



CULTURE AND FAMILY WELL-BEING: EXPLORING CROSS-CULTURAL SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES IN FAMILY WELL-BEING

Dissanayake, M

The Open University of Sri Lanka

Email: mpdis@ou.ac.lk

ABSTRACT

Wellbeing is multifaceted construct, which encompasses physical, social and mental health. Family can be defined as a group of individuals bound together by marriage, blood or adoption, living together in a single home and interacting with one another in their social roles typically those of spouses, parents, children and siblings. Family has the primary responsibility in child development providing them resources and the caregiving environment. Accordingly, family is the main force behind fostering the development and wellbeing of children and thus, it is important to consider the quality of the family environment in which children are raised. The quality of the family environment not only affect children's wellbeing and development but also well-being of other family members. Therefore, family wellbeing is important for children, parents and other members in the family setting. The main objective of this paper is to explore cross-cultural similarities and differences in family well-being. Additionally, it aims to examine the role of family functioning on family well-being and impact of negative experiences on children's well-being and development. This research was based on secondary sources gathered using the narrative review method and limited to scholarly work related to cross-cultural similarities and differences in family well-being, children's well-being and family functioning. The data was analyzed using thematic analysis. Findings suggest significant cross-cultural similarities and differences in family well-being and some factors like parenting that influence children's well-being. The strength and the quality of family relationships and the capacity of a family to support, care for and nurture one another appear to have an impact on family functioning and well-being. Certain negative experiences that affect family functioning and the quality of parenting also influence family well-being. Understanding cross-cultural similarities and differences in family well-being and associated factors may help individuals learn how to strengthen the quality of family well-being.

KEY WORDS: Gender Marginalization, Infertility

Introduction

The concept of well-being is complex and multifaceted construct, which encompasses physical, social and mental health (Dodge, Daly, Huyton, & Sanders, 2012). Well-being is recognized as a significant aspect of one's life, which affects their functioning. World Health Organization (1948) has also defined health as a state of complete physical, mental and social well-being of a person. Hence, a person's health and well-being encompass key dimensions of his or her life.

Family

Family can be defined as a group of individuals bound together by marriage, blood or adoption, living together in a single home and interacting with one another in their social roles typically those of spouses, parents, children and siblings (Burgess, 1963). The anthropologist George Murdock (1949) defined the family as a social group, which is characterized by shared residence, reproduction and economic cooperation. It comprises adults of both sexes, at least two of whom have a social accepted sexual relationship, one or more of the cohabiting adults' biological or adopted children (Murdock, 1949). Bronislaw Malinowski (1927), an anthropologist who studied tribal family systems around the world described a family as having a) boundaries, b) common residence, and c) mutual affection for one another within the family. Family is the smallest unit in society and children's social environment. As a part of society, family can be viewed as a significant social factor that impacts not only children but also every member in the family. It is evident that family dynamics and structures influence adults' behavioral outcomes (Oliveira et al., 2020). They may influence the relationship between parents and children, parenting, childrearing practices, and family well-being.

Family well-being

A family is considered to be in a state of well-being when its members are healthy, safe and have opportunities for economic and educational progress. The ability of a family to support, care for and nurture one another, and the strength and quality of family relationships are all linked to family functioning (Australian Institute of Health and Welfare, 2015). Additionally, good parenting techniques, spending time with and communicating with family members, parental employment, having a suitable place to live, financial security, having access to social services and support, being involved in the community are some factors that influence family functioning, which in turn leads to family well-being. The health and well-being of children can also flourish in families that are healthy, safe, and secure (HeadStart.gov., n.d.).

Culture

Culture can be described as the dynamic and multifaceted context of many aspects of one's life (Well, 2000). Also, culture can be defined as the shared, learnt, and transmitted

values, beliefs, customs, and ways of life of a particular person or group; it shapes individuals' thinking, decisions and actions in daily life (Leininger, & McFarland, 2006). Based on the way people define themselves in their cultural contexts — whether through their own decisions/choices and accomplishments or in relation to their membership in social groups—cultures are categorized as either individualistic or collectivist (Smith & Bond, 1994). Due to these differences, individuals in different cultural milieu may develop different perspectives on their well-being. Research has indicated that, when defining psychological well-being, people in these two cultural contexts place varying emphasis on different aspects of their lives. Individualistic cultures, for example, highlight the self-oriented aspect of well-being and, therefore, they tend to value self-acceptance, personal growth, and autonomy. Collectivist cultures, on the other hand, give more importance to the others-oriented aspect of well-being. Consequently, they focus more on maintaining positive relations with others than other aspects of mental well-being (Ryff, 1995).

Culture and Family Well-being

The socio-cultural context (e.g., cultural values, norms, expectations) in which individuals live seems to influence their lives. Children living in different socio-cultural environments may therefore perceive family dynamics, parenting practices and parent behaviors differently, leading to a range of psychological effects (Lerner & Kauffman, 1985; McKinney & Brown, 2017). Cultural beliefs and values have a significant impact on family well-being, different aspects of family life and the provision of social support and healthcare (Seyed Alitabar, 2023). Identifying cultural beliefs of families in depth helps individuals understand the impact of these beliefs on family well-being. Further, it facilitates health care professionals to select culturally-appropriate treatment for individuals (Seyed Alitabar, 2023). Previous studies have focused on investigating the interplay between cultural beliefs and family dynamics (e.g., Leung, 2017; Delvecchio et al., 2016). Particularly, they examined the influence of family cultural beliefs on various aspects such as a maternal sacrifices and adolescent psychological competence in Chinese poor single-mother families (Leung, 2017) and the relationships among self-perception of parental roles, cultural beliefs, and family functioning in Italian parents (Delvecchio et al., 2016). These research studies have revealed the complex relationship between cultural beliefs and family well-being. This suggests the importance of gaining a better understanding cultural influences on individuals' family life. Further, some theories such as Family Belief Systems Theory, highlights the significance of examining and focusing on family beliefs in order to enhance family well-being (Hohashi, 2019).

Objectives

The main objective of this paper is to explore cross-cultural similarities and differences in family well-being and associated factors. Particularly, it aims to examine the role of

family functioning on family well-being and the impact of family well-being on children's development and well-being. Further, it intends to explore the impact of negative experiences on children's well-being and development.

Methodology

This research used qualitative method and a narrative review approach. Databases such as Google Scholar, PubMed, ResearchGate, and other electronic databases were used as the primary sources of information. Literature pertaining to family well-being, family functioning, child well-being and development, and cultural variations in family well-being, parent-child relationships as well as parenting practices were incorporated into this review. In order to analyze the data and to identify the main themes relating to the main variables, the thematic analysis method was employed. The review integrated theoretical perspectives related to family well-being and child development, parenting, and parent-child relationship. In addition, it discussed family functioning and the influence of family well-being on child development. Further, cross-cultural similarities and differences were examined in relation to family well-being and parenting.

Results and Discussion

Family Well-being and Child Development: Theoretical Perspectives

Family Circumplex Model

According to the Family Circumplex Model, family systems, family structure and interactional styles have an impact on the development and psychological well-being of family members (Olson, 2000; Olson et al., 1979; Olson et al., 2019). In family research, the Family Circumplex Model is regarded as a foundational model that was developed in Western cultural contexts. This model includes two key components: cohesion and adaptability. Cohesion, the first component, is characterized by loyalty, mutual reliance among family members and the level of closeness between family members. There are two types of cohesion: disengaged (family members who spend most of their time together and heavily rely on one another), and enmeshed (family members who spend little to no time together or intentionally avoid one another). Adaptability, the second element, encompasses the leadership style (e.g., authoritarian leadership in rigid families), the types of discipline employed (e.g., inconsistent discipline in chaotic families), role change (e.g., roles in adaptable families change as children grow up), and the dynamics under external stress (e.g., structured families change when demanded).

In European contexts, the Family Circumplex Model has been successfully validated (e.g., Everri et al., 2020; Vegas et al., 2022). According to prior research on the Circumplex Model, children tend to have positive outcomes in families with high levels cohesion—strong bonds with some degree of autonomy—and adaptability—the capacity

to share leadership and responsibilities and change dynamics slightly under pressure (Gomes & Gouveia-Pereira, 2020; Kouneski, 2002). Additionally, it is believed that members of balanced family systems tend to have good communication (e.g., they actively listen to others and only speak for themselves), whereas members of unbalanced systems communicate poorly (e.g., they speak for others, disclose personal information inappropriately and do not actively listen) (Dunst, 2021; Kouneski, 2002).

The Family Circumplex Model may not always yield the optimal outcomes in all cultures or contexts since its foundation is based on Westernized values of individualism and autonomy (Kouneski, 2002; Pirutinsky & Kor, 2013). According to Pirutinsky and Kor (2013), in order for the Family Circumplex Model's assumptions to more accurately generalize to family functioning in non-westernized samples, they need to be modified in cross-cultural samples. Additionally, Olson (2000) proposed that family outcomes would change according to the level of satisfaction of each family member within the family dynamics.

Cultural Influence, Parenting & Parent-Child Relationships: Theoretical Perspectives

Ecological models of development

There are different family models that highlight distinct parenting styles as well as socialization processes. Three family models: the Family Model of Independence (which is more typical in urban/western societies), Family Model of Interdependence (which is more typical in rural/agrarian societies), and Family Model of Emotional Interdependence (which combines relatedness and autonomy), explain different socialization processes and parenting approaches (Kagitcibasi, 2007).

According to Ecological theories of development, parent-child relationships can be explained in nested contexts. Some are identified as more proximal social contexts like neighborhoods, and others as more distant contexts that include belief systems, norms, values and laws that define cultural contexts (e.g., Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 2006; Whiting & Whiting, 1975). Hence, cultural beliefs, values and norms can influence parents' as well as children's expectations and behaviors in their social interactions. Both parents and children tend to observe others' behaviors in their sociocultural environment. Consequently, they develop expectations about parent-child relationships and tend to reproduce culturally-specific patterns of behavior in their social interactions (Rogoff, 2003). Further, Cultural-ecological models emphasize the value of using developmental models that are based on researching different cultural groups in their own sociocultural milieu instead of focusing on understanding one group using models that were developed with a different group (Ogbu, 1995).

Additionally, the study of indigenous communities seems to be important in understanding parenting styles, particularly within specific cultural milieu (Lansford,

2022). For example, theocentric beliefs that are prevalent in Africa place greater value on cooperation for the benefits of everyone. Social integration of children in their social groups may help understand the reason for African parents to socialize their children in order to develop meaning and identity from their social groups rather than in themselves (Nsamenang & Lo-Oh, 2010). This suggests the impact of culturally-specific beliefs, values and expectations on parenting practices, parent-child relationships and social interactions in different socio-cultural settings.

Developmental Niche

Another paradigm that has been used to explain the influence of culturally-specific beliefs and childrearing practices, and physical as well as social characteristics of their environment on parent-child relationships is the “Developmental Niche” (Super & Harkness, 1986). Further, it appears that cultural scripts: structured sequences of behaviours, interactions and actions of a given cultural group, influence parent-child relationship by providing knowledge about desired socialization goals and the steps they may take to achieve them (Greenfield, 1994). Accordingly, these theoretical perspectives offer frameworks for understanding the influence of cultural contexts on parents’ beliefs, expectations, scripts and behaviors by providing opportunities for observational learning as well as affordances about what is feasible in a specific social environment (Lansford, 2022).

Form versus Function of Parenting

Additionally, understanding the form (parents’ particular thoughts and behaviors) versus function (the underlying meaning of the parents’ thoughts and behaviors) of parenting is viewed as an important paradigm for identifying cross-cultural similarities and variations in parenting (Bornstein, 2012). A parenting cognition or behavior is considered as culturally universal if it has the same form and function in different cultures. Nonetheless, a specific parenting cognition and behavior may also have different purposes or functions depending on the cultural context. Further, there can be cultural diversity in both form and function, since different parenting cognitions and behaviors may have different functions in different cultural settings (Lansford, 2022). For example, Japanese mothers tend to orient their infants to themselves in order to foster interdependence in mother-infant interactions. In contrast, mothers in the United States are more likely to orient their infants to objects in their environment, which encourage self-directed exploration (Bornstein et al., 2012).

Family functioning and Family Well-being

The ability of a family to support, care for and nurture one another as well as the strength and quality of family relationships are factors related to family functioning (Australian Institute of Health and Welfare, 2015). Additionally, it will contribute to family well-being and mental well-being of family members. The well-being and resilience of society

largely depend on quality of family functioning. The quality of family functioning is influenced by several factors including good parenting skills, spending time with and communicating with family members, parental employment, financial security, having a suitable place to live, access to social services and support, community involvement, family conflict and violence. Families that are better equipped to manage these demands have a better family functioning, which in turn promotes family well-being. Families dealing with difficulties in these areas tend to experience disruptions within families that affect young family members' well-being, behavior, and social repercussions as well as negative outcomes in later life (Olesen et al. 2010). Particularly, social and economic challenges that influence family functioning and families have detrimental effect on quality of parenting, which in turn affects children's well-being and development (Zubrick et al., 2008).

The Influence of Family Well-being on Child Development

Family plays a significant role in child development. Also, it is involved in children's well-being. Families are considered as a child's most significant environment influencing a child development (Garbarino 1992). Further, family relationships and interactions play a crucial role in children's development process (Bowes et al. 2009). The foundations for a child's development, health and well-being are laid during early years of children. Considering children's well-being, positive well-being serves as the basis for child development and future functioning (Layard, Clark, Cornaglia, Powdthavee, & Vernoit, 2014). According to prior research, quality of life happiness and life satisfaction are important aspects of overall well-being (Chase & Statham, 2010). It is crucial for children to develop and learn in supportive, caring and nurturing families as well as environments to enhance their healthy development (Australian Institute of Health and Welfare, 2015).

Family is viewed as a part of culture as well as society (Kagitcibasi, 2014). Hence, it can be considered as social determinant. Consequently, children's health, well-being and learning throughout their lifespan are greatly influenced by family along with factors such as parenting style, interpersonal relationships, learning environments, and maternal health (Maggi et al. 2010). Additionally, quality parenting, having access to social and family support, and family functioning significantly influence optimal health and well-being of children (Australian Institute of Health and Welfare, 2015).

Considering child development, early childhood is a crucial period, which is influenced by continuous interactions and relationships with their family (immediate environment) as well as community (wider social context) (Dunlop 2002). Particularly, early childhood experiences, relationships with parents as well as between parents have an impact on child's environment. Research has indicated that positive parent-child relationships, close friendships and coping mechanisms serve as the foundation for the protective factors (Sabolova, Birdsey, Stuart-Hamilton, & Cousins, 2020). Further, parents' involvement

plays a role in child development. It is evident that parents' involvement, particularly through accessibility (i.e., the amount of time a parent is available to the child) and engagement (i.e., the amount of time a parent spends directly engaging with the child in home learning activities like reading or playing) can have positive impact on children's development (Wise 2003).

Impact of Negative Experiences on Children's Well-Being

Previous studies have revealed that negative experiences in childhood such as family violence, child abuse and neglect, parental substance use, poverty, early mental health issues, and poor health and nutrition have a negative effect on children's cognitive and social development and have long-lasting effects on their health and welfare in adulthood (Heflin & Acevedo 2011; Felitti et al. 1998). Studies have revealed that domestic violence greatly influence children's personality, academic performance, their personal psychology (Shen & Xu, 2023), and internalizing and externalizing behavior problems (Moylan et al., 2010). Further, it was found that, once children begin school, developmental vulnerabilities become apparent and they are linked to lower academic performance, psychological problems, a higher risk of adolescent pregnancy, poorer job outcomes and legal issues (Australian Institute of Health and Welfare, 2015).

Additionally, prior research has revealed that children who have faced negative experiences in their early years in life tend to experience developmental, health, learning and behavioral issues compared to other children. It is evident that these issues may influence their lives throughout the lifespan, which may affect their ability to fully engage in society, leading to a reduction in labor force participation, resulting in increased disparity in social status and social opportunity, as well as ingrained intergenerational hindrance (National Scientific Council on the Developing Child 2005/2014).

Factors such as social and economic conditions that influence the family as well as family functioning have an impact on quality of parenting, which in turn affects child development. A longitudinal study conducted with Australian children has revealed significant evidence for the influence of family conditions, stress, family relationships and support on parenting practices across infant and child cohorts (Zubrick et al., 2008). Accordingly, there is a significant relationship between higher parenting hostility (e.g., being angry, raising one's voice and losing one's temper with their child) and higher levels of psychological distress in the caregiver—mostly the mother. Further, it has revealed that perceived lack of reciprocal support for parenting as well as lack of relationship satisfaction reported by secondary care givers (fathers) was significantly related to decreased parental warmth. More importantly, it has found that parenting practices such as consistency, warmth and hostility influence child development.

Cross-Cultural Similarities in Family Well-being

A study with children from White British origin, Pakistani, Bangladeshi and Indian ethnic backgrounds has indicated that children believed that their relationship with parents as the main factor that contribute to their well-being (McAuley, 2019). These relationships were strengthened by love, affection, reinforcement, unwavering support, and protection providing children a sense of trust and security. In this study, the second most commonly stated aspect of well-being was having positive relationships with their friends. More importantly, children have recognized the value of grandparents within family, especially the support, love and affection they offered. This suggest that not only the relationship between parents and children, but the role of grandparents are vital in children's development. The most significant finding is that, irrespective of the size of the family or the ethnic and sociocultural backgrounds of the children, strong relationships—especially with parents and grandparents—as well as friendships were found to be crucial for children's well-being (McAuley, 2019). These findings provide evidence for the influence of family on children's well-being, suggesting that the support of family plays a role in children's daily functioning across all sociocultural contexts worldwide (Sabolova, Birdsey, Stuart-Hamilton, & Cousins, 2020).

Cross-Cultural Differences in Family Well-being

Theorists such as Erik Erikson (Theory of Psychosocial Development) and Lev Vygotsky (Sociocultural Theory) emphasized the profound effect of culture on child development. The sociocultural context in which the child develops influences their socioemotional, cognitive and personality development. In fact, each culture may have unique expectations and practices for parenting as well as childrearing. Furthermore, cultural variations may influence the way individuals perceive their well-being. The meaning and individuals' perceptions of well-being may vary from one culture to another based on their cultural values, different parental perspectives, economic backgrounds that are embedded within the sociocultural context of the child (Bradshaw & Rees, 2017; Bronfenbrenner, 1994).

Culture can be defied as the values, customs, beliefs and behaviors of a specific social group. In addition, nationality, ethnicity, religion, region and other social groups are also be considered as important aspects of culture. As a result, individuals tend to have different cultural identities based on how they identify themselves with these social groups (Lansford, 2022).

Cultures are categorized as collectivist and individualistic based on the way people perceive themselves within their sociocultural milieu. The basis for the conceptualization of individualism and collectivism is the way people define themselves, whether in connection to their memberships in social groups or through their own personal traits and achievements (Smith & Bond, 1994). For example, people in collectivist cultures tend to highlight the interdependent self and the importance of their connectedness with others in

society. These cultures encourage their members to maintain social relationships with others in their social environment (Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Matsumoto & Juang, 2004). In contrast, people in individualistic cultures tend to value the independent self (Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Redford, 1999). Therefore, they tend to perceive them as unique individuals, explore their inner selves, achieve their life goals, and develop into self-expressed, distinctive individuals (Matsumoto & Juang, 2004).

The family plays a significant role in the process of human development. It appears that the spectrum of individualistic and collectivist values may influence how people perceive themselves within their family setting. Hence, individualism and collectivism should be taken into consideration in understanding human development as well as family well-being (Moussa Rogers et al., 2024). Accordingly, since collectivism emphasizes social values and prioritizes group goals over personal needs (Schwartz et al., 2012), collectivist cultures may place greater value on family cohesion and less value individualistic traits and autonomy. In fact, in these cultures, filial piety and more rigid family dynamics may foster better life outcomes (Chen, 2014). There can be variations even in individualistic cultures in terms of individualism and collectivism. For example, in some regions in the United States, values and beliefs of authoritarianism and conservatism may encourage respect for elders in family (McKinney & Brown, 2017). This suggests that these cultural values and beliefs may be crucial in understanding the family system and possible consequences for children in these family settings.

Prior research has provided evidence for cultural variations in family systems and their outcomes. For example, Turkey is known for its collectivistic and relational culture (Kağıtçıbaşı, 2007). A study with Turkish school children has revealed that parental overprotection and guilt induction are positively correlated with perceived parental warmth in these school children (Sümer & Kağıtçıbaşı, 2010). Furthermore, it appears that emerging adult children may be satisfied with lessor or higher frequency of supporting behaviors. Hence, children's reported level of cohesion may be influenced by the kind and extent of parental support they receive (Furman & Buhrmester, 1992). Also, the concept of cohesion may vary depending on cultural norms and values, and how they influence children's perceptions of parents' actions. Some have highlighted the importance of renorming of cohesion, particularly when evaluating the validity of the model (Olson et al., 2019). Furthermore, prior research has indicated that families with different cultural backgrounds and who experience special situations in life (e.g., receiving cancer diagnosis) may be cohesive, however it needs intervention (Yi, 2009).

Cross-Cultural Similarities in Parenting

Certain parenting styles seem to be universal. It is clear that the survival of an infant depends on physical caregiving of parents including feeding them and protecting them from environmental threats, that are essential to their survival. Parenting behaviors should therefore be comparable across cultures to the extent that they support in the

survival of newborns. Similarly, considering the other important aspects of child development, it seems that infants and children rely on their parents for emotional stability and cognitive stimulation. Accordingly, parenting practices such as being contingently responsive to their vocalizations, which stimulates the brain and helps in children's language acquisition, and being responsive to other important aspects that allow infants to develop secure and trustworthy relationships with their parents seem to be similar across cultural boundaries (Lansford, 2022). Previous research has also revealed that children have a universal need for love and acceptance, which is regarded as a basic psychological need, and that can be fulfilled by warm, affectionate and secure attachment that they develop with their parents (Rohner & Lansford, 2017). Accordingly, it is evident that there are cross-cultural similarities in terms of fulfilling this universal psychological need of infants and the parenting practices that help satisfying it.

Cross-Cultural Differences in Parenting

Research suggests cultural variations in parenting. Particularly, some researchers have indicated that differences in parenting within cultures are greater than those between cultures (Deater-Deckard et al., 2018). Factors such as child or parent gender, child or parent age, rural or urban residency, and socioeconomic status (SES) can influence within-culture variances in parenting. In countries with less egalitarian gender roles, mother's and father's parenting styles or the parenting of girls or boys may differ substantially (Lansford, 2022).

It is important to note that globalization, social media, urbanization and technology advancement have influenced certain aspects of culture over time (Lansford et al., 2021). As a result, when comparing the past and present, cultural variations in parenting may have changed. For example, in many countries, parents' support and use of corporal punishment by parents has decreased over time, in part because of laws that, as of August, 2021, prohibited it in 63 countries (Global Initiative to End All Corporal Punishment of Children, 2021).

Various factors may contribute to cultural variations in parenting. Particularly, cultural norms regarding the expected parental behaviours (e.g., Lansford et al., 2018) and the role of siblings as well as extended family in relation to child care (e.g., Kramer & Hamilton, 2019) can vary across cultures. Qualitative and ethnographic methods that were used to examine parenting, particularly in the field of anthropology, have identified these cultural differences. Particularly, culturally-specific patterns of parenting styles and the belief systems that underpin a wide range of childrearing practices have been recognized by anthropologists (Gottlieb & DeLoache, 2017). Their findings suggest that cultural values significantly impact on these belief systems as well as parenting. A recent study with two cultural groups (European American and Taiwanese families) has also revealed that mother-child conversations are used to impart cultural values in their children in daily interactions (Li & Fung, 2020). Additionally, there can be some other

factors (e.g., environmental factors) that may influence cultural variations in parenting. Research has identified that the affordances and limitations in physical environment may also influence parents' behaviours. Yoruba parents in Nigeria, for example, tend to socialize their children's behaviours related to food, in response to the variations in food supply caused by rainy and dry seasons (Babatunde & Setiloane, 2014). This suggests that parents in some cultures tend to socialize their children's behaviour based on the constraints in their physical environments.

There can be within-culture differences in parenting. Some have found that within-culture variations in parenting are greater than between-culture differences (Deater-Deckard et al., 2018). Factors such as socioeconomic status, parent or child gender, living area (e.g., urban, sub-urban, or rural), and parent or child age may contribute to within-culture differences in parenting and that may directly or indirectly influence family well-being. Social security that parents experience with their socioeconomic status may reduce the level of stress that they endure and the harsh parenting that can result from stress (e.g., Kotchick et al., 2021). It may influence their parenting practices, which in turn may have an impact on family well-being. Considering the influence of parent or child gender on parenting practices, research has revealed that, in countries where gender roles are less egalitarian, parenting styles of mothers and fathers, or of girls and boys may be more noticeable (Lansford, 2022).

Conclusion

This paper highlights the profound influence of culture on family well-being, with a particular emphasis on identifying cross-cultural similarities and differences with regard to family well-being. Family is considered as a crucial component of culture and society, which greatly impact on child development and well-being. Previous studies have demonstrated that the strength and quality of family functioning significantly influence family well-being, which in turn contributes to children's development and well-being. Certain negative experiences within family affect not only family functioning and well-being but children's development and well-being. Regardless cultural boundaries, parent-child relationships and the role of grandparents are crucial in providing children love, affection, and psychological support, indicating shared parenting practices and family well-being cross-cultures. Globalization, social media, urbanization and technological advancement and certain culturally specific patterns of parenting styles and the belief systems that underlie a wide range of childrearing practices have caused cross-cultural differences in parenting and family well-being, even though there are many similarities in family well-being exist across cultures. The diversity in cultural values, beliefs, and practices in relation to family functioning, parent-child relationship, parenting styles, family dynamics and family well-being highlights the importance of understanding cultural differences as well as those within a given culture. This may help interpret the impact of cultural factors on family well-being in a particular cultural context. Future

research that measures these factors that capture the distinctive features of culture will allow researchers to move beyond cross-cultural comparison and identify specific cultural factors that contribute to strengthen the quality of family well-being.

References

- Australian Institute of Health and Welfare. (2015). *Australia's welfare 2015*. 12(AUS 189). AIHW.
- Babatunde, E. D., & Setiloane, K. (2014). Changing patterns of Yoruba parenting in Nigeria. In H. Selin (Ed.), *Parenting across cultures: Childrearing, motherhood and fatherhood in non-western cultures* (pp. 241–252). Springer. 10.1007/978-94-007-7503-9_18
- Bornstein, M. H. (2012). Cultural approaches to parenting. *Parenting: Science and Practice*, 12 (2–3), 212–221. 10.1080/15295192.2012.683359
- Bornstein, M. H., Cote, L. R., Haynes, O. M., Suwalsky, J. T. D., & Bakeman, R. (2012). Modalities of infant-mother interaction in Japanese, Japanese American immigrant, and European American dyads. *Child Development*, 83, 2073–2088. 10.1111/j.1467-8624.2012.01822.x [PubMed: 22860874]
- Bowes, J., Watson, J., & Pearson, E. (2009). Families as a context for children. In J. Bowes & R. Grace (Eds.), *Children, families and communities: contexts and consequences* (pp. 91–110). Oxford University Press.
- Bradshaw, J., & Rees, G. (2017). Exploring national variations in child subjective well-being. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 80, 3-14. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2017.06.059>
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1994). Ecological models of human development. In International Encyclopedia of Education (Vol. 3, 2nd ed.). Elsevier.
- Bronfenbrenner, U., & Morris, P. A. (2006). The bioecological model of human development. In R. M. Lerner & W. Damon (Eds.), *Handbook of child psychology: Theoretical models of human development* (pp. 793–828). Wiley. 10.1002/9780470147658.chpsy0114
- Burgess, E. W. (1963). *The family: From institution to companionship* (3rd ed.). American Book Company.
- Chase, E., Statham, & J. (2010). *Childhood Wellbeing: A Brief Overview*. London Childhood Wellbeing Research Centre.

Chen, W. W. (2014). The relationship between perceived parenting style, filial piety, and life satisfaction in Hong Kong. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 28(3), 308–314.

<https://doi.org/10.1037/a0036819>

Choudhry, F. R., Park, M. S., Golden, K. J., & Bokharey, I. Z. (2017). “We Are the Soul, Pearl and Beauty of Hindu Kush Mountains”: Exploring Resilience and Psychological Wellbeing of Kalasha, an Ethnic and Religious Minority Group in Pakistan. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies on Health and Well-Being*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17482631.2016.1267344>

Deater-Deckard, K., Godwin, J., Lansford, J. E., Bacchini, D., Bombi, A. S., Bornstein, M. H., Chang, L., Di Giunta, L., Dodge, K. A., Malone, P. S., Oburu, P., Pastorelli, C., Skinner, A. T., Sorbring, E., Steinberg, L., Tapanya, S., Alampay, L. P., Uribe Tirado, L. M., Zelli, A., & Al-Hassan, S. M. (2018). Within- and between-person and group variance in behavior and beliefs in cross-cultural longitudinal data. *Journal of Adolescence*, 62, 207–217. 10.1016/j.adolescence.2017.06.002 [PubMed: 28662856]

Delvecchio, E., Riso, D. D., & Salcuni, S. (2016). Self-Perception of Parental Role, Family Functioning, and Familistic Beliefs in Italian Parents: Early Evidence. *Frontiers in psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2015.01983>

Dodge, R., Daly, A., Huyton, J., & Sanders, L. (2012). The challenge of defining wellbeing. *International Journal of Wellbeing*, 2(3), 222-235. doi:10.5502/ijw.v2i3.4

Dunlop, A. W. (2002). Perspectives on children as learners in the transition to school. In H. Fabian & A. Dunlop (Eds.). *Transitions in the early years: Debating continuity and progression for young children*. Routledge Falmer.

Dunst, C. J. (2021). Family strengths, the circumplex model of family systems, and personal and family functioning: A meta-analysis of the relationships among study measures.

Journal of Behavior, Health & Social Issues, 13(2), 1–16. <http://dx.doi.org/10.22201/fesi.20070780e.2021.13.2.77837>

Everri, M., Caricati, L., Mancini, T., Messina, M., & Fruggeri, L. (2020). Italian validation of family adaptability and cohesion scale (FACES IV) short version for adolescents:

SAD_FACES. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 29, 2507–2514.

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-020-01771-9>

Felitti, V. J., Anda, R. F., Nordenberg, D., Williamson, D. F., Spitz, A. M., Edwards, V., Koss, M. P., & Marks, J. S. (1998). Relationship of childhood abuse and household

dysfunction to many of the leading causes of death in adults. The Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACE) Study. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 14(4), 245–258. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0749-3797\(98\)00017-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0749-3797(98)00017-8)

Furman, W., & Buhrmester, D. (1992). Age and sex differences in perceptions of networks of personal relationships. *Child Development*, 63(1), 103–115.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.1992.tb03599.x>

Global Initiative to End All Corporal Punishment of Children. (2021). Countdown to universal prohibition. Available <https://endcorporalpunishment.org/countdown/>

Gomes, H. S., & Gouveia-Pereira, M. (2020). Testing the General Theory of Crime with the Circumplex Model: Curvilinear relations between family functioning and self-control. *Deviant Behavior*, 41(6), 779–791. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01639625.2019.1596449>

Gorall, D. M., & Olson, D. H. (1995). Circumplex model of family systems: Integrating ethnic diversity and other social systems. In R. H. Mikesell, D.-D. Lusteran, & S. H. McDaniel (Eds.), *Integrating family therapy: Handbook of family psychology and systems theory* (pp. 217–233). American Psychological Association. <https://doi.org/10.1037/10172-012>

Greenfield, P. M. (1994). Independence and interdependence as developmental scripts: Implications for theory, research, and practice. In P. M. Greenfield & R. R. Cocking (Eds.), *Cross-cultural roots of minority child development* (pp. 1–37). Lawrence Erlbaum.

Gottlieb A, & DeLoache J (2017). *A world of babies: Imagined childcare guides for eight societies*. Cambridge University Press.

HeadStart.gov (n.d.) *Family Support and Well-being* Retrieved May 28, 2025, from <https://headstart.gov/family-support-well-being>

Heflin, C. M. & Acevedo, S. K. (2011). Non-income effects of welfare receipt on early childhood cognitive score. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 33(5), 634–643.

Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç. (2007). *Family, self, and human development across cultures: Theory and applications* (2nd ed.) Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203937068>

Kagitcibasi, C. (2014). Family and Child Well-Being. In A. Ben-Arieh, F. Casas, I. Frønes, J. Korbin (Eds.), *Handbook of Child Well-Being*. Springer, Dordrecht. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-90-481-9063-8_50

Kotchick, B. A., Whitsett, D., & Sherman, M. F. (2021). Food insecurity and adolescent psychosocial adjustment: Indirect pathways through caregiver adjustment and caregiver–adolescent relationship quality. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 50, 89–102. 10.1007/s10964-020-01322-x [PubMed: 32980969]

Kouneski, E. (2002). *Circumplex model and FACES: Review of literature*. University of Minnesota.

Kramer, L., & Hamilton, T. N. (2019). Sibling caregiving. In Bornstein MH (Ed.), *Handbook of parenting* (3rd ed., Vol. 3, pp. 372–408). Taylor and Francis. 10.4324/9780429433214-11

Hohashi, N. (2019). A family belief systems theory for transcultural family health care nursing. *Journal of Transcultural Nursing: official journal of the Transcultural Nursing Society*, 30(5), 434–443. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1043659619853017>

Lansford, J. E. (2022). Annual research review: Cross-cultural similarities and differences in parenting. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 63(4), 466–479. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcpp.13539>

Lansford, J. E., Badahdah, A. M., & Ben Brik, A. (2021). Families in the Gulf region. In J. E. Lansford, A. Ben Brik, & A. M. Badahdah, (Eds.), *Families and social change in the Gulf region* (pp. 1–16). Routledge. 10.4324/9781003037996-1

Lansford, J. E., Godwin, J., Zelli, A., Al-Hassan, S. M., Bacchini, D., Bombi, A. S., Bornstein, M. H., Chang, L., Chen, B. B., Deater-Deckard, K., Di Giunta, L., Dodge, K. A., Malone, P. S., Oburu, P., Pastorelli, C., Skinner, A. T., Sorbring, E., Steinberg, L., Tapanya, S., Alampay, L. P., & Uribe Tirado, L. M. (2018). Longitudinal associations between parenting and youth adjustment in twelve cultural groups: Cultural normativeness of parenting as a moderator. *Developmental Psychology*, 54, 362–377. 10.1037/dev0000416

Layard, R., Clark, A. E., Cornaglia, F., Powdthavee, N., & Vernoit, J. (2014). What predicts a successful life? A life-course model of well-being. *Economic journal (London, England)*, 124(580), F720–F738. <https://doi.org/10.1111/econj.12170>

Leininger, M. M., & McFarland, M. R. (2006). *Culture Care Diversity and Universality: A Worldwide Nursing Theory* (2nd ed.), Jones and Bartlett.

Lerner, R. M., & Kauffman, M. B. (1985). The concept of development in contextualism. *Developmental Review*, 5(4), 309–333. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0273-2297\(85\)90016-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0273-2297(85)90016-4)

Leung, J. T. Y. (2017). Cultural family beliefs, maternal sacrifice, and adolescent psychological competence in Chinese poor single-mother families. *Social Development*, 26(4), 767–782. <https://doi.org/10.1111/sode.12239>

Li J, & Fung H (2020). Culture at work: European American and Taiwanese parental socialization of children's learning. *Applied Developmental Science*, 25, 26–37. [10.1080/10888691.2020.1789351](https://doi.org/10.1080/10888691.2020.1789351)

Maggi, S., Irwin, L. J., Siddiqi, A., & Hertzman, C. (2010). The social determinants of early child development: an overview. *Journal of Paediatrics and Child Health*, 46(11), 627–635. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1440-1754.2010.01817.x>

Malinowski, B. (1927). Sex and reproduction in savage society. Commentator.

Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion and motivation. *Psychological Review*, 98, 224–53. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.98.2.224>

Matsumoto, D., & Juang, L. (2004). *Culture and psychology*. (3rd ed.). Wadsworth.

McAuley, C. (2019). Exploring eleven year old children's understanding of well-being using well-being maps: Commonalities and divergences across areas of varying levels of deprivation and ethnic diversity in an English Qualitative Study. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 97, 22–29, ISSN 0190-7409, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chilyouth.2018.09.015>.

McKinney, C., & Brown, K. R. (2017). Parenting and emerging adult internalizing problems: Regional differences suggest southern parenting factor. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 26(11), 3156–3166. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-017-0749-x>

Moussa Rogers, M., Cuccolo, K., McKinney, C., Edlund, J. E., Grahe, J. E., Zlokovich, M. S., Bauer, L. M., El-Kour, T., Hässler, B., Jia, F., Norvilitis, J., Shane-Simpson, C., Yockey, R. A., Cramblet Alvarez, L. D., Eisner, L., Rhys Evans, T., Farahani, H., Haden, S., Hawkins, G., Kawabata, Y., Stoppa, T., ... Kalibatseva, Z. (2024). Understanding family dynamics in a cross-cultural sample: A multi-national study. *Psi Chi Journal of Psychological Research*, 29(2), 140–149. <https://doi.org/10.24839/2325-7342.JN29.2.140>

Moylan, C. A., Herrenkohl, T. I., Sousa, C., Tajima, E. A., Herrenkohl, R. C., & Russo, M. J. (2010). The Effects of Child Abuse and Exposure to Domestic Violence on

Adolescent Internalizing and Externalizing Behavior Problems. *Journal of family violence*, 25(1), 53–63. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10896-009-9269-9>

Murdock, G. P. (1949). *Social structure*. Macmillan.

National Scientific Council on the Developing Child 2005/2014. Excessive stress disrupts the architecture of the developing brain: working paper 3. Updated edition. Retrieved April 27, 2025 from <http://www.developingchild.harvard.edu>.

Nsamenang, A. B., & Lo-Oh, J. L. (2010). Afrique Noire. In M. H. Bornstein (Ed.), *Handbook of cultural developmental science* (pp. 383–407). Routledge.

Ogbu, J. U. (1995). Origins of human competence: A cultural-ecological perspective. In N. R. Goldberger & J. B. Veroff (Ed.), *The culture and psychology reader* (pp. 245–275). New York University Press.

Olesen, S. C., Macdonald, E., Raphael, B., & Butterworth, P. (2010). Children's exposure to parental and familial adversities: findings from a population survey of Australians. *Family Matters*, 84, 43–52.

Oliveira, C., Fonseca, G., Sotero, L., Crespo, C., & Relvas, A. P. (2020). Family dynamics during emerging adulthood: Reviewing, integrating, and challenging the field. *Journal of Family Theory & Review*, 12(3), 350–367. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jftr.12386>

Olson, D. H. (2000). Circumplex model of marital and family systems. *Journal of Family Therapy*, 22(2), 144–167. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-6427.00144>

Olson, D. H., Sprenkle, D. H., & Russell, C. S. (1979). Circumplex model of marital and family systems: I. Cohesion and adaptability dimensions, family types, and clinical applications. *Family Process*, 18(1), 3–28. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1545-5300.1979.00003.x>

Olson, D. H., Waldvogel, L., & Schlieff, M. (2019). Circumplex model of marital and family systems: An update. *Journal of Family Theory & Review*, 11(2), 199–211. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jftr.12331>

Pirutinsky, S., & Kor, A. (2013). Relevance of the circumplex model to family functioning among Orthodox Jews in Israel. *The New School Psychology Bulletin*, 10(2), 25–38. <https://nspb.net/index.php/nspb/article/view/200>

Redford, P. (1999). Self-construal and anger action tendencies in Hong Kong and the United Kingdom. In, *Merging Past, Present, and Future in Cross-Cultural Psychology* (W.J. Lonner, D. L. Dinnel, D. K. Forgays, and S.A.Hayes, eds.). Garland Science. pp. 367-386.

Rogoff, B. (2003). *The cultural nature of human development*. Oxford University Press.

Ryff, C. D. (1995). Psychological well-being in adult life. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 4(4), 99-104. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8721.ep10772395>

Rohner, R. P., & Lansford, J. E. (2017). Deep structure of the human affectional system: Introduction to interpersonal acceptance–rejection theory. *Journal of Family Theory & Review*, 9(4), 426–440. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jftr.12219>

Sabolova, K., Birdsey, N., Stuart-Hamilton, I., & Cousins, A. L. (2020). A cross-cultural exploration of children's perceptions of wellbeing: Understanding protective and risk factors, *Children and Youth Services Review*, 110, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2020.104771>.

Schwartz, S. H., Cieciuch, J., Vecchione, M., Davidov, E., Fischer, R., Beieilein, C., Ramos, A.,

Verkasalo, M., Lönnqvist, J., Demirutku, K., Dirilen-Gumus, O., & Konty, M. (2012). Redefining the theory of basic individual values. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 103(4), 663–688. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0029393>

Shen, Z., & Xu, Y. (2023). The impact of domestic violence on children's psychology and self-recognition. *SHS Web of Conferences*, 180, <https://doi.org/10.1051/shsconf/202318002031>

Seyed Alitabar, S.H. (2023). Cultural Beliefs and Family Well-being: A Narrative Review. *Journal of Psychosociological Research in Family and Culture*, 1(2), 25-32. <https://doi.org/10.61838/kman.jprfc.1.2.4>

Smith, P. B., & Bond, M. H. (1994). *Social Psychology Across Cultures: Analysis and Perspectives*. Massachusetts: Allyn and Bacon.

Sümer, N., & Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç. (2010). Culturally relevant parenting predictors of attachment security: Perspectives from Turkey. In P. Erdman & N. Kok-Mun (Eds.), *Attachment: Expanding the cultural connections* (pp. 157–179). Routledge.

Super, C. M., & Harkness, S. (1986). The developmental niche: A conceptualization at the interface of child and culture. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 9, 545–569. [10.1177/016502548600900409](https://doi.org/10.1177/016502548600900409)

Vegas, M. I., Mateos-Agut, M., Pineda-Otaola, P. J., & Sebastián-Vega, C. (2022). Psychometric properties of the FACES IV package for Spanish adolescents. *Psicologia: Reflexão e Crítica*, 35. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41155-022-00222-2>

Wise, S. (2003). Family structure, child outcomes and environment mediators. AIFS.

Whiting, J. W. M., & Whiting, B. (1975). Children of six cultures: A psycho-cultural analysis. Harvard University Press.

World Health Organization (1948). *Summary Reports on Proceedings Minutes and Final Acts of the International Health Conference held in New York from 19 June to 22 July 1946*. World Health Organization, available from: <https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/85573>

Yi, J. (2009). Cultural influences on the survivorship of families affected by childhood cancer: A case for using family systems theories. *Families, Systems & Health: The Journal of Collaborative Family Healthcare*, 27(3), 228–236. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0017150>

Zubrick, S., Smith, G., Nicholson, J., Sanson, A., & Jackiewicz, T. (2008). *Parenting and families in Australia*. FaHCSIA Social policy research paper. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1703269