Chapter 2
"Location, Location, Location": Contextualizing Chinese Families in Four Geolocations

Susan S. Chuang, Ching-Yu Huang, Xuan Li, April Chiung-Tao Shen, Meihua Zhu, Agnes Ng, and Joyce Yen Feng

Chinese families in the twenty-first century have gained significant prominence among scholars who have acknowledged the importance of ethnic minority families (Chuang & Zhu, 2018; Chuang & Tamis-LeMonda, 2013). As of 2017, Mainland China, Hong Kong, Taiwan, and Macau are home to 1.39 billion (National Bureau of Statistics of People's Republic of China, 2018), 23.58 million (Ministry of Interior of Taiwan, 2017), 7.41 million (Census and Statistics Department, Government of Hong Kong SAR, 2018), and 0.66 million people (Statistics and Census Service, Macau SAR, 2018), respectively. Besides residents of major Chinese societies and new international immigrants, Chinese diaspora is widely spread around the globe. Unfortunately, much of the knowledge on Chinese families, and more broadly, Asian families, has been primarily based on a Westernized perspective on European American families (Arnett, 2008; Henrich, Heine, & Norenzayan, 2010).

S. S. Chuang (✉)
University of Guelph, Guelph, ON, Canada
e-mail: schuang@uoguelph.ca

C.-Y. Huang
Keele University, Newcastle, UK

X. Li
New York University Shanghai, Shanghai, China

A. C.-T. Shen · J. Y. Feng
National Taiwan University, Taipei City, Taiwan

M. Zhu
East China University of Science and Technology, Shanghai, China

A. Ng
Mission Healthy Green Organization, Hong Kong, China

H. Chu, B. Thelamour (eds.), *Conceptual and Methodological Approaches to Navigating Immigrant Ecologies*, Advances in Immigrant Family Research,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-50235-5_2

Moreover, especially with the increasing immigration of Asian families in various countries such as Canada and the United States, there has been a greater research attention on Chinese immigrant families (see Chuang, Glozman, Green, & Rasmi, 2018; Chuang & Zhu, 2018; Luo, Tamis-LeMonda, & Song, 2013). However, researchers have tended to homogenize ethnic groups by ethnicity, disregarding geolocation (e.g., Mainland China, Hong Kong, Taiwan) and the societies' unique social and political histories (Chan, Bowes, & Wyver, 2009; Chen, 2014; Fung, Gerstein, Chan, & Hurley, 2013). To address these concerns, the goal of the chapter is to apply Bronfenbrenner's (1977) theoretical framework on human development to examine the sociocultural contexts (chrono-, macro-, and exo-levels) that may influence families at the micro-level (family unit). Specifically, it will explicitly focus on similarities and differences among Chinese families in four contexts, Canada, Mainland China, Hong Kong, and Taiwan, and discuss how historical roots and intracultural variations may have influenced family dynamics and relationships. More often than not, many researchers do not place great emphasis on the contextual factors that may influence families (e.g., historical and social contexts), but rather treat "culture" as a peripheral variable (Chuang, 2009; Chuang et al., 2018a). Moreover, there is a tendency to compare ethnic groups with families of European background which then overlooks the variation and nuances of Chinese families in varying geolocations (see Luo et al., 2013).

However, a critical aspect of a life course perspective is the explicit consideration of the chronosystem. Thus, we begin the discussion on some detailed overview of the history and modern states of the Chinese people to contextualize contemporary families. We then discuss the immigration policies in Canada. Next, we report on the few studies that have conducted intra-cultural comparisons on Chinese parenting, offering some preliminary findings of our current study. Lastly, we offer some suggestions for future research.

The Fluidity Among the Chronosystem, Exosystems, and Macrosystems: History and Modern States

Bronfenbrenner (1977) impressively conceptualized a broad theoretical framework on human development. The model encompassed all the complexities and variations of individuals, including their physical, psychological, and social environments, and how the various elements interconnect and influence the developing person over time (i.e., developmental time of the person as well as the time period of the experiences). The fundamental feature of this model is the direct and indirect effects of relationships in various contexts on the developing person. First, we briefly discuss the model, followed by a discussion on the complexities of time, as "current" exosystems and macrosystems pass with time, becoming a part of the chronosystem. Next we examine the various exosystems, with particular focus on political wars that have occurred in Hong Kong and Taiwan, which have impacted the sociocultural contexts of these respective Chinese societies.

Brief Overview of the Bioecological Model

The model includes five levels or systems. The first structure is the microsystem which includes a pattern of activities, social roles, and interpersonal relationships that the developing person experiences in a face-to-face (direct) setting. These experiences are in the person's immediate environment, such as the family; and their direct relationships enhance the person's development across the lifespan (Bronfenbrenner, 1977, 1995).

The next level is the mesosystem, defined as the relationship between two or more microsystems (e.g., child-mother, child-peer). The exosystem extends the mesosystems by encompassing other specific formal or informal structures that do not include the developing person. These structures such as neighborhoods and government indirectly impact the developing person's immediate setting. These systems occur through space and time (chronosystem).

Encompassing the micro-, meso-, and exosystems is the macrosystem, which does not refer to specific contexts, but rather to overarching institutional patterns of culture or subculture. The make-up of any culture can include the economic, social, educational, legal, and political systems. It is the culture that embraces the information and ideologies, which implicitly and explicitly transmit the meaning and motivation to specific agencies, social networks, roles, activities, and their interrelations. Thus, cultural values, beliefs, norms, and customs become "blueprints" for how societies function (Bronfenbrenner, 1977).

Within the macrosystem are the exosystems, which encompass specific formal or informal structures that do not include the developing person. These structures include the government (Bronfenbrenner, 1977, 1979), and of particular interest are the political wars that Hong Kong and Taiwan have endured over the many centuries. Over time, these political wars have become a part of the Chinese societies' history, influencing the institutional patterns of culture or subcultures.

The Chinese, one of the oldest and largest ethnic groups in the world, established the first unified empire in 221 BC, and settled in today's East Asia for the following centuries, albeit with frequent changes of reigning dynasties and borders. Until 1912, when the last imperial rule was overturned, China ran a pre-industrial feudal economic system following the Confucian philosophy, where the majority of the population was engaged in agricultural production under the governing literati class (Jacka, Kipnis, & Sargeson, 2013).

The rise of Europe after the Industrial Revolution dramatically changed the course of Chinese history. Unable to defend itself from the British who invaded to open the Chinese market, the Qing Empire ceded Hong Kong following two Opium Wars (1839–1842; 1856–1860). Soon after, the Qing Empire lost again during the First Sino-Japan War (1895), thus ceding the province of Taiwan to Japan. Chinese nationalists governed the country (i.e., Republic of China, ROC) throughout the 1920–1930s after the downfall of the Qing Empire, while underground communist movements increased. Despite brief collaborations to resist the Japanese invasion (1938–1945), the nationalists and the communists fought against each other until

1949, when the nationalists retreated to Taiwan and the Chinese Communist proclaimed government in Mainland China (The People's Republic of China, PRC) (Jacka et al., 2013).

The complicated modern history of China has witnessed the division of the Chinese nation into several populations: Mainland China under the Communist government (PRC), Taiwan under the Nationalist government (ROC), and Hong Kong under the British rule until it was "returned" in 1997 and has since become a Special Administrative Region of the PRC,. Mainland China. Taiwan, Hong Kong, and Mainland China are typically considered autonomous political entities, each with its own government and socioeconomic system. In addition, Macau, which was a Portuguese settlement colony for over four centuries (1557–1999), was turned over to Mainland China in 1999 with similar status as Hong Kong (Jacka et al., 2013).

Thus, these major political wars within Chinese societies have segmented China into three societies, specifically, Mainland China, Hong Kong, and Taiwan. Due to these contrasting political-cultural contexts, Ho (1986) stressed that there were significant variations in socialization among Chinese people from Mainland China, Hong Kong, Taiwan, and overseas such as differences of ideological objectives and socialization goals that impact family functioning (e.g., governmental policies on family planning). However, few researchers have explicitly taken the national government (i.e., its policies and actions) into consideration and its impact on families and how families may differ by geolocation (see Luo et al., 2013). It is imperative to begin a critical reflection on some of the historical information about the governmental transformations of Hong Kong and Taiwan and the wars that shaped their respective cultures.

From 1841 to 1997, Hong Kong was under the British governance. During this time, thousands of Chinese migrants fled China's communism to Hong Kong. Many Christian missionaries created schools and churches in Hong Kong, changing its cultural landscape. Nearing the end of the 99-year lease, before the British returned Hong Kong to China, a "one country, two systems" agreement was promised to the citizens of Hong Kong. This new regime allowed Hong Kong to continue to engage in capitalism and political freedoms that were forbidden on the Mainland for 50 years (Anonymous, 1997).

Similar to Hong Kong, Taiwan has been influenced by other "outside cultures," although the history is more complicated. Historically, inhabitants lived in Taiwan for over 5000 years, and thus identified themselves as Taiwanese, not Chinese. In 1624, the Dutch invaded Taiwan but then were expelled by the Zheng Dynasty in 1662, and then the Qing Dynasty took over Taiwan in 1683. During this time (1662–1895), increased numbers of Fujianese and Cantonese migrated to Taiwan. From 1895 to 1945, Taiwan was a part of Japan and thus engaged in the Japanese culture and celebrated Japanese history. The Japanese contributed to Taiwan's economic development in significant ways, primarily through the electrification of the island, development of massive infrastructure of roads, and the improvement of agricultural development. In 1945, Japan was defeated and Taiwan was "returned" to China, under Chiang Kai-Shek's command (Kuomintang regime) (Winckler, Lewis, Ginsberg, & Kang, 2016). After this shift in political leadership, and with the

support and assistance of other countries, especially the United States, Taiwan slowly emerged as a democratic society by 1995 (Gregor, 1995).

The political wars and invasions in Hong Kong and Taiwan have impacted their culture and ways of life. Over the history of these Chinese societies, they have experienced many governments with laws and policies transforming these Chinese societies' cultural values, beliefs, norms, and customs. Even though Hong Kong and Taiwan are a part of China, they have autonomous governments, creating differing cultural experiences for their respective families. Thus, it is important for researchers to explore the cultural differences and nuances among these families in Hong Kong, Taiwan, and Mainland China rather than clustering them as "one group."

The Macrosystem: Traditional Values, Family, and Gender Roles

The macrosystem (cultural context) for Chinese societies has rooted in Confucianism for over 2000 years, which has guided family roles and functioning. With the goal of attaining social order, Confucius focused on interdependence, social harmony, and sacrificing one's needs for the sake of the group (Ho, 1989). An individual was viewed within a relationship, holding specific family and societal roles with a clear understanding of his or her "proper place" and was required to uphold his or her roles and responsibilities to maintain social order and harmony.

The most basic and important of all the relationships was the family unit. Confucius conceptualized a template for how each family member should interact with each other, and how family values should be upheld. This template included specific rules on family hierarchy, intergenerational conduct, lines of authority, and respect for the status of others that needed to be adhered to and followed throughout one's life (Tang, 1992). Confucius also had preferred relationships for father and son, believing that the father-son relationship was the most primary and structurally important relationship in the family system, the prototype of all relationships (Kim & Park, 2006).

A central aspect of family relationships was filial piety. Filial piety referred to the respect and care that children have for their parents, and they are to bring honor and not disgrace to the family name (i.e., reputation). Children display filial piety by being obedient and devoted to their parents (Miller, Wiley, Fung, & Liang, 1997). When children reach adulthood, they are expected to financially support their parents (Ho, 1996) while parents are expected to provide their children with love, wisdom, and benevolence (Kim & Park, 2006).

Confucius further defined the roles for mothers and fathers. First, Confucius viewed fathers as the primary breadwinners, and responsible for issues that were outside of the household whereas mothers were responsible for the household and raising of children. These gendered parenting roles has been coined, "strict father, warm mother" (Wilson, 1974). Thus, mothers' daily responsibilities were to nurture, supervise, and sanction their children whereas fathers were feared and were distant figures who taught, directed, and disciplined the children. However, fathers

were to display affection toward young children, especially daughters until puberty (Wolf, 1972).

Contemporary research on Chinese families and the influence of Confucian teachings on family dynamics and relationships has focused primarily on parental control and authority. As Chuang et al. (2018) stressed, this approach leads to conclusions that overemphasize intergroup and underemphasize intragroup differences. To better understand how Chinese families have changed and transformed over the years, the significant social and political transformations that have directly and indirectly influenced Chinese families, and societies at large, need further attention.

Influences of Social Change on Contemporary Families

Over the last several decades, Mainland China, Hong Kong, and Taiwan have experienced significant changes such as political laws and social policies that have consequently affected the dynamics and relationships in families. Although there were many factors, we specifically focus on the legalization of equality in families, equal access to education, and the fertility patterns and family planning policies within these three geolocations. We discuss the implementation of these factors to stress the importance that these Chinese societies are not monolithic. It is important to note that most of the knowledge about these changes and their effects on families are based on Mainland China, as research on Hong Kong and Taiwan has received significantly less attention. Thus, we first discuss how Hong Kong and Taiwan have developed over time as these countries have their own unique historical and political experiences, and implemented their respective governments.

Post-war Taiwan and Hong Kong quickly restored their economies under the capitalist system and steadily rose to leading powers of global trade and finance. Taiwan experienced miraculous economic growth during 1950–1980s due to its electronic industry, and Hong Kong, after several major shifts, has been functioning as the finance hub of Asia-Pacific. Meanwhile, Mainland China underwent radical socialist movements such as the Land Reform (1950–1953), the Great Leap Forward (1958–1962), and the Cultural Revolution (1966–1976). During this period, the land was redistributed and the economy was nationalized and re-organized into collective agricultural production units in the rural area and state organizations in the cities (Jacka et al., 2013).

International contacts and mobility had been severed and education and research were halted at the heat of “class-struggles” and masses of urban youth were sent to rural areas to foster socialist transformation (Zhou & Hou, 1999) until Mainland China eventually “reformed and opened” in 1979 to join the global capitalist market under a socialist government. The economy – both rural and urban – was privatized, foreign investments introduced, and education and research resumed. After nearly four decades, China has become one of the world’s largest economies, with the GDP per capita ranked 107th in 2016 (United Nations, 2016), with the economic advancement bringing increased international exchanges of goods and cultural artifacts as well as mobility within and beyond the border. For example, according to

the Ministry of Education of People's Republic of China (2016), a total of 4.04 million Chinese students have travelled overseas to pursue education during 1978–2015, over 45% of which have remained abroad. These economic growth included women into the field, thus, transforming the gendered parenting roles in the family.

Gender Equality in Families

Mainland China experienced a communist revolution and a government that was actively engaged in modernizing its society. Specifically, the government created policies that acknowledged the equality between the genders such as the Marriage Law of 1950 that provided legal rights for women and children. Laws banned coerced or arranged marriages, along with polygamy and child marriages. Marriages were now viewed as a personal choice, and divorce was legalized (Engle, 1984). In 2003, the government simplified the marriage and divorce procedures, resulting in a significant increase of divorces. The divorce rate has steadily increased, with the crude divorce rate rising from 1.8% in 2002 to 3.2% in 2017 (Ministry of Civil Affairs of People's Republic of China, 2003, 2018).

In Taiwan, women used to have very limited rights, such as having no input on where they would live, no custody rights over their children, and a lack of self-protection. It was not until 1998 when new regulations were implemented that provided women with more rights, including divorce, some rights to child custody, and holding prior property if it was registered before 1985 (Yam Women Web, 1998). Several legislative changes since 1991 have advanced women's rights in Taiwan, and the government established the Gender Equality Committee in the Executive Yuan in 2011 to serve as a democracy platform. For example, various mainstreaming actions by the United States have been integrated in the government system such as the inclusion of women's rights to political participation (Executive Yuan, 2011).

Hong Kong's history of gender equality differed significantly from Mainland China and Taiwan. With the British colony influence in the mid-1880s, the English law was established in Hong Kong. The Sino-British Joint Declaration (i.e., the international treaty signed between Britain and China) in 1984 granted Hong Kong a high degree of autonomy and the laws previously experienced with the English law were maintained. Thus, Hong Kong women were safeguarded with various rights, including the right to life, freedom of religion, economic and cultural rights, rights to education, and a protection to all individuals (see Kapai, 2012).

Equal Access to Education

In 1907, the Qing government created the first public schools for girls and Western Christian missionaries influenced Mainland Chinese societies by creating formal schools for women in 1940s (Lu & Zheng, 1995; for overview, see Lui & Carpenter, 2005). During the socialist era in the late 1940s, Chairman Mao Zedong and the

Chinese Communist Party implemented a gender equality policy for girls to have the right to be educated. In 2004, junior and senior middle school students made up of almost equal number of boys and girls, with more girls than boys in secondary vocational schools. Undergraduate and graduate students also had high numbers of female students (Lui & Carpenter, 2005).

Formal education in Taiwan began with the Japanese colonial period and was later expanded by the Nationalist government. During the Japanese rule, girls were given access to elementary education which increased from 1% in 1908 to 61% by 1943, compared to boys' enrolment of 8–81%, respectively (Yu, 1988). The Taiwanese people needed to participate in the building of its economy to help Japan defend itself from the West. After WWII, Taiwan's educational system significantly expanded, along with its economic growth. But it was not until the early 1980s did girls attain parity in educational attainment (Tsai, Gates, & Chiu, 1994).

For Hong Kong people, the British missionaries created schools when they arrived in 1843, with the dual mission of evangelizing and civilizing the native girls in the Victorian era (Chiu, 2008). In the 1970s, Hong Kong businesses were increasing and transforming from low-skilled industries to electronics, banking, international trade and, thus, Hong Kong needed some basic literacy. Thus, Hong Kong authorities instituted compulsory education in 1971 for children from age 6 to 11. By 1980, all children were guaranteed free education up to grade nine, resulting in 44% of the children completing their senior secondary education by 1991 (Stateuniversity.com, n.d.).

Fertility Patterns and Family Planning Policies

In the late 1970s, Mainland China's government instituted the "one-child policy" (officially the "family planning policy") due to overpopulation. China occupies only about 7% of the world's livable lands and, yet, home to almost 25% of the world's population. Thus, the country would not be able to economically sustain continued population growth (Zhu, 2003). This policy restricted married urban couples to having only one child. Unfortunately, the one child policy intensified many parents' desires to have a son who would carry the family name, creating a sex ratio unbalance. In 1979, there were 107 boys born to every 100 girls, and the ratio increased to 121 in 2005. This translated into an estimated access of 1.1 million men, leading to 32 million more males than females who were under the age of 20 (Zhu, Lu, & Hesketh, 2009).

Currently, the common family composition in urban families is a four-two-one structure (four grandparents, two parents, one child). In urban areas, 95% of the children are only children (Chen & He, 2004). In 2013, the one-child policy has been altered to allow for two children as the population of senior citizens have become an increasing burden for adult children (see Zeng & Hesketh, 2018).

This drastic change in family structure transformed the role of the child in the household, and parent-child (as well as grandparent-child) relationships, as the

child held a powerful position. There were two parents and four grandparents to one child that challenged the Confucian teachings of hierarchy and parental power toward a more "child-centered" framework. Family resources were now concentrated on one child rather than on many children. For example, Chen and Chen (2010) examined two cohorts of Chinese parents of school-aged children (1998 and 2002) and found that over a 4-year period, Chinese parents used less power assertion (i.e., expectation that children will comply without resistance), and increased their displays of parental warmth.

Taiwan also faced population challenges after the Second World War. The rise in birth rates increased from about 38% in 1947 to 50% in 1951. There was governmental propaganda that promoted family planning programs, and changed their family slogans from "the more children you have the happier you are" to "two children are just right." Fertility control was stressed by intensive family planning education as well as inexpensive contraceptives to eligible couples (Sun, 2001). Similar to Taiwan, Hong Kong was not subjected to the one-child policy but families were encouraged to have two children to control its population growth.

In sum, these unique political, economic, and sociocultural histories have changed and transformed the ways of life for Mainland Chinese, Hong Kong, and Taiwanese families. Unfortunately, there is a greater tendency of researchers to implicitly assume that Asian/Chinese culture is homogeneous, regardless of geography (Mainland China, Hong Kong, Taiwan), and utilized traditional Chinese culture such as Confucianism to guide their work (e.g., Chan, Bowes, & Wyver, 2009; Chen, 2014; Newland, Coyl, & Chen, 2013). This assumption is evident when their samples of Chinese families included families from various geolocations which, unfortunately, continues to perpetuate the over-generalized and superficial stereotype of that geolocation (and its unique history) that is not meaningful (for further analyses, see Chuang, Glozman, Green, & Rasmi, 2018a). Moreover other researchers provided either minimal context or only empirical findings on "Chinese families" (Kan & Tsai, 2005; Lee, Zhou, Eisenberg, & Wang, 2013; Liu & Guo, 2010). These challenges are more complex when Chinese families immigrate to other countries.

The Challenges of Assessing Exo- and Macro-Level Factors

As Bronfenbrenner (1977, 1995; see also Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 2006) emphasized in his model of human development, the macrosystem, the cultural context, was a key feature that was relevant and meaningful when studying family dynamics and relationships. However, how researchers sufficiently, effectively, and meaningfully operationalized the construct of "culture" has proven to be a daunting task. Even in our attempts in this chapter to provide greater sociohistorical contexts for Chinese families, greater exploration is needed to fully capture how culture has affected the microlevels of relationships such as fathers' level of engagement with their children. Nonetheless, we discuss the findings of these Chinese fathers in Canada, Mainland China, Hong Kong, and Taiwan and highlight some results that

may lead to future consideration and research. Before this discussion, however, we further discuss the issues of culture and a call to action for researchers to better explore the families' cultural contexts in a more critical way.

While Bronfenbrenner's bioecological model remains relevant and meaningful for all researchers to consider when exploring families, many researchers, including ourselves, have failed to heed his warning in 1995. As Bronfenbrenner asserted:

> …the ultimate paradox is that the more "scientific" the study, the less we are likely to discover which human beings are subject to its results. The reason for this paradox is that psychological science took physics as its model, and physics seeks to discover universal principles: those that apply to all physical phenomena across time and space. But human beings…are widely variable in their biopsychological characteristics and, as a result, are differentially susceptible to the external conditions and forces to which they are exposed during their lifetime…what it does mean is that the research model we use must take such variation into account, and not simply in the form of random error (pp. 632–633).

There were two warnings: (1) a micro-level warning that each person has his/her own unique personal characteristics, and (2) a macro-level warning that individuals are susceptible to their social environment that is ever-changing over time. With the first warning, to date, researchers have not meaningfully assessed the influences of Chinese parents' biopsychological characteristics (e.g., personality, temperament) in relation to parenting or relationships with their children.

For the second warning, few researchers have explored the significant social and cultural transformations in Chinese countries over the last half century (Chang, Chen, & Ji, 2011; Chuang, 2013; Luo et al., 2013). Due to exo-level changes (e.g., governmental policies on family planning, access to education), operationalizing measures to capture the sociocultural changes that further influence the essence of culture will always be a struggle for researchers, both conceptually and pragmatically (e.g., devising measures to capture the multi-dimensionality and multi-faceted nature of culture). For example, Kroeber and Klukhohn (1952) compiled a list of definitions of culture and found 160 definitions, and then added their own. Although there are many definitions, they all share some common features that focus on the group's origins, activities and behaviors, heritage or traditions, group rules and norms, and how the group defines itself and their uniqueness to others (see Chuang, Green, & Moreno, 2018). A difficult challenge, however, is that researchers need to continually improve relevant measures, devise more innovative methods to capture "culture" of that particular ethnic group of interest, and be critically reflective of how sociocultural changes (e.g., governmental policies) may indirectly affect fathering and father involvement (see also Chuang, 2009).

When researchers do not critically assess or acknowledge the exo- and macrosystems, there may be a tendency to overgeneralize and oversimplify the complexities and variability of Chinese parenting. Specifically, some researchers use descriptive ethnic labels such as "Hong Kong" versus "Chinese" to then imply that these groups are distinct, while others blur the lines of distinction by interchanging the ethnic labels (see also Chan et al., 2009; Chen, 2014; Fung et al., 2013; Kwok, Ling, Leung, & Li, 2013).

Micro-Level Findings: Chinese Families of Today

There are few studies that have compared Chinese families by geolocation. However, the limited findings suggest that each geolocation's social and historical contexts have impacted parenting. For example, Li and Rao's (2000) study on the functions of literacy education for their children stated that Beijing parents placed greater emphasis on the learning of moral rules, whereas Hong Kong parents focused more on the entertainment function. It was believed that perhaps Confucian influence may be stronger for Beijing parents while Hong Kong parents have greater exposure to Western cultures. Intra-cultural differences between these two groups were also found on levels of restrictive parenting styles. Specifically, Lai, Zhang, and Wang (2000) reported that Hong Kong mothers were more likely to endorse more authoritarian practices and less inclined to show affection to their children than did Beijing mothers. These differences may reflect the one-child policy in Mainland China where parents have become more child-centered.

In our recent study on fathers with young children from Hong Kong, Mainland China, Taiwan, and Chinese-Canadian fathers (from Mainland China), findings revealed similarities across locations as well as differences among them. Regardless of geolocation, Chinese fathers were no longer "aloof, distant" but rather highly engaged with their children, countering Confucian teachings on the roles of fathers (Chuang, 2013; Chuang & Su, 2009; Freeman, Newland, & Coyl, 2008). These findings are similar to past father involvement studies, especially in fathers' levels of play (Paquette & Bigras, 2010; Lamb, Chuang, & Hwang, 2004; Tamis-LeMonda, 2004; Schoppe-Sullivan et al., 2013). Thus, there may appear to be a "global shift" to Chinese fathering, becoming more involved in their parenting responsibilities. This shift may be associated with maternal employment where both parents need to share responsibilities.

However, there were some differences among Chinese fathers as well. For example, Chinese-Canadian and Mainland Chinese fathers reported spending more time playing with than caring for their children, whereas Taiwanese fathers' involvement in childcare activities was higher than levels of play with their children. In contrast, there was no difference in levels of care or play with Hong Kong fathers. Comparing fathers by geolocation, Chinese-Canadian fathers spent more time playing with their children than Taiwanese fathers, and Mainland Chinese fathers' play time was significantly more than Hong Kong fathers. Perhaps these differences may reflect the greater focus on the child in Mainland China due to the one-child policy. For childcare activities, Taiwanese fathers spent more time caring for their children than did Chinese Canadian and Mainland Chinese fathers. Thus, Taiwanese fathers' higher levels of childcare may reflect their democratic culture where household activities are less gendered (Chuang et al., 2019).

Conclusions

It is important for researchers to examine specific ethnic groups on their own terms rather than limiting their focus on cross-cultural comparisons (Chuang, 2006; Phinney & Landin, 1998). An ethnic-specificity approach allows researchers to investigate the impact of cultural factors on particular issues and to examine whether current conceptualizations of family dynamics and functioning, which are based on a Westernized framework, are culturally relevant to minority groups (Chuang, 2009). Using Bronfenbrenner's bioecological model (1995) to explore Chinese families, and families more broadly, will allow researchers to gain a more in-depth understanding of the complexities of the families and how culture influences family dynamics and functioning.

Acknowledgments This project was funded by the Social Science and Humanities Research Council to the first author.

References

Anonymous. (1997). 1898 and all that--a brief history of Hong Kong. *The Economist, 343*, 22. http://www.economist.com/node/91779

Arnett, J. L. (2008). The neglected 95%: Why American psychology needs to become less American. *American Psychologist, 63*, 602–614. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.63.7.602

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1977). Toward an experimental ecology of human development. *American Psychologist, 32*, 513–531. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.32.7.513

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). The ecology of human development. Cambridge, CA: Harvard University Press.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1995). Developmental ecology through space and time: A future perspective. In P. Moen, G. H. Elder, & K. Lüscher (Eds.), *Examining lives in context: Perspectives on the ecology of human development* (pp. 599–618). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Bronfenbrenner, U., & Morris, P. A. (2006). The bioecological model of human development. In W. Damon & R. M. Lerner (Eds.), *Handbook of child psychology* (Vol. 1, 6th ed., pp. 793–828). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Census and Statistics Department, Government of Hong Kong SAR. (2018). *Population.* https://www.censtatd.gov.hk/hkstat/sub/so20.jsp.

Chan, S. M., Bowes, J., & Wyver, S. (2009). Chinese parenting in Hong Kong: Links among goals, beliefs and styles. *Early Child Development and Care, 179*, 849–862. https://doi.org/10.1080/03004430701536525

Chang, L., Chen, B., & Ji, L. Q. (2011). Attributions and attitudes of mothers and fathers in China. *Parenting, Science and Practice, 11*, 102–115. https://doi.org/10.1080/15295192.2011.585553

Chen, W. (2014). The relationship between perceived parenting styles, filial piety, and life satisfaction in Hong Kong. *Journal of Family Psychology, 28*, 308–314. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0036819

Chen, X., & Chen, H. (2010). Child's socioemotional functioning and adjustment in the changing Chinese society. In R. K. Silbereisen & X. Chen (Eds.), *Social change and human development: Concepts and results* (pp. 209–226). London: Sage.

Chen, X., & He, H. (2004). The family in Mainland China: Structure, organization, and significance for child development. In J. L. Roopnarine & U. P. Gielen (Eds.), *Families in global perspective* (pp. 51–62). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Chiu, P. P. (2008). "A position of usefulness": Gendering history of girls' education in colonial Hong Kong (1950s–1890s). *History of Education, 37*, 789–805. https://doi.org/10.1080/00467600802368715

Chuang, S. S. (2006). Taiwanese-Canadian mothers' beliefs about personal freedom for their young children. *Social Development, 15*, 520–536. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9507.2006.00354.x

Chuang, S. S. (2009). Transformation and change: Parenting in Chinese societies. In J. Mancini & K. A. Roberto (Eds.), *Pathways of development: Explorations of change* (pp. 191–206). Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

Chuang, S. S. (2013). Fathering roles and responsibilities of contemporary Chinese fathers in Canada and China. In S. S. Chuang & C. S. Tamis-LeMonda (Eds.), *Gender roles in immigrant families* (pp. 27–42). New York: Springer Science+Business Media.

Chuang, S. S., Glozman, J., Green, D. S., & Rasmi, S. (2018a). Parenting and family relationships in Chinese families: A critical ecological approach. *Journal of Family Theory & Review, 10*, 367–383. https://doi.org/10.1111/jftr.12257

Chuang, S. S., Green, D. S., & Moreno, R. P. (2018b). Culture. In M. Bornstein (Ed.), *The SAGE Encyclopedia of lifespan human development* (pp. 502–506). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Chuang, S. S., & Su, Y. (2009). Says who? Decision-making and conflicts among Chinese-Canadian and Mainland Chinese parents of young children [Special issue]. *Sex Roles, 60*, 527–588. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-008-9537-9

Chuang, S. S., & Tamis-LeMonda, C. S. (Eds.). (2013). *Gender roles in immigrant families*. New York: Springer Science+Business Media.

Chuang, S. S., Yuen, L., Shen, C.-T., Feng, Y., Zhu, M., Ng, A., Zheng, Y., & Green, D. S. (2019, March). *Is that MY job?: An international exploration on Chinese mothers' and fathers' perspectives on parental roles in four environments*. Poster presented at the Society for Research on Child Development, Baltimore.

Chuang, S. S., & Zhu, M. (2018). Where are you Daddy?: An exploration of father involvement in Chinese families in Canada and Mainland China. In S. S. Chuang & C. L. Costigan (Eds.), *Parental roles and relationships in immigrant families: An international approach* (pp. 11–30). New York: Springer Science+Business Media.

Engle, J. W. (1984). Divorce in the People's Republic of China: Analysis of a new law. *Contemporary Family Therapy, 6*, 192–204. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00926931

Executive Yuan. (2011). *Gender equality policy guidelines*. https://gec.ey.gov.tw/en/E9D67A141E287D4E

Freeman, H., Newland, L. A., & Coyl, D. D. (2008). Father beliefs as a mediator between contextual barriers and father involvement. *Early Child Development and Care, 178*, 803–819. https://doi.org/10.1080/03004430802352228

Fung, A. L.-C., Gerstein, L. H., Chan, Y., & Hurley, E. (2013). Children's aggression, parenting styles, and distress for Hong Kong parents. *Journal of Family Violence, 28*, 515–521. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10896-013-9518-9

Gregor, A. J. (1995). R.O.C on Taiwan: China's first democracy. *Foreign Affairs, 74*(5), S5.

Henrich, J., Heine, S. J., & Norenzayan, A. (2010). Beyond WEIRD: Towards a broad-based behavioral science. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 33*, 111–135. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X10000725

Ho, D. Y. (1989). Continuity and variation in Chinese patterns of socialization. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 51*, 149–163. https://doi.org/10.2307/352376

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

Ho, D. Y. F. (1996). Filial piety and its psychological consequences. In M. H. Bond (Ed.), *The handbook of Chinese psychology* (pp. 155–165). London: Oxford University Press.

Jacka, T., Kipnis, A. B., & Sargeson, S. (2013). *Contemporary China: Society and social change*. Melbourne, VIC: Cambridge University Press.

Kan, K., & Tsai, W.-D. (2005). Parenting practices and children's education outcomes. *Economics of Education Review, 24*, 29–43. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.econedurev.2004.04.006

Kapai, P. (2012). *The human rights of women in Hong Kong Special administrative region*. Hong Kong: University of Hong Kong Faculty of Law research Paper.

Kim, U., & Park, Y. (2006). The scientific foundation of indigenous and cultural psychology: The transnational approach. In U. Kim, Y.-S. Yang, & K.-K. Hwang (Eds.), *Indigenous and cultural psychology: Understanding people in context* (pp. 27–48). New York: Springer Science+Business Media.

Kroeber, A. L., & Kluckhohn, C. (1952). *Culture: A critical review of concepts and definitions*. Cambridge, MA: The Museum.

Kwok, S. Y. C. L., Ling, C. C. Y., Leung, C. L. K., & Li, J. C. M. (2013). Fathering self-efficacy, marital satisfaction and father involvement in Hong Kong. *Journal of Child and Family Studies, 22*, 1051–1060. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-012-9666-1

Lamb, M. E., Chuang, S. S., & Hwang, C. P. (2004). Internal reliability, temporal stability, and correlates of individual differences in paternal involvement: A 15-year longitudinal study in Sweden. In R. Day & M. E. Lamb (Eds.), *Conceptualizing and measuring father involvement* (pp. 129–148). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Lee, E. H., Zhou, Q., Eisenberg, N., & Wang, Y. (2013). Bidirectional relations between temperament and parenting styles in Chinese children. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 37*, 57–67. https://doi.org/10.1177/0165025412460795

Li, H., & Rao, N. (2000). Parental influences on Chinese literacy development: A comparison of preschoolers in Beijing, Hong Kong, and Singapore. *International Behavioral Development, 24*(1), 82–90.

Liu, M., & Guo, F. (2010). Parenting practices and their relevance to child behaviors in Canada and China. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology, 51*, 489–495. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9450.2009.00795.x

Lu, M., & Zheng, Y. (1995). The women's movement and women's liberation in China. In J. Min (Ed.), *The chalice and the blade in Chinese culture* (pp. 479–528). Beijing, China: China Social Sciences Publishing.

Lui, J., & Carpenter, M. (2005). Trends and issues of women's education in China. *The Clearing House, 78*, 277–281.

Luo, R., Tamis-LeMonda, C. S., & Song, L. (2013). Chinese parents' goals and practices in early childhood. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 28*, 843–857. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecresq.2013.08.001

Miller, P. J., Wiley, A., Fung, H., & Liang, C. (1997). Personal storytelling as a medium of socialization in Chinese and American families. *Child Development, 68*, 557–568.

Ministry of Civil Affairs of People's Republic of China. (2003). *Communiqué on the development of social services in 2002*. http://www.mca.gov.cn/article/sj/tjgb/200801/200801150093829.shtml (in Chinese).

Ministry of Civil Affairs of People's Republic of China. (2018). *Communiqué on the development of social services in 2017*. http://www.mca.gov.cn/article/sj/tjgb/2017/201708021607.pdf (in Chinese).

Ministry of Education of People's Republic of China. (2016). *Briefing of the blue paper on returning Chinese students with study-abroad experiences.* http://www.moe.edu.cn/jyb_xwfb/xw_fbh/moe_2069/xwfbh_2016n/xwfb_160325_01/160325_sfcl01/201603/t20160325_235214.html (in Chinese).

Ministry of Interior of Taiwan. (2017). *Latest population statistics of Taiwan*. http://www.moi.gov.tw/stat/chart.aspx

National Bureau of Statistics of People's Republic of China. (2018). *Communiqué on the national social and economic development statistics of People's Republic of China.* http://www.stats.gov.cn/tjsj/zxfb/201802/t20180228_1585631.html (in Chinese).

Newland, L. A., Coyl, D. D., & Chen, H.-H. (2013). Fathering and attachment in the USA and Taiwan: Contextual predictors and child outcomes. *Early Child Development and Care, 180*, 173–191. https://doi.org/10.1080/03004430903415049

Paquette, D., & Bigras, M. (2010). The risky situation: A procedure for assessing the father-child activation relationship. *Early Child Development and Care, 180*, 33–50. https://doi.org/10.1080/03004430903414687

Phinney, J. S., & Landin, J. (1998). Research paradigms for studying ethnic minority families within and across groups. In V. C. McLoyd & L. Steinberg (Eds.), *Studying minority adolescents: Conceptual, methodological, and theoretical issues* (pp. 89–109). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Schoppe-Sullivan, S. J., Kotila, L. E., Jia, R., Lang, S. N., & Bower, D. J. (2013). Comparisons of levels and predictors of mothers' and fathers' engagement with their preschool-aged children. *Early Child Development and Care, 183*, 498–514. https://doi.org/10.1080/03004430.2012.711596

Stateuniversity.com. (n.d.). *Hong Kong: History and background*. http://education.stateuniversity.com/pages/616/Hong-Kong-HISTORY-BACKGROUND.html

Statistics and Census Services, Macau SAR. (2018). *Demographic statistics*. Government of Macao Special Administrative Region Statistics and Census Service. https://www.dsec.gov.mo/getAttachment/a76b0b8b-6317-4207-adf7-439b1ec1ac38/E_DEM_FR_2018_Q3.aspx?disposition=attachment

Sun, T.-H. (2001, March). *The impacts of a family planning program on contraceptive/fertility behavior in Taiwan*. Paper presented at the Population Association of American, Washington, DC.

Tamis-LeMonda, C. S. (2004). Conceptualizing fathers' roles: Playmates and more. *Human Development, 47*, 220–227. https://doi.org/10.1159/000078724

Tang, N. M. (1992). Some psychoanalytic implications of Chinese philosophy and child-rearing practices. *Psychoanalytic Study of the Child, 47*, 371–389. https://doi.org/10.1080/00797308.1992.11822682

Tsai, S.-L., Gates, H., & Chiu, H.-Y. (1994). Schooling Taiwan's women: Educational attainment in the mid-20th century. *Sociology of Education, 67*, 243–263. https://doi.org/10.2307/2112815

United Nations. (2016). *National account – Analysis of main aggregates (AMA)*. https://unstats.un.org/unsd/snaama/resQuery.asp

Wilson, R. W. (1974). *The moral state: A study of the political socialization of Chinese and American children*. New York: Free Press.

Winckler, E. A., Lewis, J. W., Ginsberg, N. S., & Kang, Y. C. (Eds.). (2016). *Taiwan*. London: Encyclopedia Britannica.

Wolf, M. (1972). *Women and the family in rural Taiwan*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Yam Women Web. (1998). *The report on women's status in Taiwan: Legal status*. http://taiwan.yam.org.tw/womenweb/st/98e/e_law.htm

Yu, C.-M. (1988). *The education of women in Taiwan under Japanese rule, 1895–1945*. Taipei, Taiwan: Taiwan Normal University.

Zeng, Y., & Hesketh, T. (2018). The effects of China's universal two-child policy. *Lancet, 388*, 1390–1938. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(16)31405-2

Zhou, X., & Hou, L. (1999). Children of the cultural revolution: The state and the life course in the People's Republic of China. *American Sociological Review, 64*, 12–36. https://doi.org/10.2307/2657275

Zhu, W. X. (2003). The one child family policy. *Archives of Disease in Childhood, 88*, 463–464. https://doi.org/10.1136/adc.88.6.463

Zhu, W. X., Lu, L., & Hesketh, T. (2009). China's excess males, sex selective abortion, and one child policy: Analysis of data from 2005 national intercensus survey. *BMJ, 338*, b1211. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.b1211