenens, B., Park, S. Y., Vansteenkiste, M., & Mouratidis, A. (2012). Perceived parental psychological control and adolescent depressive experiences: A cross-cultural study with Belgian and South-Korean adolescents. *Journal of adolescence*, 35(2), 261-272. doi:10.1016/j.adolescence.2011.05.001

Vaux, A. (1988). *Social Support: Theory, Research, and Intervention*. New York, Praeger, *Psychiatric Services*, 460-460.

Yamawaki, N., Nelson, J., & Omori, M. (2011). Self-esteem and life satisfaction as mediators between parental bonding and psychological well-being in Japanese young adults. *Journal of International Psychology and Counseling*, 3, 1-8.

Zigmond, A. S., & Snaith, R. P. (1983). The Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale. *Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica*, 67, 361–370. doi:10.1111/j.1600-0447.1983.tb09716.x

## Appendix A

## Announcement letter

**Hi students! Would you be interested in participating in a study that assesses the influence of cultures on perceived parenting styles and psychological well-being: American versus Saudi college students.**

**The participation requirement:**

Barry University students, 18-30 years of age.

**Study Details:**

- This is an anonymous online study through PsychData.
- Study takes approximately 30-35 minutes.
- You can withdraw your participation at any time without penalty or you can choose not to answer any question.
- You may be able to receive credit for your participation if you are currently enrolled in a psychology course.
- If you want to participate, please click this link:  
<https://www.psychdata.com/s.asp?SID=174673>



If you have any questions, feel free to contact Ms. Salwa Bazaid:  
[salwa.bazaid@mymail.barry.edu](mailto:salwa.bazaid@mymail.barry.edu) or my supervisor: Dr. Stephen W. Koncsol:  
[skoncsol@barry.edu](mailto:skoncsol@barry.edu) .

## Appendix B

**Barry University  
Cover Letter**

Dear Research Participant:

Your participation in a research project is requested. The title of the study is *The Effects of Culture on Perceived Parenting Styles and Psychological Well-Being: American versus Saudi Arabian Students*. The research is being conducted by Salwa Bazaid, a graduate student in the Psychology Department at Barry University, and it is seeking information that will be useful in the field of psychology and treatment planning. The aims of the research are to examine the relationship between parenting styles and psychological well-being among American versus Saudi Arabian undergraduate students. In accordance with these aims, the following procedures will be used: five questionnaires follow this letter; these questionnaires are a simple demographic questionnaire, I anticipate the number of participants to be 300.

If you decide to participate in this research, you will be asked to complete five questionnaires. The first is a 14-item demographic questionnaire; the second questionnaire is the *Horizontal and Vertical Individualism and Collectivism Scale* (VHIC), a 16-item scale which measures four dimensions of collectivism and individualism. The third questionnaire is the *Parental Authority Questionnaire* (PAQ), a 30-item 5-point Likert scale which measures the style of parenting employed by fathers and mothers. The fourth questionnaire is the *Ryff's Psychological Well-Being Scale* (PWB), a 42-item scale which measures the individual's psychological well-being. The fifth is the *Satisfaction With Life Scale* (SWLS), a 5-item scale which measures global cognitive judgments of satisfaction with one's life. The demographic and questionnaires are estimated to take no longer than 35 minutes to complete.

Your consent to be a research participant is strictly voluntary and should you decline to participate or should you choose to drop out at any time during the study, there will be no adverse effects. If you are a student, there will be no effect on your grades.

There are no foreseeable risks associated with this study. The following procedures will be used to minimize any potential risks: participants can skip any questions you do not want to answer and may decline to participate in the study at any time. There are no direct benefits to you for participating in this study; however, your participation will contribute to research in the area of psychology and treatment planning.

If you are an undergraduate student currently enrolled in a psychology course at Barry University, you may be able to receive extra credit for your participation. Print a copy from this cover letter as a proof of your participation.

As a research participant, information you provide will be kept anonymous, that is, no names or other identifiers will be collected on any of the instruments used. SurveyMonkey.com allows researchers to suppress the delivery of IP addresses during the downloading of data, and in this study no IP address will be delivered to the researcher. However, SurveyMonkey.com does collect IP addresses for its own purposes. If you have concerns about this, you should review the privacy of SurveyMonkey.com

before you begin.

By completing and submitting this electronic survey you are acknowledging that you are at least 18-years old and that you voluntarily agree to participate in this study.

If you have any questions or concerns regarding the study or your participation in the study, you may contact me, Salwa Bazaid, by email at [salwa.bazaid@mymail.barry.edu](mailto:salwa.bazaid@mymail.barry.edu), or my supervisor, Dr. Stephen Koncsol, at (305) 899-3270 or by email at [skoncsol@barry.edu](mailto:skoncsol@barry.edu). You may also contact the Institutional Review Board point of contact, Barbara Cook, by phone at (305) 899-3020 or by email at [bcook@mail.barry.edu](mailto:bcook@mail.barry.edu).

Thank you for your participation.

Sincerely,

Salwa Bazaid

Print this page if you need a proof of participation.

## Appendix C

## Demographic Questionnaire

These questions are a biographical questionnaire that is mandatory for the next questionnaires. Authenticity will affect our result, so please consider the importance of being genuine. Please circle one of the following answers:

1. Gender
  - a) Male                      b) female
2. Age between
  - a) 18-25 years old    b) 18-25 years old    c) 30-35 years old    d) 35+
3. Ethnicity:
  - a) African American.    b) Asian    c) Hispanic    d) Caribbean    e) White
  - f) Other
4. Where were you born? \_\_\_\_\_
5. Where were you raised? \_\_\_\_\_
6. level of education:
  - a) Elementary school    b) High school    c) some college    d) Associate    e) Bachelor's
  - f) Master
  - g) PhD    h) Professional
7. marital status
  - a) single    b) separated    c) divorced    d) widowed
8. religious background
  - a) Christian    b) Jewish    c) Catholic    d) Muslim    e) Buddhist    f) Hindu    g) Other
9. primary language
  - a) English    b) Spanish    c) Arabic    d) French    e) Creole    f) Other
10. years of living in the United States
  - a) Less than one year    b) 1-5 years    c) 5-10 years    d) 10-15 years    e) Over 15 years
11. Your annual income in Dollar
  - a) Less than 25,000    b) 25,000-50,000    c) 50,000- 75,000    d) More than 75,000
12. When you were a child your parents were
  - a) married    b) separated    c) divorced    d) widowed
13. Were you raised in an:
  - a) extended family    b) nuclear family    c) single family
14. your birth order:
  - a) First born    b) Middle    c) Last born    d) other
15. Were any of your parents step-parents?
  - a) Yes                      b) No
16. Were you raised primarily by:
  - a) Parents    b) relatives    c) servants    d) foster parents

## Appendix D

Horizontal and Vertical Individualism and Collectivism Scale-16 (VHIC-16)  
Read each statement carefully and indicate your degree of agreement using the scale

below.

**1**            **2**            **3**            **4**            **5**            **6**            **7**            **8**  
**9**

**Strongly agree**

**Unsure**

**Strongly**

**disagree**

1. I prefer to be direct and forthright when I talk with people.
2. My happiness depends very much on the happiness of those around me.
3. I would do what would please my family, even if I detested that activity.
4. Winning is everything.
5. One should live one's life independently of others.
6. What happens to me is my own doing.
7. I usually sacrifice my self-interest for the benefit of my group.
8. It annoys me when other people perform better than I do.
9. It is important for me to maintain harmony within my group.
10. It is important to me that I do my job better than others.
11. I like sharing little things with my neighbours.
12. I enjoy working in situations involving competition with others.
13. We should keep our aging parents with us at home.
14. The well-being of my co-workers is important to me.
15. I enjoy being unique and different from others in many ways.
16. If a relative were in financial difficulty, I would help within my means.
17. Children should feel honoured if their parents receive a distinguished award.
18. I often do "my own thing".
19. Competition is the law of nature.
20. If a co-worker gets a prize I would feel proud.
21. I am a unique individual.
22. To me, pleasure is spending time with others.
23. When another person does better than I do, I get tense and aroused.
24. I would sacrifice an activity that I enjoy very much if my family did not approve of it.
25. I like my privacy.
26. Without competition it is not possible to have a good society.
27. Children should be taught to place duty before pleasure.
28. I feel good when I cooperate with others.
29. I hate to disagree with others in my group.
30. Some people emphasise winning; I am not one of them.

31. Before taking a major trip, I consult with most members of my family and many friends.
32. When I succeed, it is usually because of my abilities.

## Appendix E

## Parental Authority Questionnaire for Fathers

Read each statement carefully and indicate your degree of agreement using the scale below.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree Strongly agree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	

1. While I was growing up my father felt that in a well-run home the children should have their way in the family as often as the parents do.
2. Even if his children didn't agree with him, my father felt that it was for our own good if we were forced to conform to what he thought was right.
3. Whenever my father told me to do something as I was growing up, he expected me to do it immediately without asking questions.
4. As I was growing up, once family policy had been established, my father discussed the reasoning behind the policy with the children in the family.
5. My father has always encouraged verbal give-and-take whenever I have felt that family rules and restrictions were unreasonable.
6. My father has always felt that what children need is to be free to make up their own minds and to do what they want to do, even if this does not agree with what their parents might want.
7. As I was growing up my father did not allow me to question any decision he had made.
8. As I was growing up my father directed the activities and decisions of the children in the family through reasoning and discipline.
9. My father has always felt that more force should be used by parents in order to get their children to behave the way they are supposed to.
10. As I was growing up my father did not feel that I needed to obey rules and regulations of behavior simply because someone in authority had established them.
11. As I was growing up I knew what my father expected of me in the family, but I also felt free to discuss those expectations with my father when I felt that they were unreasonable.
12. My father felt that wise parents should teach their children early just who is boss in the family.
13. As I was growing up, my father seldom gave me expectations and guidelines for my behavior.
14. Most of the time as I was growing up my father did what the children in the family wanted when making family decisions.
15. As the children in my family were growing up, my father consistently gave us direction and guidance in rational and objective ways.
16. As I was growing up my father would get very upset if I tried to disagree with him.

17. My father feels that most problems in society would be solved if parents would not restrict their children's activities, decisions, and desires as they are growing up.
18. As I was growing up my father let me know what behavior he expected of me, and if I didn't meet those expectations, he punished me.
19. As I was growing up my father allowed me to decide most things for myself without a lot of direction from him.
20. As I was growing up my father took the children's opinions into consideration when making family decisions, but he would not decide for something simply because the children wanted it.
21. My father did not view himself as responsible for directing and guiding my behavior as I was growing up.
22. My father had clear standards of behavior for the children in our home as I was growing up, but he was willing to adjust those standards to the needs of each of the individual child in the family.
23. My father gave me direction for my behavior and activities as I was growing up and he expected me to follow his direction, but he was always willing to listen to my concerns and to discuss that direction with me.
24. As I was growing up my father allowed me to form my own point of view on family matters and he generally allowed me to decide for what I was going to do.
25. My father has always felt that most problems in society would be solved if we could get parents to strictly and forcibly deal with their children when they don't do what they are supposed to as they are growing up.
26. As I was growing up, my father often told me exactly what he wanted me to do and how he expected me to do it.
27. As I was growing up my father gave me clear direction for my behaviors and activities, but he was also understanding when I disagreed with him.
28. As I was growing up my father did not direct the behavior, activities, and desires of the children in the family.
29. As I was growing up I knew what my father expected of me in the family and he insisted that I conform to those expectations simply out of respect for his authority.
30. As I was growing up, if my father made a decision in the family that hurt me, he was willing to discuss that decision with me and to admit it if he had made a mistake.

## Appendix F

## Parental Authority Questionnaire for Mother

Read each statement carefully and indicate your degree of agreement using the scale below.

<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Strongly disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Neither agree nor disagree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Strongly agree</b>

1. While I was growing up my mother felt that in a well-run home the children should have their way in the family as often as the parents do.
2. Even if her children didn't agree with her, my mother felt that it was for our own good if we were forced to conform to what she thought was right.
3. Whenever my mother told me to do something as I was growing up, she expected me to do it immediately without asking questions.
4. As I was growing up, once family policy had been established, my mother discussed the reasoning behind the policy with the children in the family.
5. My mother has always encouraged verbal give-and-take whenever I have felt that family rules and restrictions were unreasonable.
6. My mother has always felt that what children need is to be free to make up their own minds and to do what they want to do, even if this does not agree with what their parents might want.
7. As I was growing up my mother did not allow me to question any decision she had made.
8. As I was growing up my mother directed the activities and decisions of the children in the family through reasoning and discipline.
9. My mother has always felt that more force should be used by parents in order to get their children to behave the way they are supposed to.
10. As I was growing up my mother did not feel that I needed to obey rules and regulations of behavior simply because someone in authority had established them.
11. As I was growing up I knew what my mother expected of me in the family, but I also felt free to discuss those expectations with my mother when I felt that they were unreasonable.
12. My mother felt that wise parents should teach their children early just who is boss in the family.
13. As I was growing up, my mother seldom gave me expectations and guidelines for my behavior.
14. Most of the time as I was growing up my mother did what the children in the family wanted when making family decisions.
15. As the children in my family were growing up, my mother consistently gave us direction and guidance in rational and objective ways.
16. As I was growing up my mother would get very upset if I tried to disagree with her.

17. My mother feels that most problems in society would be solved if parents would not restrict their children's activities, decisions, and desires as they are growing up.
18. As I was growing up my mother let me know what behavior she expected of me, and if I didn't meet those expectations, she punished me.
19. As I was growing up my mother allowed me to decide most things for myself without a lot of direction from her.
20. As I was growing up my mother took the children's opinions into consideration when making family decisions, but she would not decide for something simply because the children wanted it.
21. My mother did not view herself as responsible for directing and guiding my behavior as I was growing up.
22. My mother had clear standards of behavior for the children in our home as I was growing up, but she was willing to adjust those standards to the needs of each of the individual child in the family.
23. My mother gave me direction for my behavior and activities as I was growing up and she expected me to follow her direction, but she was always willing to listen to my concerns and to discuss that direction with me.
24. As I was growing up my mother allowed me to form my own point of view on family matters and she generally allowed me to decide for what I was going to do.
25. My mother has always felt that most problems in society would be solved if we could get parents to strictly and forcibly deal with their children when they don't do what they are supposed to as they are growing up.
26. As I was growing up, my mother often told me exactly what she wanted me to do and how she expected me to do it.
27. As I was growing up my mother gave me clear direction for my behaviors and activities, but she was also understanding when I disagreed with her.
28. As I was growing up my mother did not direct the behavior, activities, and desires of the children in the family.
29. As I was growing up I knew what my mother expected of me in the family and she insisted that I conform to those expectations simply out of respect for her authority.
30. As I was growing up, if my mother made a decision in the family that hurt me, she was willing to discuss that decision with me and to admit it if she had made a mistake.



32. I have difficulty arranging my life in a way that is satisfying to me.
33. For me, life has been a continuous process of learning, changing, and growth.
34. I have not experienced many warm and trusting relationships with others.
35. Some people wander aimlessly through life, but I am not one of them
36. My attitude about myself is probably not as positive as most people feel about themselves.
37. I judge myself by what I think is important, not by the values of what others think is important.
38. I have been able to build a home and a lifestyle for myself that is much to my liking.
39. I gave up trying to make big improvements or changes in my life a long time ago.
40. I know that I can trust my friends, and they know they can trust me.
41. I sometimes feel as if I've done all there is to do in life.
42. When I compare myself to friends and acquaintances, it makes me feel good about who I am.

## Appendix H

## Satisfaction With Life Scale (SWLS-5)

Read each statement carefully and indicate your degree of agreement using the scale below.

**1**            **2**            **3**            **4**            **5**            **6**            **7**

**Strongly disagree**

**Strongly agree**

1. In most ways my life is close to my ideal.
2. The conditions of my life are excellent.
3. I am satisfied with my life.
4. So far I have gotten the important things I want in life.
5. If I could live my life over, I would change almost nothing.

## Appendix I

Frequencies and Percentages for the Data from the Demographic Questionnaire:

American versus Saudi students and parenting styles and psychological well-being.

Cultural background		n	%
American	<b>Gender</b>		
	Male	32	18.5
	female	141	81.5
Saudi	Male	109	68.6
	Female	50	31.4
American	<b>Age range</b>		
	18-25 years	155	89.6
	26-29 years	9	5.2
	30-35 years	3	1.7
	36+	6	3.5
Saudi	18-25 years	50	31.4
	26-29 years	56	35.2
	30-35 years	44	27.7
	36+	9	5.7
American	<b>Ethnicity</b>		
	African American	57	33.7
	Asian	5	3.1
	Hispanic	62	36.2
	Caribbean	13	8
	White	33	17.2
	Other	3	1.8
Saudi	Arab	159	100
American	<b>Level of Education</b>		
	High school	47	27.2
	some college	92	53.2
	Associate degree	12	6.9
	Bachelor's degree	17	9.8
	Master's degree	3	1.7
	Doctorate degree	1	0.6
	Professional (MD, JD, DDS, etc..)	1	0.6
	Saudi	Elementary school	1
	High school	13	8.2

	some college	15	9.4
	Associate degree	2	1.3
	Bachelor's degree	79	49.7
	Master's degree	37	23.3
	Doctorate degree	9	5.7
	Professional (MD, JD, DDS, etc..)	3	1.9
American	<b>Marital Status</b>		
	Single	158	91.3
	Married	12	6.9
	separated	1	0.6
	divorced	2	1.2
Saudi	Single	78	49.1
	Married	78	49.1
	separated	1	0.6
	divorced	1	0.6
	widowed	1	0.6
American	<b>Religious background</b>		
	Christian		
	Jewish	77	44.5
	Catholic	1	0.6
	Muslim	55	31.8
	Buddhist	8	4.6
	Other	1	0.6
		31	17.9
Saudi	Muslim	158	99.4
	Other	1	0.6
American	<b>primary language</b>		
	English	141	81.5
	Spanish	15	8.7
	Arabic	5	2.9
	French	1	0.6
	Creole	4	2.3
	Other	7	4
Saudi	English	4	2.5
	Arabic	155	97.5
American	<b>Years of living in the United State</b>		
	Less than one year	6	3.5
	1-5 years	21	12.1
	5-10 years	7	4

	10-15 years	8	4.6
	Over 15 years	131	75.7
Saudi	Less than one year	32	20.1
	1-5 years	96	60.4
	5-10 years	26	16.4
	10-15 years	4	2.5
	Over 15 years	1	0.6
American	<b>Your annual income in Dollar</b>		
	Less than 25,000	146	84.5
	25,000-50,000	17	8.8
	50,000- 75,000	7	4.8
	More than 75,000	3	1.9
Saudi	Less than 25,000	79	49.7
	25,000-50,000	60	37.5
	50,000- 75,000	10	6.4
	More than 75,000	10	6.4
American	<b>When you were a child your parents were</b>		
	married	101	58.4
	separated	46	26.6
	divorced	24	13.9
	widowed	2	1.2
Saudi	married	148	93.1
	separated	3	1.9
	divorced	6	3.8
	widowed	2	1.3
American	<b>Were you raised in an</b>		
	extended family	64	37
	nuclear family	58	33.5
	single family	51	29.5
Saudi	extended family	109	68.6
	nuclear family	37	23.3
	single family	13	8.2
American	<b>your birth order</b>		
	First born	83	48
	Middle	43	24.9

	Last born	29	16.8
	other	18	10.4
Saudi	First born	41	25.8
	Middle	91	57.2
	Last born	16	10.1
	Other	11	6.9
American	<b>Were any of your parents step-parents</b>		
	Yes	45	26
	No	128	74
Saudi	Yes	23	14.5
	No	136	85.5
American	<b>Were you raised primarily by</b>		
	Parents	163	94.2
	relatives	8	4.6
	servants	1	0.6
	foster parents	1	0.6
Saudi	Parents	149	93.7
	relatives	9	5.7
	servants	1	0.6

---

Note. Americans N= 173, Saudis N= 159.