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This multimethod study examined associations between observed and parent- and child-reported intrusive parenting, parent and child cultural orientations, and children’s adjustment in a socioeconomically diverse sample of Chinese American immigrant families. Participants were 239 Chinese American school-age children ($M_{age} = 9.19$ years and range = 7.49–10.96 years) and their parents from first- and second-generation immigrant families. Parents and children reported on parents’ intrusive parenting and their own cultural orientations, and parents and teachers reported on children’s internalizing and externalizing problems. Observed intrusive parenting behaviors were coded from videotaped parent-child conflict discussions. Findings from path analysis indicated that there was a unique positive association between child Chinese orientation and child-reported intrusive parenting, a unique negative association between parents’ American orientation and child-reported intrusive parenting, and a unique positive association between child American orientation and observed intrusive parenting. Intrusive parenting was negatively associated with child adjustment, but associations varied depending on measurement. Findings suggest that different measures of intrusive parenting are differentially associated with children’s adjustment in Chinese American immigrant families.

What is the public significance of this article?

The present study examines intrusive parenting in Chinese American families using self-report measures and observational approaches, and the findings suggest that different measures of intrusive parenting are differentially associated with children’s adjustment. This study highlights the importance of using a multimethod and multi-reporter approach in understanding the associations between parenting behaviors and child outcomes.
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Following Amy Chua’s (2011) controversial memoir on tiger mothers, parenting behaviors of Asian American families continue to receive a great deal of attention in the parenting literature. In recent years, researchers have focused on identifying the specific parental behaviors (e.g., intrusive parenting) that are associated with tiger parenting (see Juang, Qin, & Park, 2013, for a review). However, there remain gaps in our understanding of intrusive parenting in Asian American families. Particularly, researchers have largely focused on (a) comparing between Asian American and European American families, with limited studies focusing on within-group variability, and (b) the educational achievement as an outcome of interest and the development period of adolescence, with fewer studies examining the psychosocial well-being of children (Juang et al., 2013). Using a multimethod and multi-reporter approach, the present study examined links between parent and child cultural orientations (American and Chinese orientations), intrusive parenting (observed, parent, and child report), and children’s adjustment (parent- and teacher-reported internalizing and externalizing problems) in a sample of first- and second-generation Chinese American children and their parents from immigrant families.
Intrusive Parenting in Chinese American Immigrant Families: Cultural Considerations

Culture shapes the way parents and parenting concepts are constructed, which may in turn affect parenting behaviors (Bornstein, 2012). Similarly, culture can shape children’s perceptions of parenting behaviors. Hence, the definition and meaning of intrusive parenting behaviors is largely dependent on culture (Kağıtcıbar, 2007). As such, immigrant families provide a unique context for studying associations between intrusive parenting and children’s adjustment because children and parents often experience challenges when navigating between the demands of their heritage and host cultures. Specifically, immigrant families are exposed to new cultural values surrounding parenting practices to which they may feel pressure to acculturate (i.e., adapt to the host culture), but they may also feel compelled to maintain parenting practices of their heritage culture (Tsai & Chentsova-Dutton, 2002).

The associations between intrusive parenting and child adjustment in non-Western cultural contexts remain poorly understood. On the one hand, scholars have proposed that concepts such as “authoritarian” and “controlling” parenting may have different implications for Chinese families compared with Western families (Chao, 1994), and that Baumrind’s authoritative parenting model may not represent the optimal parenting style in collectivistic cultures (Chao & Tseng, 2002). Studies have shown that native Chinese parents reported higher authoritarian parenting compared with Chinese American parents (Chen, Sun, & Yu, 2017), and Asian American families endorsed more authoritative parenting than European American families (Pong, Hao, & Gardner, 2005). On the other hand, researchers found that despite cultural differences in the frequency of different parenting practices, authoritative parenting, and not authoritarian parenting, is associated with optimal developmental outcomes in Chinese and Chinese American children. Specifically, in a sample of urban Chinese families, adolescents of authoritative mothers exhibited the best overall adjustment, whereas adolescents of authoritarian mothers showed the worst adjustment (Zhang, Wei, Ji, Chen, & Deater-Deckard, 2017). Similarly, within Asian American families, harsh parenting is associated with adolescents’ poorer psychological functioning (Kim, Wang, Orozco-Lapray, Shen, & Murtuza, 2013; Nguyen, 2008). Taken together, these studies suggest that despite the cultural difference in prevalence of intrusive parenting, its detrimental effects on children’s adjustment are similar across cultures.

Typically, Chinese American parents have been portrayed as more authoritative in their parenting (Steinberg, Lamborn, Dornbusch, & Darling, 1992) and endorse higher levels of controlling parenting practices when compared with other ethnic groups (Luk, King, McCarty, Stoep, & McCauley, 2016). However, less is known about factors that may be associated with within-group differences in intrusive parenting among Chinese immigrant families. Previous studies suggested that parents’ cultural orientations may play a role because parenting values may influence parenting behaviors (Friedlmeier, Corapci, & Cole, 2011) and cultural values can vary considerably within immigrant populations (Phinney, Ong, & Madden, 2000). Indeed, higher levels of acculturation have been linked to lower levels of inconsistent and harsh discipline in Chinese immigrant parents (Liu, Lau, Chen, Dinh, & Kim, 2009). Moreover, higher acculturation has been associated with Chinese American mothers’ better psychological well-being, which in turn predicted higher levels of authoritative parenting and lower levels of authoritarian parenting (Yu, Cheah, & Calvin, 2016). Collectively, these studies support the links between parents’ cultural orientations and parenting behaviors.

In comparison with literature on parental cultural orientations and its associations with parenting and child adjustment, less is known about children’s cultural orientations and their associations with parenting and child adjustment. A notable exception would be a study conducted by Chen et al. (2014), in which they found that parent-reported children’s American orientations were associated with better psychological adjustment and this association was mediated by parents’ higher use of authoritative parenting. However, most of the aforementioned research has relied only on parent and child report of parenting behaviors and child adjustment. It remains unclear whether parents’ actual display of intrusive behaviors in parent–child interactions is associated with children’s adjustment in Chinese American immigrant families. Thus, the present study uses a multimethod approach, including child and parent report as well as observational measures, to provide a complete picture of intrusive parenting in Chinese American families. Finally, most studies examining intrusive parenting have focused on adolescents. The present study examines children in late childhood, a period in which children are beginning to engage in more autonomy seeking (Freitag, Belsky, Grossmann, Grossmann, & Scheuerer-Englisch, 1996). Studying the links between intrusive parenting and adjustment in late childhood has important implications for preventive interventions that protect against maladaptive conflict and later adjustment problems.

The Present Study

The present study examined the relations of cultural orientations to multiple measures of intrusive parenting in first- and second-generation Chinese American immigrant parents and their children. Specifically, we examined the concurrent associations between parents’ and children’s cultural orientations to American and Chinese culture with observed and parent- and child-reported intrusive parenting. We hypothesized that parents’ and children’s Chinese orientation would be associated with higher levels of
intrusive parenting, whereas American orientation would be associated with lower levels of intrusive parenting. Second, we examined the relations of intrusive parenting to children’s adjustment (parent- and teacher-reported internalizing and externalizing problems). We hypothesized that higher levels of intrusive parenting would be associated with higher child maladjustment (higher internalizing and externalizing problems). Although cross-sectional data are not ideal for testing mediation, we further tested whether intrusive parenting mediated the link between cultural orientations and child adjustment. Finally, based on the well-established links of socioeconomic status (SES) to parenting and child outcomes (Bradley & Corwyn, 2002), family SES was included as a covariate along with parent’s gender, parent’s preferred language, child age, and child’s gender.

Method

Participants

Participants were 239 Chinese American children (48.1% female, $M_{age} = 9.19$ years, $SD = 0.73$, range = 7.49–10.96 years), their parents (81.3% mothers), and teachers. The sample was part of a longitudinal study examining psychological, social, and academic adjustment of first- (24.2%) and second-generation (75.8%) Chinese American children. The following conditions were set as eligibility criteria for the study: (a) the child was in first or second grade at the time of screening, (b) the child lived with at least one of her/his biological parents, (c) both biological parents identified as ethnic Chinese, (d) the child was either first generation (born outside the United States) or second generation (born in the United States with at least one foreign-born parent), and (e) both the parent and child were able to speak English or Chinese (Mandarin or Cantonese). Of this sample, 76.2% of parents were born in mainland China, 9.1% were born in Hong Kong, 3.2% were born in Taiwan, and 11.5% were born in other countries. On average, parents had lived in the United States for more than 1 decade (range = 1–38 years, $M = 11.8$ years).

Parents’ years of school education ranged from 5 years (elementary school education) to 20 years (doctorate or other advanced degree; $M = 13.3$ years, $SD = 2.44$ years). More than half (63.0%) of parents were employed full time. Families’ per capita income was calculated by dividing the total family income for the past year by the number of individuals living in the household. Families’ estimated median income for the past year was $37,500 (range = $5,000–$100,000, $M = 47,020$, $SD = 30,106.40$). Most parents (88.7%) were married and living within the same household as their spouse. Number of other children in the same household ranged from zero to six persons ($M = 1.07$, $SD = 0.72$), and number of adults within the same household, including the nonparticipating parent, ranged from zero to four persons ($M = 1.35$, $SD = 1.04$). This article used data collected from the second wave of assessment because the conflict discussion during which observed intrusive parenting was coded was only collected at Wave 2. Most of the children were in third (45.6%) or fourth (47.7%) grade, and the remaining children were in either second grade (2.9%) or fifth grade (3.8%). After obtaining approval from the university institutional review board, the sample was recruited using a variety of methods including through schools and seeking referrals from community organizations (see Chen et al., 2014).

Procedures

The child and one parent participated in a 2.5-hr laboratory assessment, which included a child interview, cognitive–behavioral tasks, a parent interview and questionnaire session, and parent–child interaction tasks. All questionnaires and interviews were separately administered for parent and child in their preferred language indicated at the beginning of the visit. All written materials were available in English, simplified Chinese, or traditional Chinese. Most parents (75.6%) completed the questionnaires in Chinese and all the children completed the assessment in English. A trained research assistant usually did the first few questions in each scale together with the child. Then, the child filled out the rest of the items in that scale by him/herself, but the research assistant was available if the child had questions. After the lab visit, the child’s classroom teacher was asked to complete the questionnaires by mail. Parents were paid $50 and children received small prizes. Teachers were paid $25 for filling out the survey for each child.

Measures

The present study used data collected from the parent, teacher, and child questionnaires. Observed intrusive parenting was coded from the parent–child conflict discussion task.

Demographic characteristics (parent report). The Family Demographics and Migration History Questionnaire was used to assess family demographic characteristics. The scale used in the present study was adapted from a measure used in a study of Mexican American immigrant families (Roosa et al., 2008). The demographic variables included in the present study are as follows: family SES (computed as the averages of standardized scores from paternal and maternal level of education and family income), parent’s gender, child’s gender and age.

Parent and child cultural orientations (parent and child report). Parents and children reported on their own orientations toward American and Chinese cultures using the Cultural and Social Acculturation Scale (CSAS; Chen & Lee, 1996; see also Chen & Tse, 2010). The CSAS is a bidimensional scale that assesses individuals’ contact with and engagement in both the heritage (Chinese) and host (American) cultures. The CSAS assesses parents’ and children’s bidimensional cultural orientations in three domains: language proficiency (e.g., “How well do you/does your child speak Cantonese or Mandarin/English?”; 1 = extremely poor, 5 = very good), media use (e.g., “How often do you/does your child watch Chinese/English movies?”; 1 = almost never, 6 = almost everyday), and social relationships (e.g., “How often do you/does your child invite Chinese/Caucasian-American friends to your house?”; 1 = almost never, 5 = more than once a week). The os for parents’ cultural orientations were .79 and .75 for the American and Chinese orientation subscales, respectively, and the os for child cultural orientations were .68 and .72 for the American and Chinese subscales, respectively. The composites for American and Chinese orientation were computed as the averages of standardized scores in the corresponding subscales.

Intrusive parenting. Parents and children reported on intrusive parenting using the 11-item Maternal Psychological Control Scale (Olsen et al., 2002). The scale was suitable for both mothers and fathers due to its gender-neutral wording, and the items were reworded to be appropriate for children. The scale assesses intru-
sive parenting on a scale of 1 (never) to 5 (always), including personal attack (e.g., “I bring up child’s past mistakes when criticizing him/her,” “She brings up my old mistakes when criticizing me”), erratic emotional behavior (e.g., “I change mood when with my child,” “S/he changes mood when s/he is with me”), guilt induction (e.g., “I tell my child that he/she should be ashamed when he/she misbehaves,” “S/he tells me that I should be ashamed or feel bad about myself when I misbehave or am naughty”), and love withdrawal (e.g., “I am less friendly with my child when my child does not see things his/her way,” “S/he is less friendly with me when I do not see things his/her way”). The αs for parent- and child-reported intrusive parenting were .85 and .84, respectively.

**Observed intrusive parenting.** As part of the lab assessment, parents and children separately completed a checklist to identify the topics they most frequently argued about in the past month (a modified version of the Issues Checklist by Prinz, Foster, Kent, & O’Leary, 1979). Topics include (1) Cleaning up/Chores, (2) Free Time, (3) Family Rules, (4) Appearance/Health, (5) Respect/Manners, (6) Noise, (7) How Family Gets Along, (8) Supervision, (9) Money, (10) Alcohol or Smoking, (11) School, (12) Extracurricular Activities, and (13) Traditional Chinese Values. For each issue, parents and children separately rated whether they had argued about that topic in the past month, and if yes, how upsetting the issue was on a scale of 1 (slightly upsetting) to 5 (very upsetting). In this sample, the top five topics endorsed by parents are as follows: respect/manners (M = 2.36), free time (M = 2.22), family rules (M = 2.13), cleaning up/chores (M = 1.94), and appearance/health (M = 1.69). The top five topics endorsed by children are as follows: schools (M = 1.69), family rules (M = 1.62), respect/manners (M = 1.52), cleaning up/chores (M = 1.36), and extracurricular activities (M = 1.34). The topics that received the largest summed rating from both parents and children were discussed for 8 min in a private videotaped discussion.

Prior to coding, the lead author and Chinese-speaking undergraduate research assistants viewed several videos to develop a coding scheme for intrusive parenting behaviors. The observers were all fluent in Chinese (Mandarin and Cantonese) and had cultural knowledge and experience with Chinese culture. Barber’s (1996) Psychological Control Scale—Observer Report was used as a guide in developing the coding scheme. Based on the observation of the videos and the theoretical conceptualization of intrusive parenting behaviors, the following five behaviors were determined to be indicative of intrusive parenting within the context of the parent–child conflict discussion task: dominating the conversation (e.g., parent raising his or her voice, “Stop, let me finish first!”), interrupting the child (i.e., not allowing the child to voice opinions), invalidating the child (e.g., “What you think about this is not important”), personal attack (e.g., “You’re so lazy!”), and guilt induction (e.g., “You know this makes mummy feel very sad”).

Once the coding scheme was developed, intrusive parenting behaviors were assessed by two independent observers. First, each observer viewed the interaction once without assigning any codes to get an overall feel for the conversation. Observers then coded for intrusive parenting every 30 s on a scale of 0 (not true) to 3 (very true) across the 8-min interaction, considering both the frequency and intensity of the intrusive behavior. Coders were instructed to consider both verbal statements and nonverbal (e.g., glaring, negative affect) aspects of intrusive parenting. Scores for intrusive parenting were computed by averaging these ratings across the entire interaction. To establish interrater reliability, the lead author trained bilingual Chinese American research assistants to reliably code 10 videos to ensure consistent application of code definition. After satisfactory reliability (r > .80) had been reached, the main coder independently coded all the videos and the reliability coder coded ~30% of all videos. Given the ordinal nature of the coding scale, intraclass correlations were used to calculate interrater reliability. A total of 33 videos were excluded from analysis; 23 participants did not complete the discussion, whereas the remaining 10 videos were excluded due to the language/dialect (e.g., Taishanese) that was not understood by the observers.

**Child adjustment (parent and teacher report).** Parents completed the Internalizing (e.g., “Complains of loneliness”) and Externalizing (e.g., “Argues a lot”) Problem subscales of the Child Behavior Checklist during the lab visit (CBCL; Achenbach & Rescorla, 2001), and teachers completed the Teacher Report Form via mail (TRF; Achenbach & Rescorla, 2001). Both the CBCL and TRF have similar structures and the items on the Internalizing and Externalizing subscales are identical. Items on both CBCL and TRF are scored on a Likert scale from 0 (not true) to 2 (very true/often true). The Chinese versions of the CBCL and TRF Internalizing and Externalizing subscales have demonstrated good internal consistency (αs > .80) and test–retest reliability (rs > .80) in Chinese American children (Chen et al., 2014). In the present sample, the αs were .90 and .90 for parent and teacher report of internalizing problems, and .99 and .87 for parent and teacher report of externalizing problems, respectively.

**Results**

All analyses were conducted using SPSS and Mplus 7.4 statistical software (Muthén & Muthén, 2017). All the reported continuous study variables were normally distributed, except for teacher-reported externalizing problems, which was slightly positively skewed. First, correlations among all study variables were examined. Second, a path analysis was used to test the hypothesized path from parent/child cultural orientations to multiple measures of intrusive parenting, and from intrusive parenting to child adjustment. Demographic variables (family SES, parent’s gender, parent’s preferred language, child’s age and gender) were controlled for in the model. The model was tested using full information maximum likelihood to handle missing data and the maximum likelihood robust estimator to adjust for standard error estimates due to nonnormality. Descriptive statistics of all variables are presented in Table 1.

**Correlation Analyses**

Correlations among study variables are reported in Table 2. Here we summarize the correlations that are most relevant to our study hypotheses. First, there was a positive correlation between observed intrusive parenting and parent-reported intrusive parenting, suggesting some cross-method convergence across reported and observed intrusive parenting behaviors. Second, parents who displayed more intrusive behaviors during the discussion had children with higher parent- and teacher-reported externalizing, but not internalizing, problems. Children with high American orientation had parents who displayed higher intrusive behaviors. Parent-reported intrusive behaviors were positively associated
with both parent-reported externalizing and internalizing problems, but not teacher report. Parents’ and children’s ratings on cultural orientations were significantly correlated on both Chinese and American orientation. Finally, parents’ American orientation was positively correlated with family SES.

Path Analysis

A path analysis model was specified to test the hypothesized associations between parent and child cultural orientations, intrusive parenting (parent- and child-reported and observed), and child adjustment (see Figure 1). The tested model showed a good fit to the data, χ² (df = 40, N = 206) = 47.73, p = .19, comparative fit index = 0.97, root mean square error of approximation = 0.03, standardized root mean square residual = 0.04. Consistent with hypotheses, parents who displayed more observed intrusive parenting behaviors reported higher child externalizing problems, indicating poorer adjustment. Furthermore, parent-reported intrusive parenting was positively associated with parent-reported, but not teacher-reported, child internalizing and externalizing problems.

Table 2
Correlations Among Study Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parenting variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Intrusive-P</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Intrusive-C</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Intrusive-O</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child adjustment variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Internalizing-P</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Internalizing-T</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td></td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Externalizing-P</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Externalizing-T</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociocultural and demographic variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Chinese-P</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. American-P</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Chinese-C</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. American-C</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td></td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Parent gender</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Child age</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Child gender</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Family SES</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Language-P</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Intrusive-P = parent-reported intrusive parenting; Intrusive-C = child-reported intrusive parenting; Intrusive-O = observed intrusive parenting; Internalizing-P = parent-reported internalizing problems; Internalizing-T = teacher-reported internalizing problems; Externalizing-P = parent-reported externalizing problems; Externalizing-T = teacher-reported externalizing problems; Chinese-P = parent-reported parent Chinese orientation; American-P = parent-reported parent American orientation; Chinese-C = child-reported child Chinese orientation; American-C = child-reported child American orientation; SES = socioeconomic status; Language-P = parents’ preferred language (0 = English, 1 = Chinese); Parent/Child gender (0 = female, 1 = male).

*p < .05. **p < .01.
Discussion

To our knowledge, this is the first study to examine relations between observed and reported intrusive parenting behaviors during parent–child interactions with cultural orientations and child adjustment in Chinese American immigrant families. As expected, intrusive parenting was generally associated with poorer child adjustment, though findings varied depending on measurement and reporter. We discuss these findings in detail in the following text.

Relations of Intrusive Parenting to Child Adjustment

Observed intrusive parenting was associated with parent-reported externalizing problems. This is in line with previous studies examining psychological control between Asian and Western cultures (Soens et al., 2012), in which the detrimental effects of psychological control were comparable. The lack of association between observed intrusive parenting and teacher-reported child externalizing problems is likely due to the fact that parents who
displayed higher levels of intrusive parenting during the discussion were reacting to perceived noncompliance of the child during the discussion. Thus, they were more likely to report their children as higher in externalizing problems. It is also possible that the children with higher levels of externalizing problems are more likely to evoke parents’ intrusive behaviors during the discussion. Due to the study’s cross-sectional design, we were unable to test for bidirectionality between intrusive parenting and children’s adjustment. However, the alternative model we tested suggests there may be some bidirectional associations among the variables. Future research including testing of alternative models with different specified pathways or longitudinal studies can shed light on the directionality of these associations. It is important to consider the context of the discussion, in which most of the topics focused on academics and family rules—topics which Chinese parenting philosophies such as guan and jiao may be most apparent (Wang, 2016). Parenting behaviors during these discussions may reflect guan, whose goal is to promote obedience and a sense of familial responsibility that emphasizes academic achievement through parental control and support (Wang & Supple, 2010).

Similarly, parent-reported intrusive parenting was uniquely associated with parent-reported child adjustment. This is consistent with previous work showing that parental psychological control is associated with poorer adjustment across both internalizing and externalizing domains (Barber & Harmon, 2002). These associations were only found for parent-reported intrusive parenting and parent-reported child adjustment, suggesting a possible within-report bias. One probable explanation is that parents and teachers may interpret children’s behaviors differently in different contexts. Importantly, there were unique associations between observed intrusive parenting and child adjustment above and beyond parent and child report. This highlights a need for research to incorporate multiple measures and informants as they may tap into differential aspects of parenting. Though there were associations between parent-reported intrusive parenting and observed intrusive parenting, there were no significant associations between parent- and child-reported intrusive parenting. This is consistent with previous research indicating discrepancies between parent and child reports in other areas such as clinical assessments of children’s socioemotional problems (De Los Reyes, 2011). It is also possible that parents and children differed in their perception or understanding of the meaning of intrusive behaviors (e.g., parenting behaviors viewed as intrusive by the child might be perceived as supportive by the parents). An important area of future research would be to directly assess children’s and parents’ perceptions or interpretations of specific parental behaviors during parent–child interactions. Such an approach would likely reveal the mechanisms through which parental behaviors are differentially associated with children’s adjustment.

**Cultural Orientations and Intrusive Parenting**

In the present sample, parents’ and children’s American and Chinese orientations were positively correlated with each other, suggesting some similarity in parent and child cultural orientations. Moreover, our preliminary analyses did not find evidence for the relation of parent–child cultural gap (as indicated by Parent × Child Cultural Orientation interactions) to intrusive parenting. This may be attributed to the age of children in our sample. Indeed, research has shown that family conflict related to the parent–child cultural gap was associated with negative adjustment in adolescents more strongly during mid- to late-adolescence compared with earlier developmental periods (Juang, Hou, Bayless, & Kim, 2018). Consistent with our hypotheses, parents’ American orientation was associated with lower child-reported intrusive parenting. This is aligned with previous research demonstrating that more acculturated immigrant parents engage in higher levels of authoritative parenting practices (Yu et al., 2016). However, there were no significant associations between parents’ cultural orientations and parent-reported intrusive parenting. This may be attributed to the way in which cultural orientations were measured in the present study. Specifically, the CSAS may not fully capture the psychosocial aspects of culture that may affect parenting behaviors (e.g., cultural values). Indeed, more recent research has distinguished between behavioral and psychological acculturation. Cheah, Zhou, Leung, and Vu (2018) found that Chinese American mothers’ psychological and behavioral acculturation were differently associated with their parenting reasons and practices. Furthermore, the items in the CSAS are limited to specific cultural groups (i.e., social relationships with Caucasian American friends, and not other ethnicities), which may not be accurate representations of social dimensions in relation to participants’ American orientation. Future research may incorporate a wider range of cultural factors, including Chinese values such as Confucianism and filial piety, to better understand links between parents’ cultural orientations and parenting behaviors.

In line with our hypotheses, children higher in Chinese orientation rated their parents as higher in intrusive parenting. This is consistent with prior research indicating that native Chinese children generally rated their parents higher in psychological control when compared with American children (Wang, Pomerantz, & Chen, 2007). Interestingly, parents whose children reported higher American orientation displayed higher levels of intrusive parenting behaviors during the discussion. One possible explanation is that children high in American orientation might have behaved in ways perceived by parents as inappropriate (e.g., talking back), leading the parent to engage in more intrusive behaviors to try to curb the child’s misbehavior. Given the transactional nature of socialization (Sameroff, 2009), it is likely that parents’ intrusive behaviors were partly in response to children’s behaviors during the discussions. Thus, more research is needed that examine the unique roles of parents’ and children’s cultural orientations in the links between intrusive parenting and child adjustment in immigrant families.

**Associations Between Demographic Variables, Intrusive Parenting, and Child Adjustment**

There was a unique association between child gender and observed intrusive parenting, with parents of boys being more likely to display intrusive behaviors compared with parents of girls. Several studies have found that parents respond to boys and girls differently in everyday interactions. Clearfield and Nelson (2006) demonstrated that mothers of sons presented higher levels of instruction-type interaction and lower levels of conversation-type interaction when compared with mothers of girls. Our findings are also consistent with a study in which mothers of boys exhibited less sensitivity compared with mothers of girls during observed conversations.
interactions (Tamis-LeMonda, Briggs, McClowry, & Snow, 2009). Similarly, teachers reported higher levels of externalizing problems for boys compared with girls. This is in line with research suggesting that boys are more likely to exhibit externalizing behavior in early childhood through early adolescence (Blatt-Eisengart, Drabick, Monahan, & Steinberg, 2009). Interestingly, higher family SES was associated with higher teacher-reported behavioral problems, and parents whose preferred language is English also reported higher internalizing problems. Moreover, correlation analyses show that parents who preferred English also report higher family SES. Hence, a possible explanation is that higher SES families, including parents whose preferred language is English, may have parents who are both working, thereby resulting in less parental control and monitoring. Furthermore, children from higher SES, English-speaking families may have fewer restrictions and structure due to being in better neighborhoods, which may then subsequently influence their adjustment. More work is needed to better understand the roles of SES and parental language and their links to children’s adjustment in immigrant families.

Limitations and Future Directions

The study had several limitations warrant mentioning. First, although the present study is part of a larger longitudinal study, the present analyses were cross-sectional due to the conflict discussion and child-reported cultural orientations only being assessed at one time point. This impedes the possibility of examining causal pathways and how the associations between cultural orientations, intrusive parenting, and child adjustment might change over time. Future research using longitudinal data can provide more robust test of the directional and transactional associations between intrusive parenting and children’s adjustment in immigrant families (see Sameroff, 2009). Second, we examined American and Chinese orientation as separate constructs and thus did not examine the influence of biculturalism. Future research could include a biculturalism measure or employ a person-centered approach to better understand the roles of different cultural orientations. Lastly, because the study was conducted in a metropolitan area with a high concentration of Asian American residents, the findings may not generalize to Chinese American immigrant families living in other geographic regions.

Conclusions and Implications

The findings demonstrate that examining intrusive parenting across multiple measures is important for understanding children’s adjustment. Our findings suggest cultural universality in some aspects of intrusive parenting, but also the need for a more nuanced approach to understanding the associations between intrusive parenting and child adjustment in Chinese American immigrant families. Our study showed that parental use of intrusive behaviors and its adverse effects on children’s adjustment can be observed even in preadolescent years, highlighting the need for early intervention targeting young children of immigrant families. Overall, these findings suggest a need to conceptualize parenting in a cultural framework and target parenting interventions in ways appropriate to the population of interest. Future research may consider focusing on the socialization goals that Chinese American immigrant parents hold, and how they go about achieving these goals through their parenting practices. It is our hope that the present study helps pave the way for future research examining the underlying dynamics between parenting practices and child adjustment in immigrant families.
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