Distribution Agreement

In presenting this thesis or dissertation as a partial fulfillment of the requirements for an advanced degree from Emory University, I hereby grant to Emory University and its agents the non-exclusive license to archive, make accessible, and display my thesis or dissertation in whole or in part in all forms of media, now or hereafter known, including display on the world wide web. I understand that I may select some access restrictions as part of the online submission of this thesis or dissertation. I retain all ownership rights to the copyright of the thesis or dissertation. I also retain the right to use in future works (such as articles or books) all or part of this thesis or dissertation.

Signature:

_____ _____

Tianyu He Date

Cultural Differences in Parental Responsibility Assignment for Misbehavior: China and the U.S.

By

Tianyu He
Master of Arts (M.A.)

Sociology

Karen Hegtvedt, Ph.D.
Committee Chair

Richard Rubinson, Ph.D.
Committee Member

Melissa J. Williams, Ph.D.
Committee Member

Accepted:

Lisa A. Tedesco, Ph.D.
Dean of the James T. Laney School of Graduate Studies

Date

Cultural Differences in Parental Responsibility Assignment for Misbehavior: China and the U.S.

By

Tianyu He

L.L.B., Peking University, 2012
B.S., Peking University, 2012

Advisor: Karen Hegtvedt, Ph.D.

An abstract of
A thesis submitted to the Faculty of the
James T. Laney School of Graduate Studies of Emory University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts in Sociology
2015

Abstract

Cultural Differences in Parental Responsibility Assignment for Misbehavior: China and the U.S.

By Tianyu He

Although scholars often attribute the academic and economic success of Asian Americans (especially compared to other racial and ethnic groups) to the strict parenting and other cultural values of Asians, little research examines attributions for negative behaviors. This study compares the impact of Western and Asian parenting and associated cultural values on perceived responsibility for misbehavior of children at different ages (12, 22, 32, 42). East Asian (Chinese) and Western (U.S.) study participants responded to vignettes of misbehavior. Results showed that Chinese perceivers, in response to misbehavior, assign more responsibility to parents and anticipate a greater loss of status for parents than U.S. perceivers. The results further showed that the influence of a child's misbehavior on the parents are moderated by the child's age, such that an elder adult child still has an impact on responsibility assignment to and the anticipated status loss for parents from the perspective of Chinese, but not American, participants. The implications of these findings on racial differences in life outcomes are discussed in this paper.

Cultural Differences in Parental Responsibility Assignment for Misbehavior: China and the U.S.

By

Tianyu He

L.L.B., Peking University, 2012
B.S., Peking University, 2012

Advisor: Karen Hegtvedt, Ph.D.

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of the
James T. Laney School of Graduate Studies of Emory University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts in Sociology
2015

Table of Contents

List of Tables/Figures

INTRODUCTION

Asian Americans outperform other races and ethnic groups academically and economically (Ngo and Lee 2007; Peng and Wright 1994). Additionally, criminology research reveals that Asian Americans, especially East Asians, have the lowest rate of juvenile arrests (Le and Stockdale 2005). Discussed extensively in both lay media (e.g. USA Today 2013[1]; Huffington Post 2013[2]; New York Times 2014[3]) and academic scholarship, these two patterns are attributed to a mutual factor: Asian parents. Specifically, journalists and scholars draw attention to several factors: the strict parenting that provides control over children's academic performance (Choi et al. 2013) and monitor of delinquent behaviors (Kim et al. 2011); parental emphasis on education as a major life goal (Kiang et al. 2013); and traditional Asian cultural values (Cheah et al. 2013). These studies delineate reasons why success motivates Asian American parents and children and in so doing, highlight potential differences between East Asian cultural values and practices compared to typical American ones. The reasons offered, however, do not capture specifically assignment of responsibility for individual performance or behaviors, especially negative ones.

With so much attention focused on the academic success of Asian Americans and Asians more generally (e.g. Lee and Zhou 2014; Ngo and Lee 2007), little work examines attributions for negative behavior, such as misbehaviors. This study investigates two

---

[1] "American moms creating a parenting melting pot" (http://www.usatoday.com/story/news/nation/2013/05/09/moms-advice-world-cultures/2131505/)

[2] "What Really Drives Success: Lessons For Tiger Mom" (http://www.huffingtonpost.com/ellen-galinsky/what-really-drives-succes_b_4694136.html)

[3] "A Scholarly Response to 'Tiger Mom': Hapiness Matters, Too"(http://sinosphere.blogs.nytimes.com/2014/05/23/a-scholarly-response-to-tiger-mom-happiness-matters-too/)

questions. First, are Chinese perceivers more likely to assign responsibility to parents for the misbehavior of their children than American perceivers? And second, will the misbehavior of children entail a greater loss of status for Chinese parents? Additionally, I explore how the age of a misbehaving child may affect patterns distinguished by culture.

Cross-cultural attribution studies, typically focused on organizational settings, show that people from East Asia are more likely to attribute negative behaviors and events to a collective or its proxies than are Americans (Lu et al. 2014; Menon et al. 1999). This tendency raises the question of how Asians attribute children's performance and whether that attribution motivates children to achieve and avoid misbehaving.

Culture shapes the causal attribution individuals make about others and social events (Morris, Menon, and Ames 2001; Morris and Peng 1994). Two dimensions of culture, namely Individualism-Collectivism and Analytic-Holistic thinking, are most commonly used to explain cognitive differences between East Asian cultures and Western cultures. The Individualism-Collectivism dimension distinguishes individualists who tend to give priority to individual goals from collectivists who tend to place more emphasis on group goals (Triandis 2004). The Analytic-Holistic dimension compares the analytic thinker who considers heavily the dispositional traits of an actor thus perceiving most actors as independent and static across time to holistic thinkers who emphasize surrounding situations thus believing that elements of the world are interconnected and expect things/actors to be constantly changing (Choi, Koo, and Choi 2007). Western cultures tend to be more individualistic and analytic while East Asian cultures are more collectivistic and holistic.

Although comparisons between people of Asian descent and other racial and ethnic groups has focused largely on differences in achieving academic goals and reasons for them (e.g. Jeynes 2007; Peng and Wright 1994), far less research addresses causal explanations

regarding negative social behavior. While achievements are seen as bringing honor to the family, and external pressures motivate individuals to avoid failures, how do perceivers cast instances of misbehavior? Are parents likewise held accountable for the actions of their children whose behavior may bring shame to the family? I expect that collectivistic Chinese perceivers who think holistically are more likely to attribute children's misbehavior to their parents than their American counterparts who emphasize individualism and analytic thinking.

Participants from China and the U.S. responded to vignettes describing children's misbehavior. This study extends previous cultural comparison studies on attribution by moving beyond organizational settings to focus on a family setting. In particular, emphasis rests on attributions to parents and grandparents as well as the impact of attributions on perceived loss of parental status. Thus this study expands understanding of cultural differences in perceived social connections and responsibility attribution.

In the following sections, I first review previous studies concerning parental influence on children's behavior in East Asian culture. Next, I build on theories of cultural orientation and empirical results from cross cultural attribution research to generate hypotheses about parental attribution patterns, comparing perceivers from East Asian and American cultures, and the consequences of these patterns for changes in perceived social status. I then describe the research design and present the findings. Last I discuss the implications of the results for understanding cross-cultural patterns of perception and behavior.

BACKGROUND

Parenting, Culture, and Attributions

Extensive discussions focusing on Asian Americans' performances, especially their superiority in academics (e.g. Peng and Wright 1994) and low levels of delinquency and crime (Kim and Goto 2000) compared to other race and ethnic groups, repeatedly point to the role of parenting (Kim et al. 2013). Both the lay media and academic scholarship highlight the influence of parents in different ways.

Some scholars posit that parents' strict parenting style aids academic success (Choi et al. 2013; Jeynes 2012). Asians' emphasis on education as a major life goal (Kiang et al. 2013) is another factor connected to traditional Asian cultural values that researchers use to explain why parents as well as Asian youth share a similar understanding towards academic outcomes. Studies involving filial piety, a traditional Asian value that children should always respect their parents, elaborate on the relationship between parents and children, emphasizing how it drives Asian children to obey their parents (Ma et al. 2013). Higher levels of parental control in Asian families may also explain the lower delinquency rates for Asian Americans (Kim and Goto 2000). In general, compared to people of other racial and ethnic groups, Asian Americans are under more pressure from their parents or families to obey and this acts as an external motivation to achieve, which leads to their better academic performances and lower delinquency or crime rates. The attribution of the greater academic success of Asians to proximal causes such as family pressures and strict parenting arguably stems from more general and abstract cultural differences between Asians and Westerners.

Social judgments such as causality attribution may vary owing to cultural differences in dimensions of individualism-collectivism (e.g., Hofstede 1984; Hui and Triandis 1986) and holistic versus analytic cognitive thinking (Choi and Nisbett 2000; Choi, Nisbett, and Norenzayan 1999; Nisbett et al. 2001). *Causal attributions* represent inferences people make about the causes of events, including behaviors of self and others (Heider 1944). This study

focuses on responsibility assignment, which is one specific type of causal attribution, where people make inferences about who is responsible for events or behaviors in question. Inferences about to whom to assign responsibility, however, do not necessarily equate with beliefs about who actually caused an event or enacted a behavior, but they reflect people's attempts to make sense out of an event or behavior.

Generally, because Western cultures tend to be more individualistic and analytic whereas East Asian cultures are more collectivistic and holistic, East Asians are more likely to attribute both events and individual behaviors to collectives, or people who represent the collectives. In Asian contexts, when a member performs a malevolent act, this act reflects not only on the moral failure of the member but also on the failure of the whole collective (Manchi Chao, Zhang, and Chiu 2008). East Asians, as holistic reasoners, consider a greater amount of information than less holistic thinkers, such as Americans, before making a final attribution (Choi et al. 2003). In seeking information, Asians may become aware of relevant collectivistic factors in their attribution process, which increases the likelihood of attributing responsibility to collectives. Similarly, perceivers from East Asian cultures compared to those from Western cultures tend to foresee prospective consequences (Maddux and Yuki 2006). For example, when asked to imagine themselves as CEOs firing employees due to financial pressure, Japanese respondents tend to feel more responsible for more distal and indirect consequences of this focal event than do American respondents.

Cultural Variation in Responsibility Assignment

A number of studies in organizations examine the assignment of responsibility when an organizational member misbehaves. Findings reveal both similarities and disparities in attribution patterns across cultures. Attribution processes often include assigning

responsibility based on the causal influence of a person on an incident (e.g., Hamilton and Sanders 1983; Zemba et al. 2006), with the greatest responsibility assigned to the person or people who are the direct cause of an event, also known as "personal causality logic." Individuals from both East Asian and Western cultural backgrounds follow this logic by assigning more responsibility to causally involved parties (Zemba et al. 2012; Zemba et al. 2006).

Nonetheless, even though East Asian and Western cultures do not differ in their responsibility judgments of an individual actor who is causally involved, East Asians assign more group responsibility than people with Western cultural background. Specifically, cultures vary in their orientation to perceived causal agency in groups (Morris et al. 2001; Yamaguchi 2001). Menon et al. (1990) suggest that cultural orientation about agency shape how perceivers make sense of social events, especially when ambiguous. Their findings show that East Asians are more likely than Westerners to conceptualize collectives as causal agents. When explaining an ambiguous outcome, East Asians tend to attribute behaviors more to group-based characteristics or activities than do Westerners.

Also, East Asian perceivers are more likely to assign responsibility to the organization itself (not only to individual actors) than are Westerners (Zemba et al. 2006). Yet, because an organization is often not an easy target to sanction for misbehavior (Coffee 1981; Zemba et al. 2006) perceivers extend the responsibility to high positioned individuals in the organization and sanction the organization symbolically. In effect, the leader is assigned responsibility based on his or her group's behavior and is blamed as an organizational proxy (Zemba et al. 2006). East Asians compared to Westerners blame uninvolved leaders more harshly because they combine both the leader's responsibility and the organization's. In

contrast, American perceivers embedded in Western culture blame leaders based on personal causality logic alone (Zemba et al. 2006).

Assuming that collectivistic and holistic orientations characterize how East Asians assign responsibility, the pattern of attributions in organizations may also extend to dynamics in the family. The family as a social organization has members who are analogous to employers and employees in organizations. Though a family does not have formally acknowledged goals, observers' attributions for the misbehavior of children may parallel that for the misconduct of an employee. Parents might be both directly involved with their children's misbehavior (e.g. encouraging the children to steal) or indirectly involved (e.g. failing to properly educate the children not to steal). Extrapolating from the results of organization studies and considering cross-cultural collectivistic and holistic orientations, it is expected that Chinese perceivers may be more likely to attribute children's misbehaviors to their parents than their American counterparts, especially when the actual causes for the misbehavior are not agreed upon or ambiguous.

H1 Chinese perceivers are more likely to assign responsibility to parents in general for their children's misbehaviors than are American perceivers.

Consequence of Responsibility Assignment

Studies that examine the consequences of attribution focus almost exclusively on direct negative sanctions (Manchi Chao et al. 2008; Tetlock et al. 2010; Wang et al. 2010). Yet implicit negative sanctions, especially the loss of status for individuals assigned responsibility, may also exist. Status refers to the relative standing of an individual in a social system, "based on some measures of prestige, honor, and deference" (Thye 2000 p. 411). For example, previous studies show that stigmatized family members (e.g. owing to drug use, mental

illness) are perceived as potential source of shame to the whole family as well as other family members (Angermeyer and Dietrich 2006; Phillips, Pearson, Li, Xu, and Yang 2002). Similarly, children's misbehavior may represent stigmatized incidents that bring shame to their families and trigger perceived status loss for other family members, particularly those who are assigned more responsibility.

The cultural patterns for status loss may be similar to responsibility assignment and analogous to previous findings about direct negative sanctions. Chinese represent East Asian cultures with their collectivistic orientation and thus perceive children as more closely interdependent within family. Children's behavior, good or bad, will reflect more on the Chinese family compared to American families. Individuals from both cultures may recognize the responsibility of parents in shaping children's behavior, but for the more collectivistic and holistic oriented Chinese, parents may be seen as indirectly contributing to the misbehavior of children compared to the perception of the more individualistic and analytical thinking Americans. The same thinking style also encourages East Asians to be more sensitive to distal and indirect consequences and antecedents (Tetlock et al. 2006). Thus information about and attributions to parents and grandparents are more salient to East Asians than their U.S. counterparts. With a collectivistic orientation, East Asians may be more likely to punish the collectivity – parents and grandparents – more for children's misbehavior than Americans might be inclined to do. One form of punishment is to reduce the status associated with members of the collectivity. Thus attributions for children's misbehavior to parents may lead perceivers to view them of lower status, especially among Chinese observers.

H2 Children's misbehaviors will lead to more perceived loss of social status for (a) parents and (b) grandparents from the perspective of Chinese perceivers than American perceivers.

Child's Age as a Moderator

Typically, very young children's misbehavior may be excused, attributed to their lack of knowledge about rules. As they age, however, two things happen: 1) children grow more accountable for their own behaviors; and 2) parents are seen as responsible for having taught their children behavioral rules. Up to a particular age, parents are likely to be held at least somewhat responsible for their children's misbehavior. Cultural beliefs may define the age at which children's behavior continues or ceases to be seen as the responsibility of their parents.

Although culturally diverse, China and U.S. have similar laws regarding parents' or guardians' legal responsibility. Under criminal liability, the guardian or other adult may be held criminally responsible for contributing to the delinquency of a minor child (aged under 18) in the U.S. (Brank, Greene, and Hochevar 2011). Laws also sanction actions of adults who encourage delinquent behavior by a child. In China, civil laws also hold parents or guardians accountable for delinquent behaviors of minors (National People's Congress of People's Republic of China 2000). In both countries, individuals are considered to be fully capable of civil conduct and responsible for their own crimes at age 18. Thus there are hardly any legal discrepancies between China and the U.S. Legal research on parental responsibility confirms that the bond between parenting behavior and a child's actions weakens as a child ages (Tomaszewski 2005). Consequently the willingness to hold parents accountable varies inversely as a function of the age of children. Results show that parents of younger youth were perceived to be more responsible for their child's delinquent behaviors than parents of older youth (Brank et al. 2011).

Cultural approaches, however, do vary and may account for different patterns for the assignment of parental responsibility for children's misbehavior at various ages and the consequential loss of status for parents of misbehaving children. Despite legal status, because of Asians' collective orientation, the behavior of children may continue to be attributed to the group to which they belong, even after they enter adulthood. Thus, perceivers may be more likely to continue to blame Chinese parents for their children's misbehavior across different ages, especially compared to blame attributed by American parents. In effect, the age of a child engaging in misbehavior may moderate the difference between Chinese and American perceivers in responsibility assignment.

H3 (a) Age of misbehaving children is negatively related to assignment of responsibility to parents among American perceivers but (b) age has less or no effect on responsibility assignment among Chinese perceivers.

Concomitantly, if age affects assignment of responsibility as hypothesized, it may also affect the consequences of parental responsibility for children's misbehavior. Again, to the extent that parents are held responsible, they may lose status in the eyes of observers. Thus,

H4 (a) Age of misbehaving children is negatively related to perceived status loss for parents and grandparents among American perceivers but (b) age has less or no effect in perceived status loss among Chinese perceivers.

METHOD

Participants

This study draws on original data gathered from American and Chinese respondents using an Internet-based survey experiment. A convenience sample of Chinese was gathered from posts on an online bulletin board of a college in Beijing and two other social-

networking sites. The American sample was drawn from Amazon Mechanical Turk. The duration of fielding was about one month starting November of 2013. Of the 553 responses in both samples, 401 were considered to be valid.[4] The 168 Chinese participants (64 male, 94 female, 10 of unreported gender and age) had an average age of 24.33 years (SD = 4.78). The 233 American participants (109 male, 119 female, 5 of unreported gender and age) had an average age of 36.36 years (SD = 12.08).

Vignettes and Procedures

The experiment was a 2 (culture) × 4 (age conditions) between-subjects design. Chinese and American participants entered the survey experiment by clicking on a generated link, and each was randomly assigned to one of the four age conditions.

Within each age condition, where the target actor is described as 12, 22, 32, or 42 years old, the respondent read three vignettes. The first and the last vignettes are the critical stimuli scenarios, describing a misbehaving male. In one scenario, an adult male was caught shoplifting a laptop worth $800; in the other scenario, an adult male got into a fight with another male who tried to cut in line. Males in both scenarios are at the same age. The vignettes vary slightly for the scenarios involving the 12-year-old. In one case, a boy shoplifted a video-game player worth $100, and the corresponding "fighting" scenario described a boy who got into a fight with another boy who cut in line. A filler vignette, identical for all conditions, describes a girl falling asleep during a cartoon, and separates the two critical vignettes. All vignettes had an identical structure. Participants were reminded at

[4] By documenting IP addresses of respondents, I was able to identify responses given by the same participants either due to problems finishing the survey the first time they opened the web page or in some cases, trying to get more gift cards by completing more than one survey. These surveys were excluded from analysis.

the beginning of each vignette that the target actor is the only-child of the family, and participants assigned to age conditions 22, 32 and 42 were additionally reminded that the target actor lives in the same city but not the same place as the parents or grandparents. A description of misbehavior (or behavior, in the filler scenario) was followed by a comment with the misbehavior being a long-term problem ("Shoplifting is an ongoing problem with him."). To create an ambiguous situation, the misbehavior was not criminally extreme, yet was not minor either.

Following the reading of each vignette, respondents first rated the measurements of responsibility assignment (see Appendix A for details of vignettes). Participants then rated two sets of statements measuring their perceptions of changes in status for the parents and grandparents of the target individual.

Following the first part of the survey, participants provided answers about their perception of the age when parents and grandparents are no longer responsible for their children or grandchildren's misbehavior; and the age that parents and grandparents should no longer be blamed for their children or grandchildren's misbehavior.

The third and fourth parts of the survey asked about individualism and collectivism values, and analytic and holistic thinking orientations. They are measured using IND-COL index (Singelis, Triandis, Bhawuk and Gelfand 1995) and Analysis-Holism scale (Choi et al. 2005) respectively (see Appendix B for the scales used). The last part of the survey asked about participants' demographic information.

The survey was in both Chinese and English. The Chinese version of the survey is the result of a back-to-back translation conducted a native Chinese speaker with proficient English skills and a bilingual Chinese. The online survey software (Qualtrics) can detect the browser's language that participants used and displayed the matching language. Participants

were also able to adjust the language. Some Chinese participants answered the survey in English at first due to their studying in English-speaking countries. But later a warning to answer the survey using native language only was implemented. The survey software recorded language used by participants.

Measures

Responsibility Assignment

Responsibility assignment is measured using three generic questions asking how much participants disagree or agree that the target individual, his parents, and his organization "is responsible for this behavior" in the scenario. Each responsibility assignment question was presented as a statement (e.g. "Alex's school or company is responsible for this behavior"), and participants chose the degree to which they agree to the statement. Responses to each question are measured on a 7-point Likert scale (from 1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree). Two questions on whether this behavior is due to inadequate parenting: "This behavior is a result of inadequate parenting from [target individual]'s parents when he was young" and inadequate support (for age 22 - 42 conditions): "This behavior is a result of inadequate support from [target individual]'s parents after he became an adult", measure specific parental responsibility assignment.

The survey also included a question for participants to report the age of children when parents and grandparents are no longer responsible or should not be blamed for children's misbehavior: "When a child turns (?) years old, the grandparents can no longer be blamed for his or her misbehaviors", participants filled out the blank.

Anticipated Status Loss

Perceived status change for parents and grandparents are measured using 10 statements (see Appendix A) describing how people in their network might treat them after

discovering the misbehavior of their children's or grandchildren's. The statements describe mainly the desire to create distance from and respect less the parents or grandparents (e.g. "If acquaintances of Alex's parents found out about this incident, they would have a worse impression of the parents," "If close friends of Alex's grandparents found out about this incident, they would be less willing to invite the grandparents over for a cup of coffee or tea"). Respondents indicated on a 7-point Likert scale (1 = "Very Unlikely" to 7 = "Very Likely") for how likely the statement associated with status loss would be. Items were combined into scales for parents (Cronbach's Alpha for each age conditions: American (Shoplifting scenario: .94, .93, .94, .95; Fighting scenario: .94, .94, .94, .95); Chinese (Shoplifting scenario: .92, .94, .95, .95; Fighting scenario: .94, .94, .93, .94) and grandparents parents (Cronbach's Alpha for each age conditions: American (Shoplifting scenario: .95, .94, .94, .95; Fighting scenario: .93, .93, .95, .97); Chinese (Shoplifting scenario: .96, .97, .95, .96; Fighting scenario: .97, .96, .96, .95)), averaged by the number of items. The mean value of the ten items was used to indicate anticipated status loss for parents and grandparents. It ranges from lowest of 1 to highest of 7.

Individualism-Collectivism Measure (IND-COL)

Singelis et al. (1995) developed a measure for individualism and collectivism (IND-COL), which has been applied in numerous cross-cultural comparison studies (e.g. Shavitt, Lalwani, Zhang and Torelli 2006) and has proved overall reliable (Cozma 2011). A total of 32 items, half of which measuring individualistic tendency (e.g. "I enjoy being unique and different from the others in many ways," "It is important for me that I do my job better than the others") and half of which measuring collectivistic tendency (e.g. "My happiness depends very much on the happiness of those around me," "I think cooperation in workplace is more

important than competition"), were provided (Triandis 1995, 2001) [5]. Highly individualistic people desire to be unique and to do their own thing free of other's interference or strive to become the best to be at the top of the social hierarchy while doing their own thing. People who are high on collectivism tend to see themselves as a member of a group and cooperation with other group members is essential. For them, serving and sacrificing for the in-group is also important (Triandis, 2001; Triandis and Suh, 2002). This survey applied the 32-item full scale, 16 statements each for the collectivistic tendency and individualistic tendency, using 7-point Likert scale to indicate the degree to which participants agree with the statements (from 1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree).

I collapsed the original IND-COL into two scales measuring collectivistic and individualistic tendency by averaging the 16 items measuring individualism (Cronbach's Alpha: Chinese = .73 American = .71) and the 16 items measuring collectivism (Cronbach's Alpha: Chinese = .76 American = .85). ANCOVA results showed that, as expected, Chinese participants are more collectivistic (M = 5.01, SD = 0.55), F (1, 355) = 7.34, p = .01 than American participants (M = 4.82, SD = 0.72) as shown on the collectivism scale. But contrary to expectation, Chinese participants are more individualistic (M = 4.89, SD = 0.54) than American participants (M = 4.67, SD = 0.69), though the difference is not statistically significant (F (1, 356) = 2.00, p = .16). Given the lack of theoretically expected variation between Chinese and Americans for the individualism scale, the results reported below only include the collectivism scale.

Analytic-Holistic Thinking Measure

[5] The 32 items are divided into four subscales, representing horizontal and vertical dimensions of individualism and collectivism. Such detail, however, was not theoretically applicable for this study, emphasizing individualistic and collectivistic trends rather than sub-dimensions.

To measure differences in analytic versus holistic thinking, this survey included Analysis-Holism Scale (AHS) developed by Choi et al. (2007). The mean value for the 24-item scale is used to indicate the degree of analytic versus holistic thinking (e.g. "Everything in the universe is somehow related to each other," "A person who is currently living a successful life will continue to stay successful."). Seven-point Likert scales were used to indicate the degree to which participants agree with the statements (from 1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree) for Chinese (Cronbach's Alpha = .75) and Americans (Cronbach's Alpha = .76).

Demographic Information

The survey also collected demographic information on participants' age, gender (0 = male, 1 = female), education level (1 = "Did not complete high school," 2 = "High school graduate," 3 = "Some college," 4 ="4-year college degree," 5 = "Master's degree," 6 = "Law, medical, or doctoral degree"), parental education level (averaged from father's and mother's education level, using the same measurement as participants' education level), and subjective socio-economic status. Subjective socio-economic status was measured from lowest 1 to highest 9, where participants were instructed to indicate where they perceive themselves to stand in their society. Demographic information was later used to control for the heterogeneity between the two samples.

Analysis

The two misbehavior vignettes were treated independently, by analyzing the effect of culture on the two misbehaviors separately. A series of t-tests showed that, within each culture, the five responsibility assignment items and anticipated status loss for parents and

grandparents significantly differs between the two misbehavior vignettes. Thus, collapsing the two scenarios was not an option.

Order of reading in which the two scenarios were displayed was treated as a within subject control variable. A series of ANOVA tests showed that, within each age condition, the order of reading had significant effect on several dependent variables (e.g. assigning responsibility to the individual in 12-year-old scenario, assigning responsibility to the organization in 22-year-old scenario etc.). Thus all subsequent analyses include the control for the order effect.

Each hypothesis was tested with a series of ANCOVAs for the seven dependent variables (assigning responsibility to the individual, the individual's organization, the individual's parents, parenting during childhood and parental support during adulthood; anticipated status loss for parents and grandparents), controlling for participant age, gender, education level, parental education level, subjective socio-economic status, and the order of reading in which the two scenarios were displayed, unless other specified.

I explored collectivistic orientation and analytic/holistic tendency as mediators using OLS regression. Participant age, gender, education level, parental education level, subjective socio-economic status, and the order of reading in which the two scenarios were displayed were used as covariates, unless other specified, together with collectivism and AHS scores as independent variables.

RESULTS

Assignment of responsibility as a function of culture

I first tested whether Chinese and American participants would differentially assign responsibility to parents for the misbehavior of their children. Hypothesis 1 suggests that

Chinese participants would tend to assign more responsibility to parents than would American participants. I also investigated whether the expected negative effect of children's age on the assignment of responsibility to their parents would be weaker among Chinese than American perceivers. Table 1 a-e show the results of simple effects on the five items asking about responsibility assignment, and the two-way analysis results of culture and target individual's age.

Main Effects of Culture and Target Age

Results involving both scenarios provided significant support for Hypothesis 1. In the "shoplifting" scenario, results showed significant main effects of culture for four items: the target individual (Table 1a), F (1, 349) = 10.16, $p < .005$; organizations individuals belong to (Table 1b), F (1, 349) = 99.28, $p < .005$; parents (Table 1c), F (1, 349) =21.43, $p < .005$; and parenting during childhood (Table 1d), F (1, 349) = 40.24, $p < .005$. Chinese participants assigned more responsibility to organizations, parents and parenting, whereas Americans assigned more responsibility to the target individuals.

Results also showed significant main effects of target age for the same four items, assigning responsibility to: the individual, F (3, 349) = 19.87, $p < .005$; companies/schools, F (3, 349) = 9.23, $p < .005$; parents, F (3, 349) = 21.35, $p < .005$, and parenting during childhood, F (3, 349) = 11.21, $p < .005$. A marginally significant main effect of target age was found for parental support during adulthood, F (3, 349) = 2.79, $p = .06$. As expected, responsibility attributed to the individual increased with the target's age, whereas responsibility attributed to companies/schools, parents, and parenting decreased with the target's age.

In the "fighting" scenario, results again showed significant main effects of culture for the first four items: the target individual, F (1, 349) = 6.82, $p = .01$; organizations individuals

belong to, F (1, 349) = 64.41, p < .005; parents, F (1, 349) = 41.85, p < .005; and parenting during childhood, F (1, 349) = 30.29, p < .005. As in the "shoplifting" scenario, Chinese participants assigned more responsibility to organizations, parents, and parenting, whereas Americans assigned more responsibility to the individual actors. Assigning responsibility to parental support during adulthood showed no significant difference between cultures, F (1, 349) < 1.

Also like the shoplifting scenario, results showed significant main effects of target age for four of the five items in the fighting scenario: assigning responsibility to the individual, F (3, 349) = 7.36, p < .005; assigning responsibility to companies/schools, F (3, 349) = 20.05, p < .005; assigning responsibility to parents, F (3, 349) = 22.17, p < .005; and assigning responsibility to parenting during childhood, F (3, 349) = 5.89, p < .005. No main effect of target age was found for parental support, F (3, 349) = 1.07, *ns.* As expected, responsibility attributed to the individual increased with the target's age, whereas responsibility attributed to organizations and parents decreased with the target's age.

Table 2a Means (Standard Deviations) and ANCOVA for the Effects of Culture, Age and Their Interaction on Responsibility Assignment to Individual

[The individual] is responsible for this behavior.	**China**	**U.S.**	***F***	***p***
"Shoplifting"	***Main effect of Culture***		10.16	< .005
	Main effect of Target Age		19.87	< .005
	Culture X Age Interaction Effect		5.31	< .005
Age 12	5.21 (1.49)	6.21 (0.89)	6.49	.01
Age 22	**6.31 (0.74)**	**6.70 (0.54)**	6.12	.02
Age 32	6.49 (0.79)	6.53 (0.73)	0.03	.87
Age 42	6.42 (0.72)	6.65 (0.52)	0.49	.49
"Fighting"	***Main effect of Culture***		6.82	.01
	Main effect of Target Age		7.36	< .005
	Culture X Age Interaction Effect		1.13	.34
Age 12	5.44 (1.11)	5.93 (1.01)	1.20	.28
Age 22	**6.16 (0.77)**	**6.41 (0.99)**	0.81	.37
Age 32	6.13 (1.03)	6.40 (0.79)	2.56	.11
Age 42	5.81 (1.49)	6.53 (0.63)	3.50	.07

Note: **Bold** figures indicate that a statistically significant change occurred between the current age and the previous age.

Table 1b Means (Standard Deviations) and ANCOVA for the Effects of Culture, Age and Their Interaction on Responsibility Assignment to Organization

[The individual's] company/school is responsible for this behavior.	**China**	**U.S.**	***F***	***p***
"Shoplifting"	***Main effect of Culture***		99.28	< .005
	Main effect of Target Age		9.27	< .005
	Culture X Age Interaction Effect		0.11	.96
Age 12	5.06 (1.46)	2.86 (1.53)	20.64	< .005
Age 22	**4.06 (1.32)**	**1.84 (1.11)**	35.43	< .005
Age 32	4.15 (1.71)	1.93 (1.09)	30.43	< .005
Age 42	4.03 (1.70)	2.00 (1.51)	13.55	< .005
"Fighting"	***Main effect of Culture***		64.41	< .005
	Main effect of Target Age		20.05	< .005
	Culture X Age Interaction Effect		1.48	.22
Age 12	4.97 (1.22)	3.11 (1.57)	9.56	< .005
Age 22	**3.88 (1.29)**	**1.82 (0.90)**	37.47	< .005
Age 32	3.46 (1.54)	2.05 (1.08)	15.42	< .005
Age 42	3.32 (1.56)	1.98 (1.37)	10.08	< .005

Note: **Bold** figures indicate that a statistically significant change occurred between the current age and the previous age.

To sum up, in both scenarios, Chinese participants, compared to Americans, assigned more responsibility to the organizations to which the individuals belong (companies and schools). Results involving responsibility to the target individual also confirmed previous research findings (Menon et al. 1999; Zemba 2006) with Americans assigning greater responsibility than Chinese respondents to the target individual. For the three items specifically measuring parental responsibility, Chinese participants blamed parents more than Americans did, as expected. They also attributed the misbehavior to parenting during the individuals' childhood more than the American participants did. However, there was no cultural difference in attribution of the misbehaviors to parental support during adulthood. Patterns were consistent across scenarios. This evidence thus clearly supports Hypotheses 1, that Chinese perceivers are more likely to attribute children's misbehaviors to parents than are American perceivers.

Culture X Target Age Interaction effects.

The 2-way interaction effect for each scenario, which speaks to Hypothesis 3, qualifies the strong patterns emerging for Hypotheses 1. Follow-up tests locate the target age at which there is a statistically significant increase in assigning responsibility to individuals, and decrease in responsibility to individual's organization, individual's parents, and parenting within each culture. The tests investigated mean differences between consecutive age conditions and whether they are statistically significant. Hypothesis 3 expected that changes in perceived responsibility would occur at later ages for the Chinese than the American participants. Generally, results are stronger for the shoplifting scenario than for the fighting scenario.

For the shoplifting scenario, the culture X target age interaction effect was significant or approached significance for the items capturing attribution to the target individual, parents, and parenting during childhood (See Tables 1-a, 1-c, 1-d). For the item capturing attribution to the target individual, the first statistically significant increase in perceived responsibility occurred between ages 12 and 22 for both Chinese participants, F (1, 58) = 11.94, $p < .005$, and American participants, F (1, 104) = 13.99, $p < .005$. Americans tended to attribute more responsibility to the individual at young ages (12 and 22) than Chinese, but the level of individual responsibility attributions did not vary by culture at older ages.

For the item capturing attribution to parents, the first statistically significant decrease occurred between age 22 and age 32 for Chinese participants, F (1, 63) = 5.51, $p = .02$, whereas it occurred earlier, between age 12 and age 22, for American participants, F (1, 104) = 45.44, $p < .005$. Decreases following the first one were not statistically significant for the Americans. However, it increased for Chinese participants, though not significantly. For the item capturing attribution to parenting during childhood, the first statistically significant decrease also occurred earlier for American participants, between age 12 and age 22, F (1,

104) = 31.26, $p < .005$, than for Chinese participants, between age 22 and age 32, F (1, 63) = 4.80, $p = .03$. Decreases following the first one were also not statistically significant for the Americans. And it again increased for Chinese participants with no significance. Thus, results from the shoplifting scenario largely confirm Hypothesis 3.

In contrast, the culture X target age interaction effect was not significant for the items measuring attribution to companies/schools or parental support during adulthood. Thus, these results from the shoplifting scenario provide no evidence for Hypothesis 3.

For the fighting scenario, none of the culture X target age interaction effects was significant. The age contrast, however, suggest that for both increases in individual responsibility and decreases in organization/school responsibility, the largest differences emerge between the age of 12 and 22 for both Chinese and American perceivers. That same age range also is significant with regard to Americans' perception of parental responsibility and parenting.

Table 1c Means (Standard Deviations) and ANCOVA for the Effects of Culture, Age and Their Interaction on Responsibility Assignment to Parents

[The individual's] parents are responsible for this behavior.	**China**	**U.S.**	***F***	***p***
"**Shoplifting**"	***Main effect of Culture***		21.43	< .005
	Main effect of Target Age		21.35	< .005
	Culture X Age Interaction Effect		3.60	.01
Age 12	5.76 (1.46)	5.14 (1.21)	1.63	.21
Age 22	5.19 (1.38)	**3.34 (1.62)**	15.77	< .005
Age 32	**4.33 (1.64)**	3.36 (1.61)	1.50	.22
Age 42	4.81 (1.85)	2.84 (1.66)	7.83	.01
"Fighting"	***Main effect of Culture***		41.85	< .005
	Main effect of Target Age		22.17	< .005
	Culture X Age Interaction Effect		1.11	.35
Age 12	5.65 (0.95)	4.82 (1.21)	6.06	.02
Age 22	5.16 (0.95)	**3.48 (1.45)**	17.90	< .005
Age 32	4.64 (1.46)	3.19 (1.34)	12.70	< .005
Age 42	4.35 (1.80)	2.96 (1.51)	7.26	.01

Note: **Bold** figures indicate that a statistically significant change occurred between the current age and the previous age.

Table 1d Means (Standard Deviations) and ANCOVA for the Effects of Culture, Age and Their Interaction on Responsibility Assignment to Parenting during Childhood

This behavior is a result of inadequate parenting from [the individual's] parents.	China	U.S.	*F*	*p*
"Shoplifting"	***Main effect of Culture***		40.24	< .005
	Main effect of Target Age		11.21	< .005
	Culture X Age Interaction Effect		3.30	.02
Age 12	5.68 (1.32)	5.16 (1.19)	5.12	.03
Age 22	5.63 (1.01)	**3.77 (1.41)**	34.51	< .005
Age 32	**5.03 (1.27)**	3.84 (1.41)	4.86	.03
Age 42	5.10 (1.64)	3.54 (1.67)	9.22	< .005
"Fighting"	***Main effect of Culture***		30.29	< .005
	Main effect of Target Age		5.89	< .005
	Culture X Age Interaction Effect		2.07	.10
Across Conditions	5.04 (1.37)	3.95 (1.39)	29.44	< .005
Age 12	5.24 (1.37)	4.71 (1.26)	2.82	.10
Age 22	5.34 (1.00)	**3.80 (1.24)**	23.92	< .005
Age 32	4.79 (1.42)	3.74 (1.26)	6.47	.01
Age 42	4.84 (1.57)	3.56 (1.51)	5.15	.03

Note: **Bold** figures indicate that a statistically significant change occurred between the current age and the previous age.

Table 1e Means (Standard Deviations) and ANCOVA for the Effects of Culture, Age and Their Interaction on Responsibility Assignment to Parental Support during Adulthood

This behavior is a result of inadequate support from [the individual's] parents after he became an adult.	China	U.S.	*F*	*p*
"Shoplifting"	***Main effect of Culture***		1.63	.20
	Main effect of Target Age		2.79	.06
	Culture X Age Interaction Effect		0.46	.64
Age 22	3.59 (1.56)	3.11 (1.60)	0.51	.48
Age 32	3.51 (1.62)	3.43 (1.59)	1.74	.19
Age 42	3.00 (1.44)	**2.93 (1.67)**	1.49	.23
"Fighting"	***Main effect of Culture***		0.39	.53
	Main effect of Target Age		1.07	.34
	Culture X Age Interaction Effect		0.99	.37
Age 22	3.16 (1.30)	2.86 (1.38)	1.19	.28
Age 32	3.08 (1.46)	3.12 (1.31)	0.39	.54
Age 42	2.65 (1.43)	2.91 (1.57)	2.33	.13

Note: **Bold** figures indicate that a statistically significant change occurred between the current age and the previous age.

Anticipated Status Loss as a Function of Culture and Age

I next tested whether Chinese, relative to American participants, would expect that parents and grandparents would experience more status loss as a result of their child or grandchild's misbehavior. Hypothesis 2 predicts that children's misbehaviors would lead to more anticipated loss of social status for both parents and grandparents from the perspective of Chinese perceivers than American perceivers.

I examined also whether the expected negative effect of children's age on perceived status loss among parents and grandparents would be weaker among Chinese than American

perceivers, as predicted in Hypothesis 4. All results are shown in Tables 2-a and 2-b. The main effects of culture and age for each scenario are described first, followed by the interaction effects.

Main Effects of Culture and Target Age

Results showed main effects of culture for both scenarios, shoplifting scenario F (1, 349) = 12.00, $p < .005$ and fighting scenario F (1, 349) = 8.87, $p < .005$ on anticipated status loss for parents (see Table 2a). Main effects of culture were also found on anticipated status loss for grandparents in both shoplifting F (1, 349) = 54.01, $p <. 005$ and fighting scenario F (1, 349) = 18.27, $p < .005$ (see Table 2b). In both cases, Chinese participants anticipated more status loss than did American participants. There were no significant main effects of target age.

Table 2a Means (Standard Deviations) and ANCOVA for the Effects of Culture, Age and Their Interaction on Anticipated Status Loss for Parents

	China	U.S.	*F*	*p*
"Shoplifting"	***Main effect of Culture***		37.05	< .005
	Main effect of Target Age		1.39	.25
	Culture X Age Interaction Effect		3.25	.02
Age 12	5.23 (1.03)	4.62 (1.08)	<1	.43
Age 22	5.66(1.05)	**4.08 (1.28)**	19.04	< .005
Age 32	**5.12(1.22)**	4.17 (1.13)	2.34	.13
Age 42	5.34(1.16)	3.91 (1.27)	18.93	< .005
"Fighting"	***Main effect of Culture***		8.87	< .005
	Main effect of Target Age		2.11	.10
	Culture X Age Interaction Effect		2.58	.05
Age 12	4.28(1.17)	4.06 (1.08)	0.06	.81
Age 22	4.68(1.28)	**3.44 (1.20)**	10.35	< .005
Age 32	**4.14(1.02)**	3.58 (1.11)	1.37	.25
Age 42	4.06(1.17)	3.45 (1.32)	<1	.32

Note: **Bold** figures indicate that a statistically significant change occurred between the current age and the previous age.

Results were consistent across scenarios. It is also noteworthy that mean scores from Chinese and American participants tended to fall on opposite sides of the scale midpoint (4), suggesting that, overall, Chinese do anticipate that parents and grandparents will lose status when their children misbehave, whereas Americans do not expect this to happen. These

results provide clear support for Hypothesis 2 that children's misbehavior will lead to more social status loss for parents and grandparents from the perspective of Chinese perceivers than American perceivers.

Table 2b Means (Standard Deviations) and ANCOVA for the Effects of Culture, Age and Their Interaction on Anticipated Status Loss for Grandparents

	China	U.S.	*F*	*p*
"Shoplifting"	***Main effect of Culture***		54.01	< .005
	Main effect of Target Age		1.19	.32
	Culture X Age Interaction Effect		< 1	.44
Age 12	4.25(1.44)	3.03(1.34)	7.64	.01
Age 22	4.76(1.37)	3.04(1.26)	25.07	< .005
Age 32	4.23(1.30)	3.04(1.18)	8.89	< .005
Age 42	4.13(1.47)	2.88(1.26)	13.19	< .005
"Fighting"	***Main effect of Culture***		18.27	< .005
	Main effect of Target Age		< 1	.84
	Culture X Age Interaction Effect		1.18	.32
Age 12	3.29(1.42)	2.63(1.16)	2.45	.12
Age 22	3.63(1.37)	2.43(1.06)	13.19	< .005
Age 32	3.27(1.24)	2.66(1.21)	2.87	.94
Age 42	3.18(1.17)	2.52(1.35)	3.57	.06

Culture X Target Age Interaction Effects

The 2-way interaction effects for each scenario speak to Hypothesis 4. Follow-up ANCOVA tests of these interaction effects are explored in terms of the target age at which there is a statistically significant decrease in anticipated status loss for parents and grandparents within each culture. The tests investigated mean difference between consecutive age conditions and whether they are statistically significant. Again, the hypothesis suggests that significant changes in anticipated status loss would occur at later ages for the Chinese than the American participants.

In the "shoplifting" scenario, results showed a culture X target age interaction effect for anticipated status loss for parents F (3, 349) = 3.25, p = .02, but not for grandparents. Anticipated status loss for parents showed a statistically significant decrease for Chinese participants between age 22 and age 32, F (1, 63) = 6.56, p = .01, whereas this occurred earlier for American participants, between age 12 and age 22, F (1, 104) = 5.40, p = .02.

In the "fighting" scenario, results again showed a significant culture X target age interaction effect for anticipated status loss for parents, F (3, 349) = 2.58, p = .05, but not for grandparents. In terms of decreases, similar to the shoplifting scenario, anticipated status loss for parents showed a significant decreases for Chinese participants between age 22 and age 32, F (1, 63) = 4.07, p = .05, however, this occurred earlier for American participants, between age 12 and age 22, F (1, 104) = 7.54, p = .01.

These findings provide partial support for Hypothesis 4, that the negative effect of the age of a misbehaving child on perceived status loss for parents and grandparents would be stronger among American than Chinese perceivers.

Hypothesis 1 and 3 also were tested by examining cultural differences in the age threshold at which participants believe parents and grandparents to be "off the hook." The results showed strong effects of culture for both items and for both parents and grandparents, as shown in Table 2. For Americans, assigning responsibility and blame to parents stops at around 18, which is also the age when individuals are legally defined to be responsible for their own actions. But Chinese participants consider parents and grandparents to be responsible for children until an older age – even though the standards for legal majority are comparable across cultures.

Table 3 Means (Standard Deviations) and ANOVA for the Effects of Culture on Perceived Age of Children When Parents and Grandparents Are "Off the Hook"

	China	U.S.		
	Mean (SD)	**Mean (SD)**	***t***	***p***
Parents are no longer responsible when child turns …	20.52 (6.02)	18.47 (4.69)	8.32	.004
Parents can no longer be blamed when child turns ...	27.63 (20.08)	19.08 (8.14)	19.42	< .005
Grandparents are no longer responsible when child turns …	11.05 (11.25)	6.02 (7.97)	13.29	< .005
Grandparents can no longer be blamed when child turns ...	12.82 (11.99)	6.05 (7.98)	21.83	< .005

In summary, these results provide partial support for Hypothesis 3(a) and 3(b). For one scenario (shoplifting), the results were as expected for attribution to parents and to parenting during childhood, such that attribution to parental responsibility extended to a

later age among Chinese than American participants. These effects did not emerge, however, for the fighting scenario. On the other hand, when participants were asked to indicate the age at which parents and grandparents could no longer be blamed or held responsible for their children, Chinese participants chose much later ages than did Americans.

Exploring Collectivistic and Holistic Tendency as Mediators

In this section, both scores on Individualistic-Collectivistic Scale and Analysis-Holism Scale were explored as possible mediators of cultural differences in assignment of responsibility and anticipated status loss. Although the effect of culture tended to remain statistically significant when collectivistic tendency and holistic thinking were added to the model, I nonetheless explored whether they may have partially mediated the effects of culture. Thus, a series of Sobel tests testing for mediation was conducted along the way (showing in parenthesis).

Collectivistic Tendency

Scores on the Individualistic-Collectivistic scale (IND-COL) (Singelis 1995), which measures individualism and collectivism tendency among individuals, were explored as a possible mediator of cultural differences in assignment of responsibility for children's misbehavior.

To explore the possible mediating role of IND-COL, I compared a series of regression models with culture (0 = American, 1 = Chinese) and IND-COL scores as the independent variables. I first entered culture as a predictor (along with the covariates). Items (assignment of responsibility to target individual, assignment of responsibility to individual's parents, status loss for parents) that showed influence from the interaction effects of culture and target age were analyzed controlling for the created interaction term. As shown in previous

Table 4 Regression Results of Mediating effects of IND-COL on Responsibility Assignment: Shoplifting

[The individual] is responsible for this behavior.								
	Culture				Culture and IND-COL			
	B	S.E.	*t*	*p*	B	S.E.	*t*	*p*
(Constant)	6.08	0.28	21.53	< .005	5.87	0.44	13.26	< .005
Gender	0.14	0.09	1.53	.13	0.14	0.09	1.50	.14
Age	0.00	0.01	0.46	.64	< .005	0.01	0.40	.69
Education	-0.04	0.05	-0.74	.46	-0.04	0.05	-0.78	.44
Parental Education	0.03	0.04	0.60	.55	0.03	0.04	0.67	.50
Subjective SES	0.01	0.03	0.45	.66	0.01	0.03	0.41	.68
Scenario Order	0.12	0.09	1.33	.19	0.11	0.09	1.27	.21
Target Age	0.11	0.05	2.23	.03	0.12	0.05	2.30	.02
Culture X Target Age	0.28	0.08	3.33	<.005	0.27	0.08	3.27	< .005
Culture	-1.05	0.24	-4.42	<.005	-1.05	0.24	-4.41	< .005
IND-COL					0.04	0.07	0.62	.54
R^2	.16				.07			
F	7.63				3.45			
[The individual's] company/school is responsible for this behavior.								
	Culture				Culture and Collectivism			
	B	S.E.	*t*	*p*	B	S.E.	*t*	*p*
(Constant)	2.86	0.46	6.21	<.005	1.64	0.76	2.18	.03
Gender	-0.24	0.16	-1.53	.13	-0.27	0.16	-1.72	.09
Age	-0.01	0.01	-1.65	.10	-0.01	0.01	-1.76	.08
Education	0.03	0.09	0.36	.72	0.05	0.09	0.52	.61
Parental Education	0.02	0.07	0.32	.75	0.04	0.07	0.62	.54
Subjective SES	0.01	0.06	0.21	.84	-<.005	0.06	-0.04	.97
Scenario Order	0.18	0.15	1.17	.24	0.18	0.15	1.20	.23
Target Age	-0.26	0.07	-3.84	<.005	-0.22	0.09	-2.50	.01
Culture X Target Age					-0.10	0.14	-0.68	.49
Culture	1.99	0.20	9.85	<.005	2.16	0.40	5.36	< .005
IND-COL					.23	0.12	1.93	.06
R^2	.38				0.40			
F	27.62				22.55			
[The individual's] parents are responsible for this behavior.								
	Culture				Culture and IND-COL			
	B	S.E.	*t*	*p*	B	S.E.	*t*	*p*
(Constant)	5.37	0.53	10.15	< .005	4.05	0.83	4.91	< .005
Gender	-0.13	0.17	-0.75	.45	-0.15	0.17	-0.90	.37
Age	-0.02	0.01	-2.76	.01	-0.03	0.01	-2.91	< .005
Education	0.11	0.10	1.06	.30	0.11	0.10	1.10	.27
Parental Education	-0.01	0.08	-0.11	.91	0.02	0.08	0.19	.85
Subjective SES	-0.03	0.06	-0.51	.61	-0.04	0.06	-0.73	.47
Scenario Order	0.62	0.17	3.76	< .005	0.61	0.17	3.70	< .005
Target Age	-0.68	0.09	-7.19	< .005	-0.65	0.09	-6.94	< .005
Culture X Target Age	0.26	0.15	1.71	.09	0.24	0.15	1.58	.12
Culture	0.31	0.44	0.69	.49	0.29	0.44	0.66	.51
IND-COL					0.27	0.13	2.08	.04
R^2	.30				.31			
F	16.74				15.58			
This behavior is a result of inadequate parenting from [the individual's] parents.								
	Culture				Culture and IND-COL			
	B	S.E.	*t*	*p*	B	S.E.	*t*	*p*
(Constant)	5.51	0.45	12.31	< .005	3.51	0.70	5.01	< .005
Gender	-0.31	0.15	-2.09	.04	-0.35	0.15	-2.34	.02
Age	-0.01	0.01	-1.58	.12	-0.01	0.01	-1.86	.06
Education	-0.07	0.09	-0.73	.47	-0.06	0.09	-0.71	.48
Parental Education	0.05	0.07	0.73	.47	0.09	0.07	1.25	.21
Subjective SES	-0.04	0.05	-0.74	.46	-0.06	0.05	-1.14	.26
Scenario Order	0.45	0.15	3.08	< .005	0.43	0.15	2.97	< .005
Target Age	-0.39	0.07	-5.95	< .005	-0.37	0.07	-5.66	< .005
Culture X Target Age								
Culture	1.20	0.20	6.12	< .005	1.11	0.20	5.68	< .005
IND-COL					0.41	0.11	3.67	< .005
R^2	.26				.29			
F	15.68				15.93			

analysis, support from parents during adulthood showed no cultural difference for both scenarios and in all four age conditions, thus I excluded it from further analysis. The six dependent variables tested in this section are: responsibility assignment on target individual, organizations individuals belong to, individual's parents, parenting during childhood, anticipated status loss for parents and grandparents. Next, IND-COL was added to the model (along with culture and the covariates). Results are presented in the right sides of Tables 4-7, comparing to culture only on the left side. As before, analyses were performed separately for the shoplifting and fighting scenarios.

Table 5 Regression Results of Mediating effects of IND-COL on Anticipated Status Loss: Shoplifting

Parents	Culture				Culture and IND-COL			
	B	S.E.	*t*	*p*	B	S.E.	*t*	*p*
(Constant)	4.40	0.39	11.21	< .005	3.64	0.61	5.93	< .005
Gender	-0.02	0.13	-0.17	.86	-0.04	0.13	-0.30	.77
Age	-0.01	0.01	-1.54	.12	-0.01	0.01	-1.64	.10
Education	0.02	0.08	0.20	.84	0.02	0.08	0.26	.79
Parental Education	0.12	0.06	2.15	.03	0.14	0.06	2.36	.02
Subjective SES	-.003	0.04	-0.07	.95	-0.01	0.05	-0.26	.79
Scenario Order	-0.19	0.07	-2.67	.01	0.13	0.12	1.03	.31
Target Age	0.13	0.12	1.06	.29	-0.17	0.07	-2.48	.01
Culture X Target Age	0.15	0.16	1.35	.18	0.14	0.12	1.26	.21
Culture	0.59	0.33	1.80	.07	0.15	0.10	1.61	.11
IND-COL					0.58	0.33	1.76	.08
R^2	.22				.23			
F	11.25				10.39			
Grandparents	Culture				Culture and IND-COL			
	B	S.E.	*t*	*p*	B	S.E.	*t*	*p*
(Constant)	2.89	0.42	6.87	< .005	1.75	0.67	2.62	.01
Gender	-0.03	0.14	-0.19	.85	-0.05	0.14	-0.35	.73
Age	0.00	0.01	-0.02	.98	0.00	0.01	-0.16	.87
Education	-0.04	0.08	-0.44	.66	-0.03	0.08	-0.38	.71
Parental Education	0.12	0.06	1.85	.07	0.14	0.07	2.15	.03
Subjective SES	-0.01	0.05	-0.20	.84	-0.02	0.05	-0.45	.65
Scenario Order	0.21	0.14	1.49	.14	0.20	0.14	1.43	.16
Target Age	-0.06	0.06	-0.90	.37	-0.04	0.06	-0.69	.49
Culture X Target Age								
Culture	1.35	.19	7.34	< .005	0.23	0.11	2.19	.03
IND-COL					1.30	0.19	6.97	< .005
R^2	.21				.23			
F	12.07				11.35			

In the "shoplifting" scenario, the absence of a main effect for culture of a culture X age interaction effect on the assignment of responsibility to parents and anticipated status loss for parents after controlling for the interaction effect of culture and target age (left side sections of Table 4-5) indicated that there was no effect that could be mediated. They are

Table 6 Regression Results of Mediating effects of IND-COL on Responsibility Assignment: Fighting

[The individual] is responsible for this behavior.

	Culture				Culture and IND-COL			
	B	S.E.	*t*	*p*	B	S.E.	*t*	*p*
(Constant)	5.87	0.32	18.65	<.005	5.22	0.49	10.65	< .005
Gender	0.09	0.11	0.81	.42	0.06	0.10	0.55	.59
Age	0.00	0.01	0.43	.65	<.005	0.01	0.47	.64
Education	-0.89	0.06	-1.25	.21	-0.05	0.06	-0.85	.40
Parental Education	0.02	0.05	0.43	.67	0.03	0.05	0.71	.48
Subjective SES	0.05	0.04	1.42	.16	0.04	0.04	1.04	.30
Scenario Order	-0.14	0.10	-1.38	.17	-0.12	0.10	-1.23	.22
Target Age	0.16	0.05	3.36	<.005	0.16	0.05	3.50	< .005
Culture X Target Age								
Culture	-0.35	.14	-2.53	.01	-0.41	0.14	-3.01	< .005
IND-COL					0.13	0.08	1.62	.11
R^2	.08				.10			
F	3.45				4.14			

[The individual's] company/school is responsible for this behavior.

	Culture				Culture and IND-COL			
	B	S.E.	*t*	*p*	B	S.E.	*t*	*p*
(Constant)	3.60	0.44	8.28	0.005	2.39	0.69	3.47	< .005
Gender	-0.15	0.15	-1.04	0.30	-0.17	0.15	-1.16	.25
Age	-0.01	0.01	-1.81	0.07	-0.02	0.01	-1.99	.05
Education	0.04	0.09	0.41	0.68	0.03	0.09	0.39	.70
Parental Education	-0.01	0.07	-0.21	0.84	0.01	0.07	0.11	.91
Subjective SES	-0.03	0.05	-0.61	0.54	-0.04	0.05	-0.83	.41
Scenario Order	0.07	0.14	0.50	0.62	-0.38	0.06	-5.94	< .005
Target Age	-0.40	0.06	-6.16	<.005	0.05	0.14	0.38	.71
Culture X Target Age								
Culture	1.49	0.19	7.78	<.005	1.43	0.19	7.46	< .005
IND-COL					0.25	0.11	2.27	.02
R^2	.33				.34			
F	21.75				20.19			

[The individual's] parents are responsible for this behavior.

	Culture				Culture and IND-COL			
	B	S.E.	*t*	*p*	B	S.E.	*t*	*p*
(Constant)	3.69	0.43	8.53	<.005	4.03	0.70	5.77	< .005
Gender	-0.19	0.16	-1.19	0.24	-0.19	0.15	-1.31	.19
Age	-0.01	0.01	-1.59	0.11	-0.01	0.01	-1.84	.07
Education	0.02	0.10	0.16	0.88	-0.02	0.09	-0.20	.84
Parental Education	0.04	0.07	0.48	0.63	0.03	0.07	0.48	.63
Subjective SES	-0.01	0.06	-0.23	0.82	-0.04	0.05	-0.68	.50
Scenario Order	0.36	0.16	2.29	0.02	0.41	0.14	2.85	.01
Target Age	1.18	0.21	5.62	<.005	-0.53	0.07	-8.08	< .005
Culture X Target Age								
Culture	3.69	0.43	8.53	<.005	0.25	0.11	2.24	.03
IND-COL					1.15	0.19	5.92	< .005
R^2	.18				0.33			
F	11.38				18.88			

This behavior is a result of inadequate parenting from [the individual's] parents.

	Culture				Culture and IND-COL			
	B	S.E.	*t*	*p*	B	S.E.	*t*	*p*
(Constant)	4.68	0.43	10.92	< .005	3.01	0.68	4.46	< .005
Gender	-0.27	0.14	-1.86	.06	-0.31	0.14	-2.15	.03
Age	-0.01	0.01	-0.67	.50	-0.01	0.01	-0.85	.40
Education	0.05	0.09	0.55	.58	0.07	0.09	0.76	.45
Parental Education	0.04	0.07	0.53	.59	0.07	0.07	1.00	.32
Subjective SES	-0.05	0.05	-0.93	.36	-0.07	0.05	-1.37	.17
Scenario Order	0.35	0.14	2.51	.01	0.35	0.14	2.51	.01
Target Age	-0.29	0.06	-4.51	< .005	-0.27	0.06	-4.28	< .005
Culture X Target Age								
Culture	1.01	.19	5.37	< .005	0.92	0.19	4.86	< .005
IND-COL					0.34	0.11	3.15	< .005
R^2	.20					0.23		
F	11.30					11.43		

thus excluded from comparisons. Comparing both sides of the table, the statistical significance of culture remained for responsibility assignment for the individual (Sobel Test *ns*), the organizations (Sobel Test *ns*), and parenting (Sobel Test $p = .03$). The effects of culture lowered for anticipated status loss for grandparents (from $p < .005$ to $p = .03$, Sobel Test *ns*).

In the "fighting" scenario, the main effect of culture and the interaction of culture and age were non-significant disappeared for anticipated status loss for parents (left side sections of Table 6-7), it is thus excluded from comparisons. Comparing both sides of the table, the statistical significance of culture remained for responsibility assignment for the individual (Sobel Test *ns*), the organizations (Sobel Test *ns*), inadequate parenting (Sobel Test $p = .03$) and anticipated status loss for grandparents (Sobel Test *ns*). The effects of culture lowered for assignment of responsibility to parents (from $p < .005$ to $p = .03$, Sobel Test $p = .04$).

Table 7 Regression Results of Mediating effects of IND-COL on Anticipated Status Loss: Fighting

Parents	Culture				Culture and IND-COL			
	B	S.E.	*t*	*p*	B	S.E.	*t*	*p*
(Constant)	3.99	.40	10.11	< .005	3.37	0.62	5.48	<.005
Gender	0.00	0.13	0.01	.99	-0.02	0.13	-0.16	.88
Age	-0.04	0.01	-2.16	.03	-0.01	0.01	-2.20	.03
Education	-0.02	0.08	-0.03	.98	0.01	0.08	0.18	.86
Parental Education	0.05	0.06	0.83	.41	0.06	0.06	1.03	.31
Subjective SES	0.01	0.05	0.23	.82	0.00	0.05	-0.02	.99
Scenario Order	0.25	0.12	2.00	.05	0.26	0.12	2.07	.04
Target Age	-0.16	0.07	-2.23	.03	-0.15	0.07	-2.15	.03
Culture X Target Age	0.03	0.12	0.24	.81	0.02	0.12	0.20	.84
Culture	0.41	0.33	1.24	.22	0.12	0.10	1.27	.20
IND-COL					0.37	0.33	1.13	.26
R^2	.11				.12			
F	5.05				4.72			
Grandparents	Culture				Culture and IND-COL			
	B	S.E.	*t*	*p*	B	S.E.	*t*	*p*
(Constant)	2.39	0.40	5.96	< .005	2.07	0.64	3.23	<.005
Gender	0.01	0.14	0.09	.93	0.00	0.14	0.01	.99
Age	-0.00	0.01	-0.09	.93	0.00	0.01	-0.11	.91
Education	-0.00	0.08	-0.02	.99	0.01	0.08	0.07	.95
Parental Education	0.01	0.06	0.23	.82	0.02	0.06	0.33	.74
Subjective SES	0.04	0.05	0.83	.41	0.03	0.05	0.71	.48
Scenario Order	0.04	0.13	0.34	.74	0.05	0.13	0.36	.72
Target Age	-0.03	0.06	-0.43	.67	-0.02	0.06	-0.38	.71
Culture X Target Age								
Culture	.75	.18	4.28	< .005	0.73	0.18	4.10	<.005
IND-COL					0.06	0.10	0.63	0.53
R^2	.09				.09			
F	4.31				3.82			

Holistic Thinking

I then explored the impact of scores on the Analysis-Holism Scale (Choi et al. 2007), which measures analytic versus holistic thinking tendency among individuals, as a possible mediator of cultural differences in assignment of responsibility for children's misbehavior. First, an ANCOVA showed that, as expected, Chinese participants (M = 5.00, SD = 0.44) were more holistic than American participants (M = 4.83, SD = 0.49), F (1, 385) = 4.01, p = .05.

Following the same steps for analyzing the effects of collectivism, I compared a series of regression models with culture (0 = American, 1 = Chinese) and Analysis-Holism Scale scores as the independent variables. The covariates include the same control variables. The same items that showed influence from the interaction between culture and target age were analyzed controlling for the interaction term created. The same six dependent variables were analyzed separately for the two scenarios. I entered Analysis-Holism scale scores and culture as predictors (along with the covariates), and then compare the results of these models with when culture alone was the predictor as shown in the left side of Table 4-7. The Results are presented in Tables 8 and 9.

In the "shoplifting" scenario, the main effects of culture remained significant for responsibility assignment for the individual (Sobel Test *ns*), the organization (Sobel Test *ns*), parenting (Sobel Test *ns*), and anticipated status loss for grandparents (Sobel Test *ns*).

In the "fighting" scenario, the main effects of culture remained significant for responsibility assignment for the individual (Sobel Test *ns*), the organization (Sobel Test *ns*), parents (Sobelt Test p = .06), parenting (Sobel Test p = .03), and anticipated status loss for grandparents (Sobel Test *ns*).

Table 8 Regression Results of Mediating effects of AHS on Responsibility Assignment

[The individual] is responsible for this behavior.	**Shoplifting**				**Fighting**			
	B	S.E.	*t*	*p*	B	S.E.	*t*	*p*
(Constant)	4.58	0.53	8.58	< .005	5.31	0.62	8.54	<. 005
Gender	0.09	0.09	0.96	.34	0.06	0.11	0.52	.61
Age	0.00	0.01	0.55	.59	0.00	0.01	0.49	.63
Education	-0.04	0.05	-0.83	.41	-0.08	0.06	-1.29	.20
Parental Education	0.03	0.04	0.73	.47	0.02	0.04	0.49	.63
Subjective SES	0.02	0.03	0.50	.62	0.05	0.04	1.44	.15
Scenario Order	0.10	0.09	1.12	.27	-0.16	0.10	-1.50	.14
Target Age	0.13	0.05	2.53	.01	0.16	0.05	3.48	< .005
Culture X Target Age	0.26	0.08	3.23	< .005				
Culture	-1.06	0.23	-4.55	< .005	-0.37	0.14	-2.69	.01
AHS	0.31	0.09	3.28	< .005	0.18	0.11	1.65	.10
R^2	.17				.10			
F	8.13				4.11			
[The individual's] company/school is responsible for this behavior.	**Shoplifting**				**Fighting**			
	B	S.E.	*t*	*p*	B	S.E.	*t*	*p*
(Constant)	2.85	0.93	3.07	< .005	3.26	0.86	3.79	< .005
Gender	-0.24	0.16	-1.49	.14	-0.12	0.15	-0.78	.44
Age	-0.01	0.01	-1.66	.10	-0.01	0.01	-1.85	.07
Education	0.03	0.09	0.36	.72	0.04	0.09	0.44	.66
Parental Education	0.02	0.07	0.33	.74	-0.02	0.07	-0.26	.80
Subjective SES	0.01	0.06	0.24	.81	-0.03	0.05	-0.63	.53
Scenario Order	0.18	0.15	1.19	.23	0.09	0.14	0.60	.55
Target Age	-0.23	0.09	-2.68	.01	-0.40	0.06	-6.26	< .005
Culture X Target Age	-0.08	0.14	-0.59	.56				
Culture	2.20	0.41	5.42	< .005	1.51	0.19	7.90	< .005
AHS	2.85	0.93	3.07	< .005	-0.22	0.15	-1.43	.15
R^2	.39				.33			
F	22.03				19.61			
[The individual's] parents are responsible for this behavior.	**Shoplifting**				**Fighting**			
	B	S.E.	*t*	*p*	B	S.E.	*t*	*p*
(Constant)	3.78	1.01	3.74	< .005	3.13	0.87	3.60	< .005
Gender	-0.18	0.17	-1.06	.29	-0.20	0.15	-1.36	.18
Age	-0.02	0.01	-2.73	.01	-0.01	0.01	-1.68	.09
Education	0.10	0.10	1.02	.31	-0.03	0.09	-0.38	.70
Parental Education	0.00	0.08	-0.04	.97	0.01	0.07	0.21	.84
Subjective SES	-0.03	0.06	-0.48	.63	-0.02	0.05	-0.35	.72
Scenario Order	0.60	0.17	3.64	< .005	0.40	0.14	2.75	.01
Target Age	-0.66	0.09	-7.04	< .005	-0.53	0.07	-8.16	< .005
Culture X Target Age	0.25	0.15	1.63	.10				
Culture	0.29	0.44	0.67	.51	1.19	0.19	6.14	< .005
AHS	0.33	0.18	1.84	.07	0.24	0.16	1.53	.13
R^2	.30				.32			
F	15.50				18.47			
This behavior is a result of inadequate parenting from [the individual's] parents.	**Shoplifting**				**Fighting**			
	B	S.E.	*t*	*p*	B	S.E.	*t*	*p*
(Constant)	3.54	0.88	4.01	< .005	2.24	0.84	2.66	.01
Gender	-0.35	0.15	-2.32	.02	-0.33	0.15	-2.27	.02
Age	-0.01	0.01	-1.55	.12	-0.00	0.01	-0.61	.54
Education	-0.07	0.09	-0.76	.45	0.04	0.09	0.49	.62
Parental Education	0.05	0.07	0.79	.43	0.04	0.07	0.63	.53
Subjective SES	-0.04	0.05	-0.73	.47	-0.05	0.05	-0.91	.37
Scenario Order	-0.39	0.07	-5.83	< .005	0.33	0.14	2.35	.02
Target Age	0.44	0.15	2.98	< .005	-0.28	0.06	-4.36	< .005
Culture X Target Age								
Culture	1.17	0.20	5.94	< .005	0.96	0.19	5.12	< .005
AHS	0.24	0.16	1.51	.13	0.38	0.15	2.50	.01
R^2	.27				.22			
F	14.24				10.89			

Table 9 Regression Results of Mediating effects of AHS on Anticipated Status Loss

	Shoplifting				Fighting			
Parents	**B**	**S.E.**	***t***	***p***	**B**	**S.E.**	***t***	***p***
(Constant)	2.65	0.75	3.55	<. 005	2.30	0.75	3.06	<. 005
Gender	-0.08	0.13	-0.65	.52	-0.06	0.13	-0.45	.65
Age	-0.01	0.01	-1.49	.14	-0.01	0.01	-2.12	.04
Education	0.01	0.07	0.13	.89	-0.01	0.08	-0.09	.93
Parental Education	0.13	0.06	2.27	.02	0.05	0.06	0.94	.35
Subjective SES	0.00	0.04	-0.03	.97	0.01	0.04	0.26	.79
Scenario Order	0.11	0.12	0.88	.38	0.23	0.12	1.83	.07
Target Age	-0.17	0.07	-2.46	.01	-0.14	0.07	-2.04	.04
Culture X Target Age	0.14	0.11	1.24	.22	0.01	0.11	0.12	.90
Culture	0.58	0.33	1.78	.08	0.40	0.33	1.21	.23
AHS	0.36	0.13	2.75	.01	0.35	0.13	2.64	.01
R^2	.24				.13			
F	11.07				5.32			
Grandparents	**B**	**S.E.**	***t***	***p***	**B**	**S.E.**	***t***	***p***
(Constant)	0.75	0.83	0.90	.37	1.59	0.79	2.00	.05
Gender	-0.06	0.14	-0.40	.69	0.01	0.14	0.08	.94
Age	0.05	0.01	0.01	.99	0.00	0.01	-0.09	.93
Education	-0.04	0.08	-0.47	.64	0.00	0.08	-0.02	.99
Parental Education	0.12	0.06	1.89	.06	0.01	0.06	0.24	.81
Subjective SES	-0.01	0.05	-0.18	.85	0.04	0.05	0.83	.41
Scenario Order	-0.05	0.06	-0.81	.42	-0.03	0.06	-0.42	.67
Target Age	0.19	0.14	1.40	.16	0.04	0.13	0.33	.74
Culture X Target Age								
Culture	1.33	0.19	7.17	<. 005	0.75	0.18	4.25	< .005
AHS	0.18	0.15	1.21	.23	0.01	0.14	0.05	.96
R^2	.22				0.9			
F	10.90				3.82			

Table 11 Regression Results of Mediating effects of IND-COL and AHS on Anticipated Status Loss

Parents	**Shoplifting**				**Fighting**			
	B	S.E.	*t*	*p*	B	S.E.	*t*	*p*
(Constant)	2.40	0.80	2.98	< .005	2.09	0.81	2.60	.01
Gender	-0.09	0.13	-0.68	.50	-0.07	0.13	-0.54	.59
Age	-0.01	0.01	-1.54	.12	-0.01	0.01	-2.10	.04
Education	0.01	0.08	0.19	.85	0.01	0.08	0.10	.92
Parental Education	0.14	0.06	2.36	.02	0.06	0.06	1.02	.31
Subjective SES	- 0.01	0.05	-0.15	.88	0.01	0.05	0.10	.92
Scenario Order	0.11	0.12	0.89	.38	0.24	0.12	1.93	.06
Target Age	- 0.17	0.07	-2.37	.02	-0.14	0.07	-2.04	.04
Culture X Target Age	0.14	0.11	1.20	.23	0.02	0.11	0.13	.90
Culture	0.57	0.33	1.74	.08	0.37	0.33	1.12	.26
Collectivism	0.08	0.10	0.84	.40	0.05	0.10	0.50	.61
AHS	0.33	0.14	2.38	.02	0.34	0.14	2.44	.02
R^2	.24				.13			
F	10.08				4.89			
Grandparents	**Shoplifting**				**Fighting**			
	B	S.E.	*t*	*p*	B	S.E.	*t*	*p*
(Constant)	1.41	0.89	1.58	.12	2.13	0.85	2.50	.01
Gender	-0.06	0.14	-0.44	.66	0.00	0.14	0.03	.97
Age	0.00	0.01	-0.14	.89	0.00	0.01	-0.12	.91
Education	-0.03	0.08	-0.40	.69	0.01	0.08	0.07	.95
Parental Education	0.14	0.07	2.14	.03	0.02	0.06	0.33	.74
Subjective SES	-0.02	0.05	-0.42	.67	0.03	0.05	0.70	.48
Scenario Order	0.19	0.14	1.39	.17	0.05	0.13	0.36	.72
Target Age	-0.04	0.06	-0.66	.51	-0.02	0.06	-0.38	.70
Culture X Target Age								
Culture	1.29	0.19	6.91	< .005	0.73	0.18	4.09	<. 005
Collectivism	0.21	0.11	1.92	.06	0.07	0.11	0.63	.53
AHS	0.09	0.16	0.58	.56	-0.02	0.15	-0.12	.91
R^2	.23				.09			
F	10.23				3.43			

Table 10 Regression Results of Mediating effects of IND-COL and AHS on Responsibility Assignment

[The individual] is responsible for this behavior.	**Shoplifting**				**Fighting**			
	B	S.E.	*t*	*p*	B	S.E.	*t*	*p*
(Constant)	4.67	0.58	8.11	<. 005	4.61	0.65	7.08	<. 005
Gender	0.09	0.09	0.99	.32	0.03	0.11	0.31	.75
Age	0.00	0.01	0.55	.58	0.00	0.01	0.53	.59
Education	-0.05	0.05	-0.90	.37	-0.06	0.06	-0.90	.37
Parental Education	0.03	0.04	0.66	.51	0.03	0.05	0.70	.49
Subjective SES	0.02	0.03	0.57	.57	0.04	0.04	1.10	.27
Scenario Order	0.10	0.09	1.08	.28	-0.13	0.10	-1.32	.19
Target Age	0.12	0.05	2.49	.01	0.16	0.05	3.57	<. 005
Culture X Target Age	0.26	0.08	3.23	<. 005				
Culture	-1.05	0.23	-4.50	<. 005	-0.42	0.14	-3.10	<. 005
Collectivism	-0.02	0.07	-0.35	.73	0.09	0.08	1.13	.26
AHS	0.32	0.10	3.21	<. 005	0.16	0.11	1.43	.15
R^2	.19				.10			
F	7.36				3.94			
[The individual's] company/school is responsible for this behavior.	**Shoplifting**				**Fighting**			
	B	S.E.	*t*	*p*	B	S.E.	*t*	*p*
(Constant)	2.07	1.00	2.08	.04	3.75	0.91	4.12	<. 005
Gender	-0.25	0.16	-1.59	.11	-0.12	0.15	-0.80	.43
Age	-0.01	0.01	-1.79	.08	-0.02	0.01	-2.10	.04
Education	0.05	0.09	0.54	.59	0.04	0.09	0.47	.64
Parental Education	0.04	0.07	0.62	.53	0.01	0.07	0.12	.90
Subjective SES	0.00	0.06	-0.07	.95	-0.05	0.05	-0.94	.35
Scenario Order	0.19	0.15	1.24	.22	-0.39	0.06	-6.07	<. 005
Target Age	-0.22	0.09	-2.53	.01	0.07	0.14	0.52	.60
Culture X Target Age	-0.09	0.14	-0.67	.51				
Culture	2.17	0.40	5.36	<. 005	1.46	0.19	7.64	<. 005
Collectivism	0.25	0.12	2.03	.04	0.33	0.12	2.85	.01
AHS	-0.11	0.17	-0.66	.51	-0.36	0.16	-2.26	.02
R^2	.39				.35			
F	20.51				18.89			
[The individual's] parents are responsible for this behavior.	**Shoplifting**				**Fighting**			
	B	S.E.	*t*	*p*	B	S.E.	*t*	*p*
(Constant)	3.15	1.09	2.90	<. 005	3.45	0.93	3.72	<. 005
Gender	-0.19	0.17	-1.09	.28	-0.22	0.15	-1.44	.15
Age	-0.03	0.01	-2.85	.01	-0.01	0.01	-1.79	.07
Education	0.11	0.10	1.06	.29	-0.02	0.09	-0.23	.82
Parental Education	0.01	0.08	0.18	.86	0.03	0.07	0.48	.64
Subjective SES	-0.04	0.06	-0.67	.50	-0.03	0.05	-0.63	.53
Scenario Order	0.60	0.17	3.62	<. 005	0.40	0.14	2.78	.01
Target Age	-0.65	0.09	-6.87	<. 005	-0.52	0.07	-8.03	<. 005
Culture X Target Age	0.24	0.15	1.55	.12				
Culture	0.29	0.44	0.65	.52	1.14	0.20	5.84	<. 005
Collectivism	0.22	0.13	1.62	.11	0.22	0.12	1.86	.06
AHS	0.24	0.19	1.27	.21	0.15	0.16	0.94	.35
R^2	.31				.33			
F	14.34				17.08			
This behavior is a result of inadequate parenting from [the individual's] parents.	**Shoplifting**				**Fighting**			
	B	S.E.	*t*	*p*	B	S.E.	*t*	*p*
(Constant)	3.25	0.93	3.48	<. 005	2.00	0.90	2.24	.03
Gender	-0.36	0.15	-2.38	.02	-0.35	0.14	-2.40	.02
Age	-0.01	0.01	-1.84	.07	-0.01	0.01	-0.77	.44
Education	-0.06	0.09	-0.72	.47	0.06	0.09	0.71	.48
Parental Education	0.09	0.07	1.24	.21	0.07	0.07	0.99	.32
Subjective SES	-0.06	0.05	-1.11	.27	-0.07	0.05	-1.29	.20
Scenario Order	0.43	0.15	2.94	<. 005	0.34	0.14	2.41	.02
Target Age	-0.37	0.07	-5.63	<. 005	-0.26	0.06	-4.21	<. 005
Culture X Target Age								
Culture	1.10	0.20	5.63	<. 005	0.89	0.19	4.75	<. 005
Collectivism	0.40	0.12	3.37	<. 005	0.28	0.11	2.51	.01
AHS	0.07	0.16	0.43	.67	0.27	0.16	1.70	.09
R^2	.29				.23			
F	14.32				10.64			

Last, I added both IND-COL and Analysis-Holism scores into the regressions and compare the changes in the effects of culture. Results are presented in Tables 10-11. Again, changes in the effects of culture were compared with results in Tables 4-7. They did not show any mediating effect on culture.

DISCUSSION

Previous studies comparing people from Western cultures and East Asian cultures have indicated cultural variations on perceived causal attributions of responsibility. East Asian cultures are more likely to attribute social events and individual behaviors to collectives or the proxies (Manchi Chao et al. 2008; Tetlock et al. 2010) and this attribution tendency is especially significant when facing negative events (Zemba and Young 2012). Accumulating empirical evidence mainly deals with how individuals from the two cultures assign blame in an organization setting (Manchi Chao et al. 2008). This study extends previous findings to a family setting, where children's misbehavior is similar to employee misconduct and parents and grandparents constitute the "organization". Additional emphasis on cultural variation in how participants perceive status loss for parents and grandparents, the aftermath of responsibility assignment, is unique.

In line with previous findings, this study finds that Chinese participants are more likely to attribute individual's misbehavior to their organizations, parents, and childhood parenting than their American counterparts. In contrast, Americans assign greater responsibility to individuals themselves (the children in the scenarios). These patterns confirm Hypothesis 1. Chinese also tend to report greater anticipated perceived loss of status for both parents and

grandparents, which can be interpreted as implicit negative sanctions for the family, providing support for Hypothesis 2.

To explain the cultural difference in responsibility assignment and anticipated status loss, collectivistic and holistic tendency were explored as mediators. Comparing to collectivistic tendency, holistic tendency explained more items. But the pattern was not clear-cut for either collectivistic or holistic tendency. Even when the effects of culture did decrease due to the addition of the two mediators, Sobel Tests did not confirm the existence of mediations. These results suggest that both collectivistic and holistic tendencies do not mediate the cultural differences of assigning responsibility to and anticipated status loss of parents in the scenarios.

This study also explores how age of misbehaving children affects the responsibility attribution as well as anticipated status loss for parents and grandparents. The strong findings for Hypothesis 1 and Hypothesis 2 are qualified by the age of the misbehaving child. As expected, responsibility attribution along with anticipated status loss decreases as children's age increases. However, for Chinese participants, this decrease occurs later than for Americans. American participants reported a significant decrease for both parental responsibility and perceived status loss when children's age change from 12 to 22, whereas such changes occur later in the minds of Chinese perceivers, between the age of 22 to 32. Questions asking participants directly when parents should no longer be hold accountable for their children's misbehavior confirm also that Chinese, comparing to U.S., participants believe that parents are responsible for older children.

Two reasons might account for this delay. First, as holistic thinkers, Chinese may take into account more indirect and subtle information when doing attribution. As parents and grandparents become more irrelevant aging to children's behavior, Chinese perceivers still

consider this piece of information as more relevant than American perceivers. Second, as the findings show, parental support does not seem to affect responsibility for children's misbehavior, but childhood parenting plays an important role. This not only means that parenting in general is more influential in participants' view than adulthood support but also that as children age, they become more distant from the age directly influenced by parenting. Chinese participants still place greater blame on parenting than Americans because they take intro account everything possible.

The findings show an interesting increase between ages 12 to 22 for perceived status loss in both scenarios for Chinese perceivers. Status loss can be seen as a punishment, thus Chinese perceivers attribute a misbehaving 22-year-old to his parents more than a misbehaving 12-year-old. My conjecture for this phenomenon is that, for Chinese, underage children still may be influenced by parents' instruction while a 22-year-old's behavior reflects prior inadequate parenting. But for American, the legal age 18 might be more important and a 12-year-old is not yet a fully legal civilian, thus his behavior may be attributed more to the parents who are adults but as a child becomes adult, observers believe that he should be responsible for his own actions.

Analysis of responses to the filler condition, which was designed to present a neutral scenario where the behavior is neither positive nor negative, Chinese and American participants still differed. Although there is only marginal difference in individual responsibility assignment, Chinese participants attributed greater responsibility to organizations, parents, and parenting. This indicates a more generic cultural difference that cannot be simply explained by the two dimensions of cultural differences, indicating a strong tendency for people with East Asian cultural backgrounds to digest any behavior as connected to collectives or collective figures.

These findings denote a different angle for explaining Asian American's better performance in the U.S. other than the well-known "face saving" mechanism, where parents try to save their "face" by pushing their children to produce better outcomes. This study connects this Asian concept, commonly interpreted as unique to Asians, with a well-researched concept of social status, or the loss of status. As influenced by East Asian cultures, Asian American parents and children tend to interpret their own performances, regardless academically or else's, as a reflection of their families, parents or guardians. This effect is not limited to childhood but persists throughout their lives. The fear of losing social status might motivate parents to adopt stricter parenting style, and as academic performance is almost a universal indicator for evaluating children's early life outcomes, they will emphasize the value of education as life goals. The implicit pressure not to lose status may explain the reasons revealed by previous studies on why Asians and Asian Americans are constantly driven by external motivation.

While these findings offer new insights regarding cultural comparisons and responsibility attributions, this study has some limitations. The Chinese sample and the U.S. sample are not ideally homogeneous. The U.S. participants are older than Chinese participants, thus they might be more empathetic towards parents and are more reluctant to blame parents and grandparents. Both samples, especially Chinese participants, were not drawn randomly. The methods used to recruit participants tended to attract participants with higher education, especially for the Chinese sample. Future research should involve comparisons between more similar samples instead of controlling for demographic information in the analysis. Future research should also consider exploring how certain demographic information, like age and education, may influence responsibility attribution to parents. While this study did not reveal consistent patterns across scenarios or depended

variables for the demographic information of participants, it should be noted that some of the items did show significant effect on cultural differences. For example, age of participants were significant for assignment of responsibility to parents (in "Shoplifting") and anticipated status loss for parents (in "Fighting") (more detailed results see Tables 4 and 5).

Another limitation is that in the initial analysis I found a difference between the two scenarios. After inspection, I think it is because in the "fighting" scenario, the target individual in the scenario who got into a fight was instigated by another person's immoral action ("cutting in line"), thus participants blame him less. This leads to an order effect. Participants who read "fighting" scenario first might blame the target individual more while those who read "shoplifting" scenario first might blame the target individual in the "fighting" scenario less harsh because they might compare the two individuals. Future research, while considering applying more diverse scenarios, should also further understand how severity and characteristics of different misbehaviors alter perceivers' attribution judgments.

Most importantly, this study did not confirm potential mechanisms behind the cultural differences of responsibility assignment and anticipated status loss. Instead of focusing on IND-COL cultural orientations and Analysis-Holism thinking styles, future research should include other factors that might account for cultural differences in social judgments. One potential reason might be that people from the two cultures have distinct understanding of aspects of parenting, and they endorse different parenting styles (Cheah et al 2013). Thus, the judgment of the role of parents and parenting is based on dissimilar standards, leading to incompatible assignment of responsibility. Researchers should also take note of the influence of globalization on the values of East Asian countries. While the frequently studied cultural orientations and cognitive thinking styles do capture certain aspects of

cultural differences, they might not reflect the concurrently changing reality. Assigning responsibility to and the blaming of parents are happening in the realm of family, whereas many items in scales that measure cultural orientations and thinking styles target individual's relationship with the community, country or broader society. More domain specific factors that derive from the over-arching cultural differences may be more interpretive in this case. For example, Asians comparing to Westerners are more likely to include significant others in their self-representation and self-construal (e.g. Markus and Kitayama 1991, Brewer and Chen 2007). Consequently in this scenario, Asians might subconsciously perceive misbehavior as a result of both the parents and the child, thus assigning more responsibility to parents than Westerners, who perceive the misbehavior a sole outcome of the child.

APPENDIX A

Vignettes

Condition 1&2

Alex is a 12-year-old boy. He was caught in a shopping mall trying to steal a video-game player worth $100. Shoplifting is an ongoing problem with him.

Lee is a 12-year-old boy. He got into a fight with another boy when buying movie tickets. The other boy tried to cut in line by squeezing in front of Lee. Getting into fights is an ongoing problem with Lee.

Condition 3&4

Alex is a 22-year-old man. He was caught in a shopping mall, trying to steal a laptop computer worth $800. Shoplifting is an ongoing problem with him.

Lee is a 22-year-old man. He got in a fight with a guy when buying movie tickets. The guy tried to cut in line by squeezing in front of Lee. Getting into fights is an ongoing problem with Lee.

Condition 5&6

Alex is a 32-year-old man. He was caught in a shopping mall, trying to steal a laptop computer worth $800. Shoplifting is an ongoing problem with him.

Lee is a 32-year-old man. He got in a fight with a guy when buying movie tickets. The guy tried to cut in line by squeezing in front of Lee. Getting into fights is an ongoing problem with Lee.

Condition 7&8

Alex is a 42-year-old man. He was caught in a shopping mall, trying to steal a laptop computer worth $800. Shoplifting is an ongoing problem with him.

Lee is a 42-year-old man. He got in a fight with a guy when buying movie tickets. The guy tried to cut in line by squeezing in front of Lee. Getting into fights is an ongoing problem with Lee.

Filler Condition

Susie is a 3-year-old girl. She fell asleep watching a cartoon. She tends to take naps a lot.

Questions following scenario: "Shoplifting"

Responsibility Assignment

1.Alex is responsible for this behavior.

2.This behavior is a result of inadequate parenting from Alex's parents.

3.Alex's parents are responsible for this behavior.

4.Alex's school is responsible for this behavior.

Anticipated Status Loss

5.If acquaintances of Alex's parents found out about this incident, they would have a worse impression of the parents.

6.This incident would hurt the status of Alex's parents in their neighborhood or at their workplace.

7.Alex's parents will do whatever they can to hide this incident from their close friends.

8.If acquaintances of Alex's parents found out about this incident, they would be less willing to invite the parents over for a cup of coffee or tea.

9.Alex's parents will do whatever they can to hide this incident from their acquaintances.

10.People in Alex's parents' neighborhood or at their workplace would have lessrespect for his parents after this incident.

12.If close friends of Alex's parents found out about this incident, they would have a worse impression of the parents.
13.If close friends of Alex's parents found out about this incident, they would be less willing to invite the parents over for a cup of coffee or tea.
14.If close friends of Alex's parents found out about this incident, they might refuse the parents' invitation to go out to eat.
15.If acquaintances of Alex's parents found out about this incident, they might refuse the parents' invitation to go out to eat.

Questions following scenario: "Fighting"
Responsibility Assignment
1.Lee's company/school is responsible for this behavior.
2.Lee's parents are responsible for this misbehavior.
3.Lee is responsible for this behavior.
4.This behavior is a result of inadequate parenting from Lee's parents when he was young.
5.This behavior is a result of inadequate support from Lee's parents after he became an adult.
Anticipated Status Loss
6.If acquaintances of Lee's parents found out about this incident, they would be less willing to invite the parents over for a cup of coffee or tea.
7.If close friends of Lee's parents found out about this incident, they would have a worse impression of the parents.
8.If close friends of Lee's parents found out about this incident, they would be less willing to invite the parents over for a cup of coffee or tea.
9.Lee's parents will do whatever they can to hide this incident from their acquaintances.
10.If acquaintances of Lee's parents found out about this incident, they would have a worse impression of the parents.
11.This incident would hurt the status of Lee's parents in their neighborhood or at their workplace.
12.Lee's parents will do whatever they can to hide this incident from their close friends.
13.People in Lee's parents' neighborhood or at their workplace would have less respect for them after this incident.
14.If acquaintances of Lee's parents found out about this incident, they might refuse the parents' invitation to go out to eat.
15.If close friends of Lee's parents found out about this incident, they might refuse the parents' invitation to go out to eat.

Questions Following Filler Condition
Responsibility Assignment
1.Susie's parents are responsible for this behavior.
2.Susie is responsible for this behavior.
3.Susie's school is responsible for this behavior.
4.This behavior is a result of inadequate parenting from Susie's parents.
Anticipated Status Loss
5.If close friends of Susie's parents found out about this incident, they would have a worse impression of the parents.
6.Susie's parents will do whatever they can to hide this incident from their close friends.

7.If close friends of Susie's parents found out about this incident, they would be less willing to invite the parents over for a cup of coffee or tea.
8.People in Susie's parents' neighborhood would have less respect for them after this incident.
9.This incident would hurt the status of Susie's parents in their neighborhood or at their workplace.
10.If close friends of Susie's parents found out about this incident, they might refuse the parents' invitation to go out to eat.
11.If acquaintances of Susie's parents found out about this incident, they would be less willing to invite the parents over for a cup of coffee or tea.
12.Susie's parents will do whatever they can to hide this incident from their acquaintances.
13.If acquaintances of Susie's parents found out about this incident, they would have a worse impression of the parents.
14.If acquaintances of Susie's parents found out about this incident, they might refuse the parents' invitation to go out to eat.

APPENDIX B

IND-COL scale (Singelis et al. 1995)

Individualism

1. I prefer to be direct and forthright when I talk with people 2. One should live one's life independently of others
2. I often do my own thing
3. I am a unique individual
4. I like my privacy
5. When I succeeded, it is usually because of my abilities
6. What happens to me is my own doing
7. I enjoy being unique and different from the others in many ways
8. Winning is everything
9. It annoys me when others people perform better than I do
10. It is important for me that I do my job better than the others
11. I enjoy working in situations involving competition with others
12. Competition is law of nature
13. When another person does better than I do, I get tense and aroused
14. Without competition it is impossible to have a good society
15. Some people emphasize winning; I am not one of them (reverse)

Collectivism

1. My happiness depends very much on the happiness of those around me
2. I like sharing little things with my neighbors
3. The wellbeing of my coworkers is important to me
4. It is important for me to maintain harmony within my group
5. If a relative were in financial difficulty, I would help within my means
6. If a co-worker gets a price I would feel proud
7. To me pleasure is spending time with others
8. I feel good when I cooperate with others
9. I would do what would please my family
10. I usually sacrifice my self-interest for the benefit of my group
11. We should keep our aging parents with us at home
12. Children should feel honored if their parents receive a distinguished award
13. Children should be taught to place duty before pleasure
14. I would sacrifice an activity that I enjoy very much if my family did not approve of it
15. I hate to disagree with others in my group
16. Before making a major trip, I consult with most members of my family and many friends

Analysis-Holism Scale (Choi et al. 2007)

1. Everything in the universe is somehow related to each other.
2. Nothing is unrelated.
3. Everything in the world is intertwined in a causal relationship.
4. Even a small change in any element of the universe can lead to significant alterations in other elements.
5. Any phenomenon has numerous numbers of causes, although some of the causes are not known.
6. Any phenomenon entails a numerous number of consequences, although some of them may not be known.
7. It is more desirable to take the middle ground than go to extremes.
8. When disagreement exists among people, they should search for ways to compromise and embrace everyone's opinions.
9. It is more important to find a point of compromise than to debate who is right/wrong, when one's opinions conflict with other's opinions.
10. It is desirable to be in harmony, rather than in discord, with others of different opinions than one's own.
11. Choosing a middle ground in an argument should be avoided
12. We should avoid going to extremes.
13. Every phenomenon in the world moves in predictable directions.
14. A person who is currently living a successful life will continue to stay successful
15. An individual who is currently honest will stay honest in the future.
16. If an event is moving toward a certain direction, it will continue to move toward that direction current situations can change at any time.
17. Future events are predictable based on present situations.
18. The whole, rather than its parts, should be considered in order to understand a phenomenon.
19. It is more important to pay attention to the whole than its parts.
20. The whole is greater than the sum of its parts.
21. It is more important to pay attention to the whole context rather than the details.
22. It is not possible to understand the parts without considering the whole picture.
23. We should consider the situation a person is faced with, as well as his/her personality, in order to understand one's behavior.

Reference:

Angermeyer, M. C., and Shulze Dietrich. 2006. "Public Beliefs About and Attitudes Towards People with Mental Illness: a Review of Population Studies." *Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica* 113(3):163–79.

Brank, Eve M., Edie Greene, and Katherine Hochevar. 2011. "Holding Parents Responsible: Is Vicarious Responsibility the Public's Answer to Juvenile Crime?." *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law* 17(4):507–29.

Brewer, Marilynn B., and Ya-Ru Chen. 2007. "Where (Who) Are Collectives in Collectivism? Toward Conceptual Clarification of Individualism and Collectivism.." *Psychological review* 114(1):133–51.

Cheah, Charissa S. L., Christy Y. Y. Leung, and Nan Zhou. 2013. "Understanding 'Tiger Parenting' Through the Perceptions of Chinese Immigrant Mothers: Can Chinese and U.S. Parenting Coexist?." *Asian American Journal of Psychology* 4(1): 30–40.

Choi, Incheol, Reeshad Dalal, Chu Kim-Prieto, and Hyekyung Park. 2003. "Culture and Judgement of Causal Relevance.." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 84(1):46–59.

Choi, Incheol, Minkyung Koo, and Joon A. Choi. 2007. "Individual Differences in Analytic Versus Holistic Thinking.." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 33(5): 691–705.

Choi, Incheol, and Richard. E. Nisbett. 2000. "Cultural Psychology of Surprise: Holistic Theories and Recognition of Contradiction.." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 79(6): 890–905.

Choi, Incheol, Richard E. Nisbett, and Ara Norenzayan. 1999. "Causal Attribution Across Cultures: Variation and Universality." *Psychological bulletin* 125(1): 47–63.

Choi, Yoonsun, You S. Kim, Su Y. Kim, and Irene J. K. Park. 2013. "Is Asian American Parenting Controlling and Harsh? Empirical Testing of Relationships Between Korean American and Western Parenting Measures.." *Asian American Journal of Psychology* 4(1): 19–29.

Coffee, John C. 1981. "'No Soul to Damn: No Body to Kick': an Unscandalized Inquiry Into the Problem of Corporate Punishment." *Michigan Law Review* 79(3):386–459.

Hamilton, V. Lee., Joseph Sanders, Yoko Hosoi, Zensuke Ishimura, Nozomu Matsubara, Haruo Nisimura, Nobuho Tomita and Kazuhiko Tokoro. 1983. "Universals in Judging Wrongdoing: Japanese and Americans Compared." *American Sociological Review* 48(2):199–211.

Heider, Fritz 1944. "Social Perception and Phenomenal Causality." *Psychological review* 51:358–74.

Hofstede, Geert. 1984. "Cultural Dimensions in Management and Planning." *Asia Pacific*

Journal of Management 1(2): 81–99.

Hui, C. Harry, and Harry C. Triandis. 1986. "Individualism-Collectivism: a Study of Cross-Cultural Researchers." *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* 17(2): 225–48.

Jeynes, William H. 2007. "The Relationship Between Parental Involvement and Urban Secondary School Student Academic Achievement a Meta-Analysis." *Urban Education* 42(1): 82–110.

Kiang, Lisa, Kandace Andrews, Gabriela L. Stein, Andrew J. Supple, and Laura M. Gonzalez. 2013. "Socioeconomic Stress and Academic Adjustment Among Asian American Adolescents: the Protective Role of Family Obligation." *Journal of Youth and Adolescence* 42(6): 837–47.

Kim, Tia E., and Sharon G. Goto. 2000. "Peer Delinquency and Parental Social Support as Predictors of Asian American Adolescent Delinquency." *Deviant Behavior* 21(4):331–47.

Kim, Tia E., and Michiko Otsuki-Clutter. 2011. "Multiethnic Comparisons of the Predictors of Adolescent Delinquency Among Urban Adolescents." *Internet Journal of Criminology* (online).

Kim, Su Y., Yijie Wang, Diana Orozco-Lapray, Yishan Shen, and Mohammed Murtuza. 2013. "Does 'Tiger Parenting' Exist? Parenting Profiles of Chinese Americans and Adolescent Developmental Outcomes.." *Asian American Journal of Psychology* 4(1):7–18.

Le, Thao N., and Gary D. Stockdale. 2005. "Individualism, Collectivism, and Delinquency in Asian American Adolescents." *Journal of Clinical Child & Adolescent Psychology* 34(4): 681–91.

Lee, Jennifer, and Min Zhou. 2014. "The Success Frame and Achievement Paradox: the Costs and Consequences for Asian Americans." *Race and Social Problems* 6(1): 38–55.

Lu, Xiaowei, Xiang Yao, Christopher Cochran, and Kaiping Peng. 2014. "Culture and Institutional Agency: Difference in Judgments of Economic Behavior and Organizational Responsibilities." *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 44(2): 77–86.

Ma, Pei-Wen W. W., Uttara Desai, Login S. George, Alyssa A. San Filippo, and Samantha Varon. 2014. "Managing Family Conflict Over Career Decisions: the Experience of Asian Americans." *Journal of Career Development* 41(6): 487–506.

Maddux, William W., and Masaki Yuki. 2006. "The 'Ripple Effect': Cultural Differences in Perceptions of the Consequences of Events." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 32(5):669–83.

Manchi Chao, Melody, Zhi-Xue Zhang, and Chi-Yue Chiu. 2008. "Personal and Collective Culpability Judgment: a Functional Analysis of East Asian--North American Differences." 39(6):730–44.

Markus, Hazel R., and Shinobu Kitayama. 2010. "Cultures and Selves: a Cycle of Mutual Constitution." *Perspectives on Psychological Science* 5(4):420–30.

Menon, Tanya, Michael. W. Morris, Chi-yue Chiu, and Ying-yi Hong. 1999. "Culture and the Construal of Agency: Attribution to Individual Versus Group Dispositions.." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 76(5): 701–17.

Morris, Michael W., and Kaiping Peng. 1994. "Culture and Cause: American and Chinese Attributions for Social and Physical Events." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 67:949–49.

Morris, Michael W., Tanya Menon, and Daniel R. Ames. 2001. "Culturally Conferred Conceptions of Agency: a Key to Social Perception of Persons, Groups, and Other Actors." *Personality and Social Psychology Review* 5(2): 169–82.

National People's Congress of People's Republic of China. 2000. "General Principles of the Civil Law of the People's Republic of China": Article 11.

Ngo, Bic, and Stacey J. Lee. 2007. "Complicating the Image of Model Minority Success: a Review of Southeast Asian American Education." *Review of Educational Research* 77(4): 415–53.

Nisbett, Richard E., Kaiping Peng, Incheol Choi, and Ara Norenzayan. 2001. "Culture and Systems of Thought: Holistic Versus Analytic Cognition." *Psychological review* 108(2):291–310.

Peng, Samuel S., and DeeAnn Wright. 1994. "Explanation of Academic Achievement of Asian American Students." *The Journal of Educational Research* 87(6):346–52.

Phillips, Michael R., Veronica Pearson, Feifei Li, Minjie Xu, and Lawrence Yang. 2002. "Stigma and Expressed Emotion: a Study of People with Schizophrenia and Their Family Members in China.." *British Journal of Psychiatry* 181:488–93.

Singelis, T. M., H. C. Triandis, D. P. S. Bhawuk, and M. J. Gelfand. 1995. "Horizontal and Vertical Dimensions of Individualism and Collectivism: a Theoretical and Measurement Refinement." *Cross-Cultural Research* 29(3):240–75.

Tetlock, Philip E., William T. Self, and Ramadhar Singh. 2010. "The Punitiveness Paradox: When Is External Pressure Exculpatory – and When a Signal Just to Spread Blame?." *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 46(2):388–95.

Thye, Shane R., David Willer, and Barry Markovsky. 2006. "From Status to Power: New Models at the Intersection of Two Theories." *Social Forces* 84(3):1471–95.

Tomaszewski, A. L. 2005. "From Columbine to Kazaa: Parental Liability in a New World." *University of Illinois Law Review* 2005 (2): 573-599

Triandis, Harry C. 2004. "The Many Dimensions of Culture." *The Academy of Management Executive* 18(1): 88-93

Wang, Cynthia S., and Angela K. -y. Leung. 2010. "The Cultural Dynamics of Rewarding Honesty and Punishing Deception." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 36(11):1529–42.

Yamaguchi, Susumu, Michele Gelfand, Megumi M. Ohashi, and Yuriko Zemba. 2005. "The Cultural Psychology of Control Illusions of Personal Versus Collective Control in the United States and Japan." *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* 36(6):750–61.

Zemba, Yuriko. 2006. "Responses to Organizational Harm: Mechanism of Blaming Managers as Proxies for a Culpable Organization." *Asian Journal of Social Psychology* 9(3):184–94.

Zemba, Yuriko., Maria J. Young, Michael W. Morris. 2006. "Blaming Leaders for Organizational Accidents: Proxy Logic in Collective- Versus Individual-Agency Cultures." *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* 101(1):16–16.

Zemba, Yuriko, and M. J. Young. 2012. "Assigning Credit to Organizational Leaders: How Japanese and Americans Differ." *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* 43(6):899–914.