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The present study examined the relations between perceived parenting styles and family conflict with data from 149 Asian American college students. Ratings of parenting styles were highest for authoritarian style, followed by authoritative and permissive styles. Tests of mediation revealed that authoritarian parenting significantly explained why parents’ adherence to Asian cultural values was associated with increased family conflict. Tests of moderation showed that as permissive parenting increased, more acculturated participants reported lower family conflict, although the reverse was true for their less acculturated counterparts. When authoritarian parenting increased, integrated, separated, and assimilated participants reported increased family conflict, whereas the marginalized group reported lower family conflict. Finally, assimilated participants reported less family conflicts at higher levels of authoritative parenting in comparison to the integrated, separated, and marginalized groups.
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Studies examining Asian American college students have shown that parental orientation to traditional Asian culture and Asian values gap (i.e., difference between parents’ and children’s adherence to traditional Asian cultural values) are associated with increased family conflict (Ahn, Kim, & Park, 2008; Lee, Choe, Kim, & Ngo, 2000; Park, Vo, & Tsong, 2008), especially in the areas of academic and career, dating and marriage, and family expectations (Ahn et al., 2008). To explain these findings, one could hypothesize that Asian American parents who adhere to traditional Asian values may utilize parenting behaviors that are incongruent with their children’s level of acculturation and enculturation. For example, traditional Asian parents may reinforce the value of filial piety (e.g., unquestioning obedience to parents) and expect their children to prioritize family obligations over personal interests. However, for acculturated children, these parental behaviors may conflict with their need for autonomy, a developmental goal which is strongly emphasized in the dominant European American culture in the United States (e.g., Erikson, 1959). The purpose of the present study was to gain a better understanding of family conflict among Asian American college students by examining the relationships between perceived-parents’ adherence to Asian values, children’s acculturation and enculturation, and perceived-parenting styles.

For this purpose, we gathered data from college students, as opposed to younger children, based on the perspective that a certain level of emotional and relational maturity is necessary for individuals to reflect on and gain insight toward their family dynamics. This level of maturity may not be achieved until late adoles-
cence or young adulthood, the typical developmental periods of most college students. Furthermore, in comparison to younger children, college students may be better able to objectively identify patterns in their parent relationship because of greater physical and emotional separation from parental controls and expectations (e.g., moving away from home). Younger children, on the other hand, may have a more difficult time because they may be immersed in family dynamics that make them emotionally reactive to their parents.

Parenting Styles

Literature on parenting behaviors has been largely influenced by Baumrind’s (1971) conceptualization of the authoritarian, permissive, and authoritative parenting styles, which encompass various characteristics, such as maturity demands, communication styles, nurturance, warmth, and involvement (Darling & Steinberg, 1993). In regards to authoritarian parenting style, children are expected to acquiesce to parental demands, while parents are expected to be strict, highly directive, and emotionally detached from their children. On the other hand, permissive parenting style involves parents who place few restrictions, rules, or limits on their children, with the expectation that their children will regulate their own activities. In terms of authoritative parenting, this style emphasizes clear and firm direction to children, while moderating discipline with warmth, reason, and flexibility.

Among the different parenting styles, studies indicate that Asian American parents tend to utilize the authoritarian style to a greater extent than European American parents (Chao, 1994; Kawamura, Frost, & Marmatz, 2002; Pong, Hao, & Gardner, 2005). This difference in parenting styles may be explained by Darling and Steinberg’s (1993) integrative parenting model, which suggests that the parents’ cultural value orientation and socialization goals influence which parenting style they use. In support of this explanation, Xu, Farver, Zhang, Zeng, Yu, and Cai (2005) found that adherence to Asian values of collectivism, conformity to norms, emotional self-control, and humility were associated with higher use of authoritarian parenting among Chinese mothers. In addition, Chao (2000) found that the association between filial piety and authoritarian parenting were higher for Chinese mothers than European American mothers.

Despite Asian Americans’ tendency for utilizing authoritarian parenting, Baumrind (1971) asserted that this style is harmful to children’s self-esteem and favored instead the use of authoritative style, which Baumrind contended would lead children to become autonomous, achievement-oriented, and self-controlled (cf. Buri, Louiselle, Misukanis, & Mueller, 1988). However, Darling and Steinberg (1993) argued that the beneficial aspects of authoritative style may be culture-bound and apply primarily to European Americans from middle-class families. Consistent with Darling and Steinberg, an examination of the 1990 and 1992 National Educational Longitudinal Study—which included a data from 873 Asian Americans, 1449 Latino/as, 1176 African Americans, and 8292 European American eight grade students—suggested that the associations between higher academic achievement and higher authoritative and lower authoritarian styles were found only for European Americans (Park & Bauer, 2002).

When considering an Asian cultural perspective, authoritarian parenting may have desirable characteristics despite Baumrind’s (1971) assertions. According to Chao (2000), an important socialization goal among Asian parents is to “train” their children to be hardworking, self-disciplined, and obedient. Compared to the other parenting styles, authoritarian emphasis on strictness and conformity to parental expectations may be more conducive to these socialization goals. On the other hand, an important socialization goal in Western culture appears to be the emphasis on positive self-esteem and independence from parents (Heine, Lehman, Markus, & Kitayama, 1999). From a Western cultural perspective, it appears that authoritative parenting may be desirable as Baumrind (1971) originally indicated. Taken together, the impact of parenting styles appear to vary based on cultural factors.

For Asian American families, there appears to be mixed findings with respect to the outcomes associated with parenting styles. The findings from several studies that examined Asians and Asian Americans are consistent with Baumrind’s (1971) claim that favors authoritative style and discourages authoritarian style (Herz & Gullone, 1999; Lau & Cheung, 1987;
Lau, Hau, Cheung, Lew, & Berndt, 1990; Xu et al., 2005). However, findings from other studies (e.g., Leung, Lau, & Lam, 1998) suggest that authoritarian style is associated with beneficial outcomes for Asian American families, particularly in regards to higher academic achievement. Furthermore, Steinberg, Lamborn, Darling, Mounts, & Dornbusch (1994) found that there was an association for higher grade point average and academic self-concept with authoritarian parenting for Asian American, but not for European American adolescents. More recently, Ang and Goh (2006) conducted a cluster analysis of data from Singaporean adolescents reared by authoritarian parents and they were able to identify clusters of both well-adjusted and maladjusted adolescents, suggesting that authoritarian parenting does not necessarily result in negative outcomes, and that parenting style outcomes may depend on other variables.

**Acculturation and Enculturation**

Because Asian Americans traverse through multiple and often conflicting cultural realities (e.g., Asian vs. European American culture), the impact of parenting styles on family relations may depend on children’s level of acculturation and enculturation. Acculturation refers to the process of adapting to the attitudes, values, and behaviors of the dominant culture of the host country (Berry, Trimble, & Olmedo, 1986); while, enculturation refers to the degree to which individuals adhere to their heritage cultures (Kim, 2008). Based on a combination of either high or low levels of acculturation and enculturation, individuals can be characterized as having one of the following attitudes: integration, assimilation, separation, and marginalization. Integration (i.e., high acculturation, high enculturation) refers to individuals who are able to competently function in both the dominant and heritage cultures. Assimilation (i.e., high acculturation, low enculturation) refers to individuals who effectively function within the adopted dominant culture, but has difficulty with their heritage culture. In contrast, separation (i.e., low acculturation, high enculturation) refers to individuals who have a difficulty navigating the norms outside their heritage culture. Lastly, marginalization (i.e., low acculturation, low enculturation) refers to individuals who have little affinity to both their heritage and host cultures (Berry, 1989; Kim, 2008).

**Hypotheses**

The present study aimed to examine possible influences of culture-related variables, namely parents’ adherence to Asian cultural values and children’s acculturation and enculturation levels, on the relation between parenting styles and family conflicts. Based on the above literature, the present study examined three hypotheses with Asian American college students. First, we hypothesized that the use of authoritarian parenting style would be rated higher than the other two parenting styles. Second, we hypothesized that each of the parenting styles (authoritarian, permissive, and authoritative) will mediate the relation between parents’ adherence to Asian values and family conflicts. This hypothesis is based on the notion that family conflicts may occur when parents’ Asian values are expressed in terms of behaviors and expectations (i.e., parenting styles) that are incongruent with the children’s expectations. An underlying assumption of this hypothesis is that parental adherence to traditional Asian values indirectly affects family conflicts through its influence on parenting styles, which in turn is hypothesized to have a direct effect on family conflicts.

Third, we hypothesized that children’s acculturation and enculturation levels will moderate the relations between each of the parenting styles and family conflict. This hypothesis assumes that family conflicts will decrease as the congruence between parenting styles and children’s expectations increases. For Asian American children, their expectations may be largely influenced by levels of acculturation and enculturation because of their exposure to both Western and Asian cultures, respectively. For example, expectations of highly enculturated Asian American children may be more congruent with authoritarian parenting style because of their affinity toward the cultural value of filial piety. Thus, these enculturated children may experience lower levels of family conflicts even though their parents are authoritarian. On the other hand, acculturated Asian American children may perceive authoritarian parenting as overly restrictive and nonaffectionate, which in turn may contribute to parent–child conflicts.
Instead, the acculturated child may prefer parents who are more authoritative or permissive.

Method

Participants

A total of 149 Asian American students from a large West Coast University participated in the present study; of whom, 85 were female (57.0%) and 60 were male (40.3%) with four who did not report sex. The average age of the Asian American participants was 19.58 years ($SD = 1.26$), with a range of 17 to 25 years. The largest Asian ethnic group was Chinese ($n = 39, 26.4$%), followed by Korean ($n = 21, 14.2$%), Filipino ($n = 20, 13.5$%), Vietnamese ($n = 16, 10.7$%), Japanese ($n = 10, 6.8$%) and the remaining 43 (28.4%) were from other Asian groups. Most Asian American participants were either first generation ($n = 34, 22.8$%) or second generation ($n = 93, 62.4$%) while the rest were third generation ($n = 11, 7.4$%), fourth generation ($n = 2, 1.3$%), and fifth generation ($n = 2, 1.3$%), with five who did not report their generation status. Most of the fathers (83.3%) and mothers (86.8%) were reported to be first generation. The generational distributions suggest that most parents in the sample were first generation, while their children were mostly first or second generation. The average income was at the higher end of the $45,000 to $60,000 range. In regards to birth order, there were 57 (38.3%) first-born, 52 (34.9%) second-born, 17 (11.4%) third-born, 11 (7.4%) fourth-born, 3 (2.0%) fifth-born, and two seventh- and one eighth-born (6 missing data). The majority of the Asian American participants reported having married parents (82.2%), while about 9.6% reported divorced parents, and the rest were widowed, remarried, or separated.

Measures

The questionnaire consisted of a demographic sheet and four scales: Parental Authority Questionnaire (PAQ; Buri, 1991), Asian Values Scale—Revised (AVS-R; Kim & Hong, 2004), Asian American Multidimensional Acculturation Scale (AAMAS; Chung, Kim, & Abreu, 2004), and Asian American Family Conflicts Scale (AAFCS; Lee et al., 2000).

Demographic sheet. The demographic sheet contained items regarding the participant’s gender, age, ethnicity, generational status, and birth order. In addition, the participants were asked about the following characteristics about their parents and family: family income, each parent’s generational status, parents’ marital status, each parent’s English fluency, and family member composition in the household.

PAQ. Buri (1991) designed the PAQ to measure three different types of parenting styles: permissive, authoritarian, and authoritative as defined by Baumrind (1971). The scale consists of 30 items asking the respondents to rate their perceptions of their mother’s and father’s parenting behavior on a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree), with 10 items for each subscale (i.e., permissive, authoritarian, authoritative). Higher scores for each subscale represented higher endorsement of the measured parenting style. Sample questions for each subscale are as follows: “As I was growing up my mother seldom gave me expectations and guidelines for my behavior” for permissive; “My mother has always felt that more force should be used by parents in order to get their children to behave the way they are supposed to” for authoritarian; “As the children in my family were growing up my mother consistently gave us direction and guidance in rational and objective ways” for authoritative. The present data yielded coefficient alphas of .74, .84, and .80 for the permissive, authoritarian, and authoritative subscales, respectively.

AVS-R. We asked participants to report their perceptions of their parents’ adherence to Asian cultural values based on the items from the AVS-R. Previous studies have used this method to measure perceived parent’s adherence to Asian values (Ahn et al., 2008; Park et al., 2008). Kim, Atkinson, and Yang (1999) originally constructed the Asian Values Scale in order to measure one’s adherence to Asian cultural values. Kim and Hong (2004) used the Rasch model to modify the original AVS to improve its psychometric properties, which resulted in 25 total items for the AVS-R. Respondents rate each item on a 4-point scale (1 = strongly disagree to 4 = strongly agree) with higher scores representing higher adherence to Asian values. Sample items are “One
should not deviate from familial and social norms,” “One’s achievements should be viewed as family’s achievements,” and “The worst thing one can do is to bring disgrace to one’s family reputation.” The present data yielded a coefficient alpha of .87.

AAMAS. The AAMAS is a 15-item measure of Asian Americans’ engagement in the behavioral norms of one’s Asian culture-of-origin, other Asian American cultures, and the European American culture. The AAMAS contains three subscales: Culture of Origin (AAMAS-CO), Other Asian American Cultures (AAMAS-AA), and European American Culture (AAMAS-EA). The AAMAS-CO and the AAMAS-EA was used in the present study to measure enculturation and acculturation, respectively. For each item, respondents were asked to answer on a 6 point scale ranging from 1 (not very much) to 6 (very much). The items measure four reliable domains of acculturation: cultural identity, language, cultural knowledge, and food consumption. Sample items in the AAMAS include, “How well do you speak the language of ______,” “How often do you actually eat the food of ______,” “How knowledgeable are you about the history of ______,” and “How much would you like to interact and associate with people from ______.” The present data yielded the following coefficient alphas: .87 for AAMAS-CO and .78 for the AAMAS-EA.

AAFCS. Lee et al. (2000) designed the AAFCS to measure parent–child conflicts among Asian American families. The AAFCS consists of 10 items which represent typical cultural specific conflicts that are measured by likelihood and seriousness of the family conflict. The items are worded to show disagreement between the children and parents (e.g., “Your parents tell you what to do with your life, but you want to make your own decisions”). The likelihood scale ranges from 1 (almost never) to 5 (almost always) and the seriousness scale ranges from 1 (not at all) to 5 (extremely). Higher scores reflect higher family conflict. In the present study, the likelihood and seriousness scores were combined to generate an overall intensity score, as suggested by Lee et al. For the present study, a coefficient alpha of .89 was found.

Results

Preliminary Analysis

Diagnostics. Prior to each analysis, diagnostics were conducted to examine the assumptions for each analysis. The Shapiro-Wilk’s test indicated that all of the study’s variables had approximately normal distributions. Tests of linearity, independence of observations, and homoscedasticity indicated that assumptions for the multiple regression analyses were met. An alpha of .05 was used to assess for significance of all statistical tests. See Table 1 for the means, standard deviations of the study variables.

Related demographic variables. We examined the possible relations between the demographic variables (i.e., gender, age, family income, generational status, parent’s generational status, parents’ marital status, and birth order) and family conflict. The results showed that family income (r = -.24, p = .007), participants’ generational status (r = -.23, p = .007), and parent’s generational status (r = -.21, p = .014) were significantly related to family conflict at the .05 alpha level. Hence, these variables were controlled for in the regression analyses.

Mean differences. The results of t tests showed that Asian American participants’ authoritarian parenting style score (M = 3.30, SD = 0.64) was significantly higher than permissive parenting style score (M = 2.61, SD = 0.53), t(148) = −8.33, p < .001, d = .68, but not significantly higher than authoritative parenting style score (M = 3.21, SD = 0.56), t(148) = 1.12, p = .264, d = .09. In addition, Authoritative parenting score was significantly higher than permissive parenting score, t(148) = −11.49, p < .001, d = .94. These results provide partial support for the first hypothesis.

Procedure

Upon receiving approval from the host university, participants were recruited from an Asian American studies course at a large West Coast university and were offered extra credit as an incentive for participation. Participants were informed that their participation was voluntary and that their responses would be anonymous. Once participants provided informed consent, they completed the paper-and-pencil questionnaire.
Correlation and regression. We computed zero-order correlations to examine the possible bivariate relationships between the predictor variables and the dependent variable, family conflict (See Table 1). The results showed that permissive ($r = -0.16$) and authoritative ($r = -0.41$) parenting were inversely related to family conflict, while parents’ AVS-R ($r = 0.26$) and authoritarian parenting ($r = 0.39$) were positively related to family conflict. Because each of the perceived parenting styles was significantly correlated with one another, we conducted a simultaneous regression analysis to examine the impact of each parenting style on family conflict while controlling for the other parenting styles. This regression model ($R^2 = 0.27$, $p < .001$) indicated that authoritative (β = 0.37, $p < .001$) and authoritative parenting (β = -0.36, $p < .001$) were significant predictors, while permissive parenting (β = 0.12, $p = .141$) was not.

Tests of Mediation Effects

To address the second hypothesis regarding whether the parenting styles mediated the relation between parents’ adherence to Asian values and family conflict, Baron and Kenny’s (1986) procedure for mediation test was implemented for each of the three parenting style scores. The first requirement of this procedure is that there is a significant relation between parents’ AVS-R and AAFCS. The second requirement is that there is a significant relation between parents’ AVS-R and the parenting style score. For the third requirement, a multiple regression model that regressed AAFCS on parents’ AVS-R and each of the parenting style scores (mediator variable) need to be examined. If the significant relation between parents’ AVS-R and AAFCS became nonsignificant or reduced, it indicates that the parenting style variable is a significant mediator. After each regression analysis, we conducted a Sobel (1982) tests for assessing the level of significance of the mediation model. For each of the multiple regressions, family income, participants’ generational status, and parents’ generational status were controlled for in the first step of the regression. See Table 2 for results of the tests of mediation models for the three parenting styles.

Permissive style. Parent’s AVS-R score significantly predicted 5% of the variance in family conflict, $F(5, 127) = 6.87, p = .010$ and 8% of the variance in permissive parenting, $F(5, 127) = 10.70, p = .001$. Contrary to the hypothesis, when both variables were included in the model that predicted family conflict, parent’s AVS-R remained significant ($p = .018$) while permissive parenting was nonsignificant ($p = .677$). The Sobel’s test for indirect effects was not significant, $z = 0.41, p = .343$. Hence, permissive parenting style did not mediate the relation between parent’s adherence to Asian values and family conflict and second hypothesis was not supported for this parenting style variable.

Authoritarian style. Parent’s AVS-R score significantly predicted 5% of the variance in authoritarian parenting, $F(5, 127) = 7.63, p = .007$. Consistent with the hypothesis, the parent’s AVS-R score became nonsignificant.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. PAQ-Permissive</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. PAQ-Authoritarian</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>-0.47***</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. PAQ-Authoritative</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.33***</td>
<td>-0.24***</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Parents’ AVS-R</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.21*</td>
<td>-0.20*</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. AAMAS-CO</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.24***</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. AAMAS-EA</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.17*</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. AAFCS</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>-0.16*</td>
<td>0.39***</td>
<td>-0.41***</td>
<td>0.26**</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. PAQ = Parental Authority Questionnaire; Parent’s AVS-R = Participant-perceived parents’ score on the Asian Values Scale-Revised; AAMAS-CO = Asian American Multidimensional Acculturation Scale-Culture of Origin; AAMAS-EA = Asian American Multidimensional Acculturation Scale-European Americans; AAFCS = Asian American Family Conflict Scale.

*p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.
When authoritarian parenting was controlled. The Sobel’s test suggested a significant mediation effect, $z = 2.24$, $p = .012$. The semipartial correlation between parent’s AVS-R and family conflict decreased from .21 to .13 when authoritarian parenting was taken accounted for in the regression model, suggesting that 38% of parent’s AVS-R’s effect on family conflict was indirectly explained by authoritarian parenting. Hence, authoritarian parenting style mediated the relation between parent’s adherence to Asian values and family conflict and second hypothesis was partially supported for this parenting style variable.

**Authoritative style.** Contrary to the hypothesis, Parent’s AVS-R score did not significantly predict authoritative parenting, $F(5, 127) = 3.35$, $p = .069$. The Sobel’s test was not significant, $z = 1.52$, $p = .065$. Hence, authoritative parenting style did not mediate the relation between parent’s adherence to Asian values and family conflict and second hypothesis was not supported for this parenting style variable.

### Tests of Moderation Effects

For the third hypothesis, we conducted a hierarchical multiple regression analysis that regressed family conflict to examine three-way interactions between acculturation, enculturation, and each of the three parenting styles; hence, a total of three regressions were tested. For each multiple regression, family income, students’ generational status and parent’s generational status was entered into the first step of each regression analyses to control for their effects. PAQ = Parental Authority Questionnaire; AAFCS = Asian American Family Conflict Scale; Parent’s AVS-R = Participant-perceived parent’s score on the Asian Values Scale-Revised.

- **Mediator: PAQ-Permissive**
  - DV: AAFCS
    - Parents’ AVS-R $0.66$, $SE = 0.25$, $r = 0.31$, $sr = 0.21$, $t = 2.62$, $R^2 = 0.05$, $F = 6.87$, $p = .010$

  - DV: Permissive
    - Parents’ AVS-R $-0.54$, $SE = 0.17$, $r = -0.23$, $sr = -0.28$, $t = -3.27$, $R^2 = 0.08$, $F = 10.70$, $p = .001$

  - DV: AAFCS
    - Parents’ AVS-R $0.63$, $SE = 0.26$, $r = 0.31$, $sr = 0.20$, $t = 2.39$, $R^2 = 0.05$, $F = 3.50$, $p = .033$

  - Permissive
    - $R^2 = -0.06$, $SE = 0.04$, $sr = -0.07$, $t = -0.42$, $p = .677$

- **Mediator: PAQ-Authoritarian**
  - DV: AAFCS
    - Parents’ AVS-R $0.66$, $SE = 0.25$, $r = 0.31$, $sr = 0.21$, $t = 2.62$, $R^2 = 0.05$, $F = 6.87$, $p = .010$

  - DV: Authoritarian
    - Parents’ AVS $0.53$, $SE = 0.19$, $r = 0.27$, $sr = 0.23$, $t = 2.76$, $R^2 = 0.05$, $F = 7.63$, $p = .007$

  - DV: AAFCS
    - Parents’ AVS $0.43$, $SE = 0.24$, $r = 0.31$, $sr = 0.13$, $t = 1.74$, $R^2 = 0.14$, $F = 11.73$, $p = .001$

  - Authoritarian
    - $R^2 = 0.44$, $SE = 0.11$, $sr = 0.37$, $t = 3.97$, $p = .084$

- **Mediator: PAQ-Authoritative**
  - DV: AAFCS
    - Parents’ AVS $0.66$, $SE = 0.25$, $r = 0.31$, $sr = 0.21$, $t = 2.62$, $R^2 = 0.05$, $F = 6.87$, $p = .010$

  - DV: Authoritative
    - Parent’s AVS $-0.29$, $SE = 0.16$, $r = -0.24$, $sr = -0.15$, $t = -1.83$, $R^2 = 0.02$, $F = 3.35$, $p = .069$

  - DV: AAFCS
    - Parents’ AVS $0.55$, $SE = 0.24$, $r = 0.32$, $sr = 0.18$, $t = 2.27$, $R^2 = 0.11$, $F = 8.91$, $p = .001$

  - Authoritative
    - $R^2 = -0.41$, $SE = -0.36$, $sr = -0.25$, $t = -3.15$, $p = .002$

**Note.** Three mediating tests are portrayed for each type of parenting style, with each step of the mediating test. Parent’s generational status, family income, and students’ generational status was entered into the first step of each regression analyses to control for their effects. PAQ = Parental Authority Questionnaire; AAFCS = Asian American Family Conflict Scale; Parent’s AVS-R = Participant-perceived parent’s score on the Asian Values Scale-Revised.
were referred to as integrated, high-acculturation and low-enculturation individuals were referred to as assimilated, low acculturation and high enculturation individuals were referred to as separated, and low acculturation and low enculturation individuals were referred to as marginalized. See Table 3 for the results of the moderation tests for the permissive, authoritarian, and authoritative parenting styles, respectively.

**Permissive style.** The permissive parenting style’s interaction model significantly predicted 21% of the variance on family conflict, $F(12, 121) = 2.65, p = .003, f^2 = .27$ (See Table 3). A significant two-way interaction was found between permissive parenting style and acculturation (AAMAS-EA). As illustrated in Figure 1A, as permissive parenting style increased, the low acculturation group reported more family conflict, while there was a decrease of family conflict for the high acculturation group.

**Authoritarian style.** The authoritarian parenting style’s interaction model significantly predicted 33% of the variance on family conflict, $F(12, 121) = 4.84, p < .001, f^2 = .49$ (See Table 3). Authoritarian parenting style had a significant positive relation with family conflict. There was a significant three-way interaction between authoritarian parenting style, enculturation, and acculturation on family conflict. As illustrated in Figure 1B, as authoritarian parenting style increased, the integrated, sepa-

### Table 3

Hierarchical Multiple Regression Examining the Interaction of Parenting Styles, Acculturation, and Enculturation on Family Conflict

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>$R^2/\Delta R^2$</th>
<th>$F/\Delta F$</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>$f^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moderator: Permissive style</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall model</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>.622</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enculturation (A)</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-0.65</td>
<td></td>
<td>.516</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acculturation (B)</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td></td>
<td>.589</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permissive (C)</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-1.38</td>
<td></td>
<td>.171</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A \times B$</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-0.64</td>
<td></td>
<td>.527</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A \times C$</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-1.22</td>
<td></td>
<td>.224</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$B \times C$</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-2.53</td>
<td></td>
<td>.013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A \times B \times C$</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-0.49</td>
<td></td>
<td>.622</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moderator: Authoritarian style</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall model</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>9.19</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enculturation (A)</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-1.93</td>
<td></td>
<td>.055</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acculturation (B)</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td></td>
<td>.141</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarian (C)</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A \times B$</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-1.53</td>
<td></td>
<td>.129</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A \times C$</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td></td>
<td>.039</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$B \times C$</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td></td>
<td>.369</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A \times B \times C$</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-3.03</td>
<td></td>
<td>.003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moderator: Authoritative style</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total model</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enculturation (A)</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-0.88</td>
<td></td>
<td>.379</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acculturation (B)</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td></td>
<td>.330</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritative (C)</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-2.46</td>
<td></td>
<td>.015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A \times B$</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-1.89</td>
<td></td>
<td>.061</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A \times C$</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td></td>
<td>.103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$B \times C$</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-2.19</td>
<td></td>
<td>.031</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A \times B \times C$</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td></td>
<td>.030</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** DV = Family Conflict. Only step 4 results are included in this table. Step 1 included control variables: family income, students’ generational status, and parent’s generational status. Step 2 included control variables and predictor variables. Step 3 included control, predictor, and two-way interaction terms. Step 4 included all variables and three-way interaction term.
rated, and assimilated groups reported higher family conflict, while the marginalized group reported less family conflict. The magnitude of the increased family conflict for the integrated group was less than the separated and assimilated groups. In addition, the assimilated group appeared to have higher family conflict with high authoritarian parenting style than the other three groups.

**Authoritative style.** The authoritative parenting style’s interaction model significantly predicted 26% of the variance on family conflict, $F(12, 121) = 3.60, p < .001, f^2 = .35$ (See Table 3). Higher levels of authoritative parenting style were associated with decreased family conflict. A three-way interaction was found between authoritative parenting style, acculturation, and enculturation on family conflict. As illustrated in Figure 1C, the assimilated group reported higher family conflict than the other three groups at the low authoritative level, while the reports of family conflict were lower than the three groups at high levels of authoritative parenting.

**Discussion**

The present study showed that the rating of authoritarian parenting style was higher than permissive style, as hypothesized. The results also showed that the rating of authoritative style was higher than permissive style. This finding is consistent with past literature that suggests that Asian American parents have a tendency for authoritarian parenting (Chao, 1994; Kawamura et al., 2002; Pong et al., 2005). Also, the results showed partial support for hypothesized relations among parenting styles, parents’ adherence to Asian values, acculturation, enculturation, and family conflict among Asian American college students.

To address the second hypothesis, a series of mediation tests were conducted to examine whether parenting style explained why parents’ adherence to Asian values was related to family conflict. As hypothesized, authoritarian style was found to significantly mediate the relation between parents’ adherence to Asian cultural values and family conflict. In addition, the results showed that parents’ adherence to Asian values was positively related to authoritarian parenting style. This finding is consistent with Xu et al.’s (2005) study which found that Asian cultural values of collectivism, conformity to norms, emotional self-control, and humility were related to authoritarian parenting for Chinese mothers. Overall, the present findings suggest that parents who adhere strongly the Asian values tend to utilize authoritarian parenting style, which in turn is associated with increased family conflict.

Contrary to our hypotheses, permissive and authoritative parenting styles did not mediate the relation between parents’ Asian values and family conflict. Specific to permissive parenting style, a significant relation between permissive style and family conflict was not found. Although it is difficult to interpret this nonsignificant finding, it may be the case that Asian American family conflict may have less to do with lenient parenting and more to do with the perception of Asian American parents as being overly restrictive and autocratic. In terms of authoritative parenting style, it was puzzling...
that the relation between authoritative parenting style and parents’ Asian values was not significant when the demographic variables were included in the regression model. In contrast, an examination of the zero-order correlations suggests that there was a significant inverse relation between these two variables. It appears that a future study may be warranted to clarify these discrepant findings.

To address the third hypothesis, a series of hierarchical multiple regression analyses were conducted to assess whether acculturation and enculturation moderated the relation between parenting style and family conflict. For permissive parenting, the results indicated that participants’ acculturation level was a significant moderator in that as permissive parenting increased, more acculturated Asian Americans reported lower family conflict, while less acculturated Asian Americans reported higher family conflict. This finding may suggest that more acculturated Asian Americans may interpret their parents’ permissiveness as respect for their autonomy. These individuals may appreciate the freedom that they are given by their permissive parents to make their own life choices. On the other hand, less acculturated Asian Americans may perceive permissiveness as a sign that parents are being neglectful, in that, parents are failing to fulfill their role of “training” them to work harder, and be more disciplined and obedient (Chao, 1994).

With regard to authoritarian parenting style, the results showed a three-way interaction effect: when authoritarian style increased, integrated, separated and assimilated Asian Americans reported increased family conflict, whereas the marginalized group reported lower family conflict. The inverse directionality between authoritarian style and family conflict for the marginalized group was unexpected. Although it is difficult to explain this unexpected finding, we speculated two rival hypotheses. First, because marginalized individuals may feel disconnected to both the Asian American community and larger European American culture, they may rely on familial attachments to fulfill their need to belong. Therefore, marginalized individuals may be more tolerant of their parents’ restrictiveness and demands for family obligation. Conversely, it may be the case that marginalized individuals may have created physical and/or emotional distance from their parents because they did not feel culturally connected with them. Because of the distance, there may not be as many situations for marginalized individuals to have conflict with their parents.

Another unexpected finding was that the separated individuals did not report lower family conflict at higher levels of authoritarian parenting style. We had expected that separated Asian Americans would be more receptive to authoritarian parenting since they would also adhere to traditional Asian familial norms that emphasize unquestioning obedience and respect to their parents (Kim, Atkinson, & Umemoto, 2001). To explain this unexpected finding, we cite Lau and Cheung (1987), who suggested that authoritarianism may reflect two forms of parental control: 1) the restrictiveness parents place on their children, and 2) setting limits to help children organize their behaviors and learn the consequences of their actions. Perhaps the separated individuals in the present study responded to the restrictiveness aspect of authoritarianism as opposed to the latter point.

For authoritative parenting style, a three-way interaction effect was found in which assimilated Asian Americans reported lower family conflict at higher levels of authoritative parenting, when compared to the other three groups. Based on Baumrind’s (1971) assertion that authoritative style reinforces autonomy and self-reliance, assimilated Asian Americans may prefer authoritative parenting because these qualities are valued in European American culture. However, unlike Baumrind’s valuation of authoritative parenting, it appeared that no changes in family conflict were observed at higher levels of authoritative parenting for integrated, separated, and marginalized individuals. This finding is consistent with Darling and Steinberg (1993) who emphasized the importance of considering the cultural context of family’s values and socialization goals when examining parenting behaviors.

As in all studies, the present study has limitations. First, a potential limitation is the study’s reliance on perceived parents’ adherence to Asian cultural values and parenting styles; participants’ perceptions may differ from their parents’ own accounts of their values and parenting styles. Despite this limitation, findings from past studies suggest that perceptions of parental behaviors may be a relevant and important dimension of family functioning for Asian Amer-
icans. For example, several studies utilized participant-perceived variables, such as perceived parental acculturation (Lee et al., 2000), perceived parental traditionalism (Aldwin & Greenberger, 1987), and perceived parent–child Asian values gap (Ahn et al., 2008) and found these variables to be significantly related to mental health and family conflict variables.

Second, the scale (i.e., PAQ) utilized to measure parenting style elicited childhood recollections of parenting behaviors. Although other studies have used the PAQ with college students, it is unclear how accurately recall data captured actual parenting behaviors while they were children. According to Gerlsma, Arrindell, and Emmelkamp (1991), recalled parenting styles may be influenced by current mood states (i.e., depression), suggesting the presence of potentially intervening variables when examining recall data.

A third limitation is that the study recruited participants from an Asian American Studies course. Although the majority of the enrolled students reported that they were taking the course to fulfill a general education requirement, as opposed to majoring in Asian American Studies, these students may be particularly more interested in topics related to Asian Americans than those not enrolled in the course. In addition, although we did not reveal the study’s hypotheses to the participants, the materials covered in the course might have biased their attitudes toward the study’s variables. Fourth, the participants were recruited from a university in the West Coast and Asian American college students from other regions of the United States may have different attitudes toward the study’s variables. Taken together, the recruitment strategy used in the present study limits the generalizability of the findings to the overall Asian American college student population.

The results of the present study have implications for future research. As a response to the limitation of the present study’s use of students’ perceptions of parents’ adherence to Asian values and parenting styles, future studies might examine actual parents’ scores on these variables. In addition, the effects of parenting may be more pertinent for Asian American children and adolescents than college students, since college students generally have less everyday contact with their parents because they tend to live away from home. Future research might examine the study’s variables with the Asian American children and adolescent populations. Based on previous literature and the unexpected findings regarding authoritarian parenting style, future studies might deconstruct this variable by examining aspects that are restrictive versus those that help organize children’s behavior (e.g., Lau & Cheung, 1987). Lastly, we designated family conflict as the outcome variable in the present study because it is a common struggle faced by Asian American families. However, it may be informative in future studies to examine family conflict as a predictor variable given that the relations between these variables are correlational as opposed to causal. For example, the level of family conflict may influence children’s attitudes toward acculturation and enculturation.

Notwithstanding the limitations in the study, the present results also have implications for clinical practice with Asian American families. The results showed that the parents’ use of authoritarian parenting style could be based on their adherence to Asian cultural values. Therefore, it might be beneficial for clinicians to validate the cultural basis for Asian Americans’ parenting styles, and help parents and children become more aware and understanding of parents’ use of the authoritarian style. Furthermore, clinicians can help parents understand that their children may value autonomy and self-reliance based on their acculturation to the dominant Western culture in the United States. Clinicians can help the parents become aware of how children might react to their authoritarian parenting, and how that this parenting style may contribute to family conflict. Finally, the present results suggest that the effects of parenting style on students may vary according to their acculturation and enculturation levels. Rather than inflexibly prescribing a particular parenting style for Asian American parents, clinicians might make their recommendations based on an assessment of the children’s level of acculturation and enculturation.
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