

PARENTING STYLES AND PSYCHOLOGICAL DISTRESS IN YOUNG ADULTS: FILIAL PIETY AS A MEDIATING FACTOR

Farheen Atif^{a*}, Maryam F. Munir^b, & Dr. Saima Majeed^c

^{a,b,c} Department of Psychology, Forman Christian College University (A Chartered University), Lahore, Pakistan

*Correspondence to: Ms. Farheen Atif, Department of Psychology, Forman Christian College University (A Chartered University), Lahore, Pakistan. E-mail: atiffarheen28@gmail.com. ORCID: 0009-0000-3230-7742

KEYWORDS:

Parenting Styles, Filial Piety, Psychological Distress, Young Adults, Cross-Cultural Psychology

CITE THIS ARTICLE:

Atif, F., & Munir, M. F., & Majeed, S. (2026). Parenting styles and psychological distress in young adults: filial piety as a mediating factor. *Pakistan Journal of Positive Psychology*, 3(8), 90-99.

ABSTRACT

This study investigated the link between psychological distress in Pakistani young adults, filial piety, and parenting styles. Baumrind's parenting styles typology and Yeh and Bedford's dual filial piety model were used as the core framework for this study. This study aimed to understand how these parenting styles- Authoritarian, Authoritative, and Permissive- affect psychological distress in young adults, how the collectivistic cultural phenomenon of filial piety (Reciprocal Filial Piety and Authoritarian Filial Piety) connects to psychological distress, and how the two variables influence psychological distress simultaneously. A sample of $n=400$ was collected using convenience sampling. The Parenting Styles and Dimensions Questionnaire- Short Form (PSDQ-SF), Dual Filial Piety Scale (DFPS), and the Depression Anxiety Scale-10 (DASS-10) were completed by the participants for a correlational and cross-sectional study. SPSS 25 was used to analyse the data. Pearson product-moment correlation analysis was used, in which authoritative parenting ($r = -.25, p < .001$) and reciprocal filial piety ($r = -.25, p < .001$) were negatively correlated with psychological distress, and authoritarian parenting ($r = .36, p < .001$) and permissive parenting ($r = .20, p < .001$) were positively correlated. Authoritarian filial piety did not significantly associate with distress ($r = .07, p = .169$). Multiple Regression analysis showed that the model was significant, $F(5,394) = 19.83, p < .001$, explaining 20.1% variance in psychological distress ($R^2 = .20$). Authoritarian Filial Piety ($\beta = .21, p < .001$) and authoritarian parenting ($\beta = .20, p < .001$) proved to be the strongest positive predictors, whereas authoritative parenting ($\beta = -.18, p = .002$) and reciprocal filial piety ($\beta = -.19, p = .002$) were significant negative predictors, permissive parenting showed a weak positive affect ($\beta = .13, p = .013$). Mediation Analysis further shows that RFP partially mediated the relationship between authoritative parenting and psychological distress, with a significant indirect effect (Effect = -0.07 , 95% CI $[-0.12, -0.02]$). Results highlight the protective role of emotionally supportive and mutually respectful family relationships within the Pakistani cultural context.

I. INTRODUCTION

Recently, there has been a considerable increase in mental health concerns among adolescents and young adults globally; that is, about 20% of the global adolescent population experiences some form of mental health concern annually, with symptoms emerging as young as age 14 (Carnobell et al., 2023). Psychological distress, including symptoms of anxiety, stress, and depression, has increased according to estimates across countries and age groups (Wang et al., 2025; Daly & Macchia, 2023). The relational and cultural elements that influence emotional well-being, especially in non-Western cultures, are not adequately explained by these patterns, even though they

demonstrate the rising incidence of mental health issues (Cucchi & Qorontheleh, 2025; Adebayo et al., 2024). In Pakistan, studies report a prevalence of 42.66% of depressive disorder among youth (Khan & Siddiqui, 2021). Youth mental health is greatly impacted by paternal conduct and cultural expectations in collectivistic cultures (Li et al., 2024). Psychological Distress is the state of emotional discomfort and suffering characterized by symptoms of anxiety, depression, and stress. It may include irritability and physical complaints. It occurs when people perceive the demands of their environment as greater than their capacity for coping (Drapeau et al., 2012; Mirowsky & Ross, 2002; Li et al., 2025; Roy et al., 2025). In societies like South and East Asia, Psychological Distress, largely shaped by family dynamics, styles, and systems, may co-occur with maladaptive coping strategies and the ability of young adults to regulate their emotions under autonomy (Ishaque, 2025). Emotional strain can be increased by intergenerational obligations, parental expectations, and filial responsibilities (Li et al., 2025; Bedford & Yeh, 2021).

Parenting styles consistently show up as a major determinant of psychological readjustment. Baumrind's (1991) typology specifies three types of parenting: Authoritative, Authoritarian, and Permissive; these styles exist on the spectrum of warmth and control (Ma et al., 2023; Baumrind, 2013). Previous studies define authoritative parenting as the balance of warmth and control, associated with healthier psychological outcomes, including emotional regulation and resilience (Goagoses et al., 2023). Permissive and authoritarian parenting are associated with higher levels of discomfort (Chyung et al., 2022). Authoritarian parenting marked with high control low warmth (Romero-Acosta et al., 2021) and permissive parenting with high warmth and low control, findings regarding permissive parenting remain inconsistent, though it is generally considered less adaptive than authoritative parenting (Garcia et al., 2018). This may, however, not be reflective of collectivistic environments (Xia, 2020) because they are based on Western individualism and less on Eastern collectivism. Perceived parental control differs across societies even within collectivistic ones (Yim, 2022). Parenting Styles and dynamics are deeply rooted in larger cultural expectations about family interactions in collectivistic contexts (Yim, 2022). One such phenomenon that embodies the ideal of respect, obligation, and dependence between parents and children is Filial Piety (Mai & Le, 2024; Yeh & Bedford, 2003). The Dual Filial Piety Model by Yeh & Bedford (2003) distinguishes two types of filial piety: Reciprocal Filial Piety (RFP), characterized by gratitude and emotional intimacy, and Authoritarian Filial Piety (AFP), which is based on duty and obedience. As filial piety derives from patterns of family dynamics, it is very crucial to analyse the correlation with parenting styles to comprehensively understand how parental behaviours influence the findings in young adults (Zhang et al., 2024; Bedford & Yeh, 2019).

There is ample cross-cultural evidence that authoritative parenting style correlates negatively with psychological distress, consequently indicating better emotional adjustment, resilience, and autonomy (Goagoses et al., 2023). For Pakistan, relevant findings emerge indicating that authoritative parenting styles correlate with better emotional adjustment (Nadeem et al., 2022). Research shows divergence in how authoritative parenting operates alongside deeply seated cultural norms of respect and obedience (Lin & Wang, 2022). Authoritative parenting converges individual autonomy with relational coherence (Sun et al., 2019) and emerges from the ability to reconcile culturally rooted expectations of filial obligations with developmental needs (Soenens et al., 2018; Cheung & Cheah, 2025). On the other hand, the authoritarian parenting style is more commonly linked with increased psychological distress (Goagoses et al., 2023), and Pakistani research shows that high control paired with low warmth relates to an increase in distress (Suneel et al., 2021). A paradox arises in more cultural literature, as rigid parental supervision is often justified as moral guidance (Kim & Rohner, 2003; Lansford, 2024). Further studies also explain that despite the initial contradictions, dominant effects of authoritarian parenting may hinge on the extent to which the level of control is perceived as excessive and devoid of warmth, given that rigorous parenting in collectivistic cultures is still paired with warmth despite excessive control (Pinquart & Kauser, 2018; Lansford, 2024; Soenens & Vansteenkiste, 2025). For Permissive parenting, certain research indicates that excessive warmth fosters emotional expressiveness and resilience (Garcia et al., 2018), but others associate it with diminished control, inadequate readjustment, and dependency (Haghshenas et al., 2024).

Existing Literature further suggest that parenting contributes to the filial attitudes, Authoritative parenting tends to foster RFP through emotional warmth and communication (Pan & Tang, 2021; Nainee et al., 2021) whereas authoritarian parenting is more strongly correlated with authoritarian filial piety due to emphasis on obedience

and hierarchy (Lin & Wang, 2022; Khan & Siddiqui, 2021), permissive parenting does not emerge as a strong correlation for either AFP or RFP (Lin & Wang, 2022), the absence of structured guidance may be affecting by weakening the development of both (Nainee et al., 2021; Khan and Siddiqui, 2021). Although parenting styles, filial piety, and psychological distress have been studied independently, limited research combines these relationships in a collectivistic context, particularly in Pakistan; this gap restricts comprehensive understanding of how culturally embedded familial values and rearing behaviours jointly shape emotional well-being (Han & Cheung, 2025; Kyeong et al., 2025; Safa & Zubair, 2025; Yang et al., 2024; Martinez et al., 2020).

Purpose of the Study

The current study aimed to investigate the extent to which Parenting styles and filial piety jointly and independently predict psychological distress among Pakistani Young adults. (Khan & Siddiqui, 2021; Han & Cheung, 2025; Bedford & Yeh 2019). Particularly, this study aims to examine the roles of parenting styles in predicting symptoms of psychological distress (Pinquart & Kauser, 2018; Sutrisno, 2025; Abidin et al., 2022); additionally, the study explores the mediating role of filial piety (Sun et al., 2024).

Hypotheses

1. Authoritative parenting will be negatively correlated with psychological distress
2. Authoritarian parenting will be positively correlated with psychological distress
3. Permissive parenting will be positively correlated with psychological distress
4. Reciprocal filial piety will be negatively correlated with psychological distress
5. Authoritarian filial piety will be positively correlated with psychological distress.
6. Filial piety is expected to mediate the relationship between parenting styles and psychological distress.

II. METHOD

Participants

A convenience sampling method was used to collect data from 400 university students aged 18-25 years (Etikan, Musa & Alkassim, 2016; Arnett, 2000), from both public and private sector universities in Pakistan. The sample size was calculated using an online sample calculator, Raosoft (Raosoft, 2024). Participants were required to be fluent in English and provide informed consent before filling out the questionnaire booklet. Responses with missing data or without informed consent were excluded from the analysis (APA, 2020; Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2002).

Measures

Parenting styles were measured using the Parenting Styles and Dimensions Questionnaire – Short Form (PSDQ-SF; Robinson et al., 2001), which is a 32-item self-report questionnaire that measures across the dimensions of Authoritative, Authoritarian, and Permissive Parenting on a 5-point Likert scale, with 1= Never and 5=Always. Filial Piety was measured using the Dual Filial Piety Scale (DFPS; Yeh & Bedford, 2003), assessing reciprocal filial piety (RFP) and authoritarian filial piety (AFP) across 16 items on a 6-point Likert scale, 1= Extremely Unimportant and 6= Extremely Important. Lastly, Psychological distress is measured using the Depression Anxiety Stress Scale – 10 (DASS-10; Halford & Frost, 2021). DASS-10 has 10 items measured on a 4-point Likert scale, with 0= Did not apply to 3= Applied to me very much, or most of the time.

Procedure

The current study uses a cross-sectional correlational research design among parenting styles, filial piety, and psychological distress in Pakistani young adults, as the data were collected only at one point in time and do not prove causation (Barnett, Koushik & Schuster, 2023; Creswell & Creswell, 2017). The participants completed a self-administered questionnaire booklet containing the informed consent sheet, demographic sheet, and the standardized measures: PSDQ-SF, DFPS & DASS-10. Participation was voluntary and anonymous; the responses were secure and were accessible only to researchers. The data were analysed for descriptive and inferential statistics using IBM SPSS Statistics 25. The data were first computed for total scores and means for each dimension or subscale and then calculated for correlation and mediation. Statistical analysis was conducted using IBM SPSS Statistics 25. Descriptive statistics and Pearson's product-moment correlations were computed to examine

relationships among variables; Multiple Standard Regression analysis was conducted to evaluate the predictive roles of parenting styles and filial piety on psychological distress. HAYES Mediation Analysis V4.2 was used to study filial piety as a mediator for parenting styles and psychological distress. Assumptions of normality, linearity, homoscedasticity, and multicollinearity were assessed and found to be within acceptable limits. Statistical significance was established at $p < .05$.

III. RESULTS

Table I: Descriptive Statistics

Variable	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Range
Authoritative Parenting	3.38	0.90	1-5
Authoritarian Parenting	2.46	0.80	1-5
Permissive Parenting	2.71	0.75	1-5
Reciprocal Filial Piety	5.26	0.86	1-6
Authoritarian Filial Piety	3.47	1.00	1-6
Psychological Distress	1.28	0.73	0-3

Note: N= 400. Scores represent the mean scores of each subscale.

Descriptive statistics indicated that participants reported relatively high levels of authoritative parenting ($M=3.40$, $SD=0.90$), moderate levels of permissive parenting ($M=2.70$, $SD=0.70$), and low levels of authoritarian parenting ($M=2.50$, $SD=0.80$). In terms of filial piety, RFP ($M=5.30$, $SD=0.90$) was higher than AFP ($M=3.50$, $SD=1.00$). Psychological was comparatively mild ($M=1.30$, $SD=0.70$). Higher scores indicated higher levels of the respective construct. Parenting Styles (Authoritarian, Authoritative & Permissive) were measured on a 5-point Likert scale, Filial Piety (RFP & AFP) was measured on a 6-point Likert scale, and psychological distress was measured on a 4-point scale.

Table II: Pearson's Product Moment Correlation for n=400 young adults in Pakistan

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Authoritative	—					
2. Authoritarian	-.32**	—				
3. Permissive	.16**	.37**	—			
4. Reciprocal Filial Piety	.53**	-.34**	-.02	—		
5. Authoritarian Filial Piety	.32**	-.04	.09	.49**	—	
6. Psychological Distress	-.25**	.36**	.20**	-.25**	.07	—

$p < .01^{**}$

Pearson's product-moment correlation analysis indicates that authoritative parenting was negatively associated with psychological distress ($r = -.25$, $p < .001$), whereas authoritarian ($r = .36$, $p < .001$) and permissive parenting ($r = .25$, $p < .001$) were positively associated with distress. RFP was negatively related to psychological distress ($r = -.25$, $p < .001$), and AFP showed no significant bivariate association ($r = .07$, $p = .169$). Additionally, authoritative parenting was positively correlated with RFP ($r = .53$, $p < .001$), and authoritarian parenting was negatively correlated with RFP ($r = -.34$, $p < .001$).

Table III: Multiple Regression Analysis Predicting Psychological Distress

Predictor	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Constant	1.28	0.28	—	4.53	<0.001
Authoritative Parenting	-0.143	0.046	-0.176	-3.10	0.002
Authoritarian Parenting	0.182	0.050	0.197	3.60	< 0.001
Permissive Parenting	0.125	0.050	0.128	2.50	0.013
Reciprocal Filial Piety	-0.161	0.051	-0.189	-3.15	0.002
Authoritarian Filial Piety	0.157	0.039	0.214	4.07	<0.001

Note. Model Summary $R = .45$, $R^2 = .20$, Adjusted $R^2 = .19$, $F(5, 394) = 19.83$, $p < .001$

A multiple regression analysis indicates that parenting styles and filial piety jointly explained 20% of the variance in psychological distress [$F(5, 394) = 19.83$, $p < .001$]. Authoritarian parenting ($\beta = .20$, $p < .001$), permissive parenting ($\beta = .13$, $p = .013$), positively predicted psychological distress, authoritative parenting ($\beta = -.18$, $p = .002$) showed negative correlation with psychological distress. RFP ($\beta = -.19$, $p = .002$) also negatively predicted distress, whereas AFP ($\beta = .21$, $p < .001$) positively predicted psychological distress. Collectively, the results showed that Filial Piety and Parenting styles both significantly and independently predict Psychological Distress, with authoritarian trends raising risk and warmth serving as a protective factor.

Table IV: Mediation Analysis Summary

Model	Path a (X → M) B (p)	Path b (M → Y) B (p)	Direct Effect (c') B (p)	Indirect Effect	95% Boot CI	Mediation
Authoritative → RFP → Distress	0.502 (< .001)	-0.136 (.005)	-0.136 (.003)	-0.068	[-0.119, -0.021]	Partial
Authoritarian → RFP → Distress	-0.367 (< .001)	-0.120 (.005)	0.285 (< .001)	0.044	[0.013, 0.083]	Partial
Permissive → RFP → Distress	-0.027 (.645)	-0.207 (< .001)	0.187 (< .001)	0.006	[-0.019, 0.033]	No mediation
Authoritative → AFP → Distress	0.355 (< .001)	0.122 (.001)	-0.247 (< .001)	0.043	[0.015, 0.079]	Partial
Authoritarian → AFP → Distress	-0.049 (.439)	0.061 (.077)	0.332 (< .001)	-0.003	[-0.017, 0.009]	No mediation
Permissive → AFP → Distress	0.114 (.089)	0.039 (.288)	0.188 (< .001)	0.004	[-0.004, 0.021]	No mediation

Note. B= unstandardized regression coefficient. Indirect effects were estimated using Hayes' PROCESS Macro (Model 4) with 5,000 bootstrap samples. Mediation was considered significant when the 95% bootstrap confidence interval did not include zero. RFP = Reciprocal Filial Piety; AFP = Authoritarian Filial Piety.

To assess filial piety as a mediator for parenting styles and psychological distress, mediation analysis was conducted using Hayes' PROCESS Macro V4.2 with 5000 bootstrap samples and 95% bias-corrected confidence intervals. Mediation was considered significant when the bootstrap confidence interval for the indirect effect did not include zero. RFP showed partial mediation with authoritative parenting and authoritarian parenting. Significant mediation between authoritative parenting and psychological distress: Authoritative parenting positively predicted RFP ($B = .502$, $p < .001$), which then negatively predicted psychological distress ($B = -.136$, $p = .005$). The indirect effect was significant ($B = .068$, $BootSE = .025$, 95% CI [-0.119, -0.021]), whereas direct effect remained significant ($B = -.136$, $p = .003$), similarly Authoritarian parenting negatively predicted RFP ($B = -.367$, $p < .001$), and then RFP negatively predicted psychological distress ($B = -.120$, $p = .005$). The indirect effect was significant ($B = 0.044$, $BootSE = 0.018$, 95% CI [0.013, 0.083]), and the direct effect also remained significant ($B = 0.285$, $p < .001$). Permissive parenting did not show a significant indirect effect (95% Boot CI [-0.019, 0.033]). AFP showed significant partial mediation only in the relationship between Authoritative parenting and psychological distress. Authoritative parenting positively predicted AFP ($B = 0.355$, $p < .001$), and AFP positively predicted psychological distress ($B = 0.122$, $p = .001$). The indirect effect was significant ($B = 0.043$, $BootSE = 0.016$, 95% CI [0.015, 0.079]), and the direct effect also remained significant ($B = -0.247$, $p < .001$).

IV.DISCUSSION

Parenting Styles and Psychological Distress

The study examined the relationship between parenting styles, filial piety, and psychological distress among Pakistani young adults. These findings were consistent with previous literature in providing insights about how family dynamics are related to psychological well-being (Green et al., 2024). Authoritative parenting showed negative associations with psychological distress (Liem, Cavell & Lustig, 2010; Pinquart & Kauser, 2017), and Authoritarian parenting showed a positive association with Psychological Distress (Chen et al., 2025; Sikandar, Parveen & Khan, 2025). The findings do not suggest that Authoritative parenting reduces distress but that

individuals view their parents as responsive and appropriate in terms of their control (Kanat-Maymon & Assor, 2010); hence, authoritative parenting may be associated with environments that support psychological needs, which in turn connects with better emotional regulation (Bradshaw et al., 2025; Costa et al., 2018). Whereas stringent parenting styles are likely a factor in psychological distress, as psychologically, these settings repress emotional expression, which internalizes stress, decreases adaptability, and leads to failure-related anxiety (Soenens & Vansteenkiste, 2010; Lansford, 2025). Permissive parenting also showed a weaker positive correlation, indicating that a lower level of regulation may be associated with higher distress, potentially due to hindered development of self-regulation skills due to potential failure in providing sufficient guidance for adaptive coping (Ashraf, Khan & Atta, 2024; Ali et al., 2024).

Filial Piety and Psychological Distress

RFP was associated with lower psychological distress, proving that mutual respect and emotional intimacy among parent-child delves into relatedness, introspective internalized meaningful familism (Han & Cheung, 2025; Sun et al., 2019). AFP showed a complex pattern; there was a significant correlation at a bivariate level; however, it showed positive predictive power in the regression model, suggesting that AFP may not independently relate to distress but may become relevant when studying familial dynamics (Han & Cheung, 2025). This might be due to the suppression effect, i.e., the effect depends on context (Sun et al., 2019), which supports the idea that family processes are multidimensional and independent rather than isolated (Han & Cheung, 2025).

Mediating Effects of Filial Piety

RFP emerged as the more consistent mediator, partially mediating the association between both authoritative and authoritarian parenting styles and psychological distress (Lin & Wang, 2022; Wu & Chen 2021). Particularly, the trend was seen in authoritative parenting, which in turn related to lower levels of psychological distress, suggesting that supportive and responsive parenting may foster mutual respect, gratitude, and emotional closeness between parents and children, thereby serving as a protective factor for psychological well-being. Alternatively, higher authoritarian parenting was associated with lower RFP, which in turn was associated with greater psychological distress (Yeh & Bedford, 2021; Wu & Chen, 2021; Han & Cheung, 2025). These findings stayed consistent with Yeh & Bedford (2003), who proposed that RFP develops through healthy parent-child relationships and promotes positive psychological development (Han & Cheung, 2025).

AFP demonstrated a limited mediation role, significantly mediating only the relationship between authoritative parenting and psychological distress, but no significant mediation was observed for authoritarian parenting or permissive parenting (Han & Cheung, 2025; Wu & Chen, 2021; Pan & Tang, 2021). Although the positive indirect effect through AFP suggests greater endorsement of obligational behaviour and obedience slightly attenuating the protective effect of authoritative parenting, this finding should be interpreted within the Pakistani cultural context, as warm parenting may coexist with expectations of respect, obedience, and responsibility. Additionally, the absence of significant mediation in the remaining models suggests that AFP may not represent the primary psychological mechanisms through which less adaptive parenting styles influence psychological wellbeing (Chao, 1994; Han & Cheung, 2025; Wu & Chen, 2021). On the whole, these findings highlight that the quality of the relationship between parent and child, characterized by reciprocity, affection, trust, and voluntary respect, appears to be a more significant pathway linking parenting styles to young adults' psychological wellbeing than obligational values (Bedford & Yeh, 2021; Han & Cheung, 2025; Wu & Chen, 2021).

Limitations and Future Directions

The present study is limited in terms of research design. The cross-sectional correlational design limits the ability to draw causal connections regarding the relationship of variables. A longitudinal research design would provide a much clearer understanding of the developmental pathways. Additionally, the self-report measures are threatened by response bias, for example, social desirability, and subjective interpretations. It is already established that perceptions of parenting styles may differ in collectivistic contexts; moreover, the perception may also be different from actual parenting behaviour. Further studies may benefit from incorporating multi-informant approaches, including parental reports. The sample consisted primarily of university-aged students from selected institutions in Pakistan; findings may not be generalizable to individuals in other regions of Pakistan. In the future, inclusion of more culturally and socioeconomically diverse groups is needed to enhance external validity.

V. CONCLUSION

The study examined the relationship among Parenting styles, Filial Piety, and Psychological Distress among young adults. The findings showed that authoritative parenting and RFP are consistently correlated with lower psychological distress, leaving no ambiguity; however, the Authoritarian and Permissive parenting styles and AFP are complexly correlated with greater psychological distress. RFP is partially mediated by authoritative parenting, underscoring the significance of an emotionally supportive and mutually respectful parent-child relationship. Overall, the findings suggest that the influence of parenting is not only shaped by parenting behaviours but also by how filial values are internalized in collectivistic contexts. The study contributes to the understanding of culturally embedded family processes and highlights the importance of cultivating supportive family relationships while balancing cultural values to promote psychological well-being.

Disclosure Statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

Funding

The author received no funding from any organizations.

VI. REFERENCES

- Abidin, F. A., Yudiana, W., & Fadilah, S. H. (2022). Parenting Style and Emotional Well-Being Among Adolescents: The Role of Basic Psychological Needs Satisfaction and Frustration. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13(13). <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.901646>
- Adebayo, Y. O., Adesiyun, R. E., Amadi, C. S., Ipede, O., Karakitie, L. O., & Adebayo, K. T. (2024). Cross-cultural perspectives on mental health: Understanding variations and promoting cultural competence. *World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews*, 23(1), 432–439. <https://doi.org/10.30574/wjarr.2024.23.1.2040>.
- Ali, A. L., Javaid, Z. K., Mahmood, K., & Batool, A. (2024). Perceived Parenting Styles in Relation with Coping Strategies among the Children of Single Parents in Pakistan. *Journal of Health and Rehabilitation Research*, 4(1), 1773–1781. <https://doi.org/10.61919/jhrr.v4i1.721>
- American Psychological Association. (2020). Publication manual of the American psychological association 2020. American psychological association.
- Arnett, J. J. (2000). Emerging adulthood: A theory of development from the late teens through the twenties. *American psychologist*, 55(5), 469.
- Ashraf, A., Khan, M. L., & Atta, N. (2024). Permissive Parenting, Self Regulation and Risk-Taking Behavior among Adolescents. *Global Social Sciences Review*, IX(I), 88-100. [https://doi.org/10.31703/gssr.2024\(IX-I\).09](https://doi.org/10.31703/gssr.2024(IX-I).09)
- Barnett, T. A., Koushik, A., & Schuster, T. (2023). Invited Commentary: Cross-Sectional Studies and Causal Inference-It's Complicated. *American Journal of Epidemiology*, 192(4), 517–519. <https://doi.org/10.1093/aje/kwad026>
- Baumrind, D. (1966). Effects of Authoritative Parental Control on Child Behavior. *Child Development*, 37(4), 887–907. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1126611>
- Baumrind, D. (1966). Effects of Authoritative Parental Control on Child Behavior. *Child Development*, 37(4), 887–907. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1126611>
- Baumrind, D. (2013). The influence of parenting style on adolescent competence and substance use. In *Adolescents and their Families* (pp. 22-61). Routledge.
- Bedford, O., & Yeh, K.-H. (2019). The history and the future of the psychology of filial piety: Chinese norms to contextualized personality construct. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10(100), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.00100>
- Bedford, O., & Yeh, K.-H. (2021). Evolution of the Conceptualization of Filial Piety in the Global Context: From Skin to Skeleton. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.570547>

- Bradshaw, E. L., Duineveld, J. J., Conigrave, J. H., Steward, B. A., Ferber, K. A., Joussemet, M., Parker, P. D., & Ryan, R. M. (2024). Disentangling autonomy-supportive and psychologically controlling parenting: A meta-analysis of self-determination theory's dual process model across cultures. *American Psychologist*. <https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0001389>
- Carbonell, Á., Georgieva, S., José-Javier Navarro-Pérez, & Botija, M. (2023). From Social Rejection to Welfare Oblivion: Health and Mental Health in Juvenile Justice in Brazil, Colombia and Spain. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 20(11), 5989–5989. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph20115989>
- Chao, R. K. (1994). Beyond Parental Control and Authoritarian Parenting Style: Understanding Chinese Parenting through the Cultural Notion of Training. *Child Development*, 65(4), 1111–1119. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.1994.tb00806.x>
- Chen, Y., Li, X., Lin, M., Li, X., & Deng, X. (2025). Associations of authoritarian parenting with parent-adolescent interbrain synchrony in emotional co-experiencing situations. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 98, 101806. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appdev.2025.101806>
- Cheung, H. S., & Cheah, C. S. L. (2025). The forms and functions of parental control and parental warmth across cultures: Evidence for commonality and specificity. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01650254251337734>
- Chyung, Y. J., Lee, Y. A., Ahn, S. J., & Bang, H. S. (2021). Associations of Perceived Parental Psychological Control with Depression, Anxiety in Children and Adolescents: A Meta-Analysis. *Marriage & Family Review*, 1–40. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01494929.2021.1941496>
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2002). *Research methods in education*. Routledge.
- Costa, S., Gugliandolo, M. C., Barberis, N., Cuzzocrea, F., & Liga, F. (2018). Antecedents and consequences of parental psychological control and autonomy support: The role of psychological basic needs. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 36(4), 1168–1189. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265407518756778>
- Costa, S., Sireno, S., Larcán, R., & Cuzzocrea, F. (2018). The six dimensions of parenting and adolescent psychological adjustment: The mediating role of psychological needs. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 60(2), 128–137. <https://doi.org/10.1111/sjop.12507>
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2017). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Sage publications.
- Cucchi A and Qoronthleh MW (2025) Cultural perspective on religion, spirituality and mental health. *Front. Psychol.* 16:1568861. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2025.1568861
- Daly, M., & Macchia, L. (2023). Global trends in emotional distress. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 120(14). <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2216207120>
- Drapeau, A., Marchand, A., & Beaulieu-Prévost, D. (2012). Epidemiology of psychological distress. *Mental illnesses-understanding, prediction and control*, 69(2), 105–106.
- Etikan, I., Musa, S. A., & Alkassim, R. S. (2016). Comparison of Convenience Sampling and Purposive Sampling. *American Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics*, 5(1), 1–4. <https://doi.org/10.3898/175864316818855248>
- García, O. F., Serra, E., Zacarés, J. J., & García, F. (2018). Parenting styles and short-and long-term socialization outcomes: A study among Spanish adolescents and older adults. *Psychosocial Intervention*, 27(3), 153–161.
- Goagoses, N., Bolz, T., Eilts, J., Schipper, N., Schütz, J., Rademacher, A., Vesterling, C., & Koglin, U. (2022). Parenting dimensions/styles and emotion dysregulation in childhood and adolescence: a systematic review and Meta-analysis. *Current Psychology*, 42, 18798–18822. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-022-03037-7>
- Green, D. S., Goldstein, A. L., Zhu, J. Y., Hamza, C. A., Scharfe, E., & Molnar, D. S. (2024). Parents' influences on well-being in emerging adulthood: The role of basic psychological needs. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 33(10), 3326–3337.
- Haghshenas, R., Fereidooni-Moghadam, M., & Ghazavi, Z. (2024). The relationship between perceived parenting styles and anxiety in adolescents. *Scientific Reports*, 14(1), 25623.
- Halford, W. K., & Frost, A. D. (2021). Depression anxiety stress scale-10: a brief measure for routine psychotherapy outcome and progress assessment. *Behaviour Change*, 38(4), 221–234.
- Han, X., Cheung, Mc. The Relationship Between Dual Filial Piety and Mental Disorders and Symptoms Among Adolescents: A Systematic Review of Quantitative and Qualitative Studies. *Adolescent Res Rev* 10, 31–45 (2025). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40894-024-00234-2>

- Han, X., Cheung, Mc., Li, X. et al. The role of filial piety and family dysfunction in eating pathology: a cross-sectional and longitudinal study within the Chinese context. *J Eat Disord* 14, 79 (2026). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40337-026-01552-7>
- Ishaque, A. (2025). Association between psychological distress and health risk behaviours among youth in Karachi. *JPMA. The Journal of the Pakistan Medical Association*, 75(5), 757-762.
- Kanat-Maymon, M., & Assor, A. (2010). Perceived maternal control and responsiveness to distress as predictors of young adults' empathic responses. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 36(1), 33-46.
- Khan, F., & Siddiqui, D. A. (2021). Parenting Style, Filial Piety, and its Outcomes: The Role of Culture in a Moderated Mediation Framework. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3942005>
- Kim, S. I., & Rohner, R. P. (2003). Perceived parental acceptance and emotional empathy among university students in Korea. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 34(6), 723-735.
- Kyeong, Y., Yu, M., Tiemeier, H., Bakermans-Kranenburg, M. J., & Setoh, P. (2025). Filial Piety Across Sociocultural Context and the Life Span. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/09637214241312630>
- Lansford, J. E. (2024). Cultural values, parenting and child adjustment: Introduction to the special issue. *International Journal of Psychology*, 59(4). <https://doi.org/10.1002/ijop.13121>
- Lansford, J. E. (2025). Theories of parenting and child development in different cultural contexts. *Theory and Society*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11186-025-09639-x>
- Li Q, Wei S and Liu Z (2024) How is parental psychological control associated with adolescent mental health in economically disadvantaged areas? The serial mediating role of psychological reactance and problematic smartphone use. *Front. Psychiatry* 15:1458378. doi: 10.3389/fpsyt.2024.1458378
- Li, X., Shi, K., Zhang, J. et al. A family dynamics theory perspective on parenting styles and children's aggressive behavior. *BMC Psychol* 12, 697 (2024). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40359-024-02217-3>
- Li Z, Li J, Kong J, Li Z, Wang R and Jiang F (2024) Adolescent mental health interventions: a narrative review of the positive effects of physical activity and implementation strategies. *Front. Psychol.* 15:1433698. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1433698
- Liem, J. H., Cavell, E. C., & Lustig, K. (2010). The influence of authoritative parenting during adolescence on depressive symptoms in young adulthood: Examining the mediating roles of self-development and peer support. *The Journal of genetic psychology*, 171(1), 73-92.
- Lin L and Wang Q (2022) Adolescents' Filial Piety Attitudes in Relation to Their Perceived Parenting Styles: An Urban–Rural Comparative Longitudinal Study in China. *Front. Psychol.* 12:750751. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2021.750751
- Ma, Z., Wang, X., Zhang, J., Yang, C., Du, H., Dou, F., Li, J., Zhao, Y., Quan, P., & Hu, X. (2023). The Bidirectional Relationship between Chronic Kidney Disease and Hyperuricemia: Evidence from a Population-Based Prospective Cohort Study. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 20(3), 1728. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph20031728>
- Mai HV, Le HV. The interdependence of happiness and filial piety within the family: a study in Vietnam. *Health Psychol Rep.* 2023 Oct 19;12(2):124-132. doi: 10.5114/hpr/172091. PMID: 38628278; PMCID: PMC11016942.
- Martinez, I., Garcia, F., Veiga, F., Garcia, O. F., Rodrigues, Y., & Serra, E. (2020). Parenting Styles, Internalization of Values and Self-Esteem: A Cross-Cultural Study in Spain, Portugal and Brazil. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(7), 2370. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17072370>
- Mirowsky, J., & Ross, C. E. (2002). Measurement for a Human Science. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 43(2), 152–170. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3090194>
- Nadeem, A., Saleem, M., & Khan, A. A. (2022). Perceived Parental Practices and Mental Health Problems of University Students in the Cultural Context of Pakistan. *Human Nature Journal of Social Sciences*, 3(3), 263-275. <https://doi.org/10.71016/hnjss/cf9s1s45>
- Nainee S, Tan S-A, Tan C-S, Gan S-W and Tan J-P (2021) Asian “Guan” Parenting and Life Satisfaction Among Adolescents in Malaysia: The Mediating Role of Filial Piety. *Front. Psychol.* 12:746540. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2021.746540, 40, 410-419
- Pan Y and Tang R (2021) The Effect of Filial Piety and Cognitive Development on the Development of Adolescents' Depressive Symptoms: A Longitudinal Study. *Front. Psychol.* 12:751064. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2021.751064

- Pinquart, M., & Kauser, R. (2018). Do the associations of parenting styles with behavior problems and academic achievement vary by culture? Results from a meta-analysis. *Cultural Diversity & Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 24(1), 75–100. <https://doi.org/10.1037/cdp0000149>
- Raosoftware. (2004). Sample size calculator. <http://www.raosoftware.com/samplesize.html>
- Robinson, C. C. (2001). The parenting styles and dimensions questionnaire (PSDQ). *Handbook of family measurement techniques*, 3, 319.
- Romero-Acosta, K., Gómez-de-Regil, L., Lowe, G. A., Lipps, G. E., & Gibson, R. C. (2021). Parenting styles, anxiety and depressive symptoms in child/adolescent. *International journal of psychological research*, 14(1), 12-32.
- Roy, S., Biswas, A. K., & Sharma, M. (2025, August). Stress, Anxiety, and Depression as Psychological Distress Among College and Undergraduate Students: A Scoping Review of Reviews Guided by the Socio-Ecological Model. In *Healthcare* (Vol. 13, No. 16, p. 1948). MDPI.
- Safa, Maryam & Zubair, Aisha. (2025). Perceived Parenting Styles, Filial Piety and the Moderating Role of Morality Among Adolescents.
- Sikandar, A., Parveen, T., & Khan, S. (2025). Authoritarian Parenting, Emotional Regulation and Mental Health: Students in Perspective. *Proscholar Insights*, 4(1), 208–213. <https://doi.org/10.62997/psi.2025a-41058>
- Soenens, B., Park, S. Y., Mabbe, E., Vansteenkiste, M., Chen, B., Van Petegem, S., & Brenning, K. (2018). The moderating role of vertical collectivism in South-Korean adolescents' perceptions of and responses to autonomy-supportive and controlling parenting. *Frontiers in psychology*, 9, 1080.
- Soenens, B., & Vansteenkiste, M. (2010). A theoretical upgrade of the concept of parental psychological control: Proposing new insights on the basis of self-determination theory. *Developmental review*, 30(1), 74-99.
- Soenens, B., & Vansteenkiste, M. (2025). Studying parenting in adolescence from a dynamic perspective: the case of autonomy-supportive and controlling parenting. *European Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 22(2), 142–167. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17405629.2023.2282647>
- Sun L, Li A, Chen M, Li L, Zhao Y, Zhu A and Hu P (2024) Mediating and moderating effects of authoritative parenting styles on adolescent behavioral problems. *Front. Psychol.* 15:1336354. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1336354
- Sun P, Fan X, Sun Y, Jiang H and Wang L (2019) Relations Between Dual Filial Piety and Life Satisfaction: The Mediating Roles of Individuating Autonomy and Relating Autonomy. *Front. Psychol.* 10:2549. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2019.02549
- Suneel, I., Schwaiger, E., & Nazim, A. (2021). The Relationship of Parental Practices and Psychological Distress among Adult Children of Alcoholic Fathers in Pakistan. *Global Social Sciences Review*, VI(III), 150–158. [https://doi.org/10.31703/gssr.2021\(vi-iii\).16](https://doi.org/10.31703/gssr.2021(vi-iii).16)
- Sutrisno, A. P. and Komala, R. (2025) "Relationship between parenting styles and mental health in first-year university students", *Science Midwifery*, 13(5), 1421–1430. doi: 10.35335/midwifery.v13i5.2198
- Wang, J., Huang, X., Li, Z. et al. Effect of parenting style on the emotional and behavioral problems among Chinese adolescents: the mediating effect of resilience. *BMC Public Health* 24, 787 (2024). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-024-18167-9>
- Wang R, Liu M, Sun Y and Li Q (2024) Different impacts of parental psychological and behavioral control on the cultivation of advantageous strength in Chinese rural adolescent. *Front. Psychol.* 15:1349386. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1349386
- Wu, C. W., & Chen, W. W. (2021). Mediating role of regulatory focus in the relation between filial piety and youths' life satisfaction and psychological distress. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 24(4), 499-510.
- Yang, L., Li, Y., & Wang, W. (2024). The Relationship Between Childhood Emotional Abuse and Nonsuicidal Self-Injury Among Chinese College Students: The Mediating Role of Depression and the Moderating Effect of Reciprocal Filial Piety. *Psychology Research and Behavior Management*, 17, 4345–4354. <https://doi.org/10.2147/PRBM.S498812>
- Yeh, K.-H. and Bedford, O. (2003), A test of the Dual Filial Piety model. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 6: 215-228. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1467-839X.2003.00122.x>
- Yim, EP-Y. (2022) Effects of Asian cultural values on parenting style and young children's perceived competence: A cross-sectional study. *Front. Psychol.* 13:905093. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2022.905093
- Zhang, Y., Chen, B., Ding, Q., & Wei, H. (2024). The cost of "snubbing": the effect of parental phubbing on filial piety behavior in children and adolescents. *Front. Psychol.* 15:1296516. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1296516