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Abstract

Parental expectation, particularly among Chinese family groups, is understood to be formative upon their children’s identity, behavior in family relationships, educational success and decisions in career choices. China's long history of traditionalism in its social values, heavily based on Confucian philosophy of the family, bears this out. Significant social changes have happened in recent years due to political shifts, modernization, capitalization, immigration, and government population control policies. However, expectation is an element on which both academic study and educational research are rather limited. Current study has touched on the topic of parental expectation and raised some awareness, but the need for further empirical study would serve not only to clarify the changing state of parental expectation regarding the development of children, but also its critical impact on the much weakened family relationships among contemporary Chinese families.

The purpose of this study is to investigate parental expectation and its influence upon the parent-child relationship in family relationships through mixed methods due to the complexity of a very reserved nature culturally rooted among Chinese groups. The qualitative research methods involved both interviews and focus group studies, while the quantitative research explored the influence of parental expectation on parent-child relationship through a questionnaire survey with 41 items in Likert scale via Exploratory Factor Analysis on SPSS.

Keywords: expectation, relationship, parental expectation, parent-child relationship, family relationship, Chinese cultural groups.

關键词：期望、关系、父母期望、亲子关系、家庭关系、華裔文化群體
Chapter One: Introduction

Observation and Rationale

Gullotta and Blau (2008) stated that “there are numerous factors that impact child development, but the most important is the influence of family,” and “the parental environment is the first contextual factor encountered and thus serves as the impetus for a child’s development” (pp. 22 & 26). Parents are children’s first social relationship, function, and network. Prior to and concurrent with school education, the influence of parents eventually permeates into children’s values, identities, and growth in all aspects of life as their lives expand (Coser, 1964; Lewis & Rosenblum, 1979). However, the knowledge of human development and the understanding of family relationships are subjects rarely addressed within school curriculum before “adulthood” at the age of 18 and in higher education only when such subject emphasis is selected.

Education in the form of schooling is designed to cultivate students’ talents and advance their professional opportunities toward their interests by having the best curriculum, facility, systems and educators. No child is supposed to be left behind, but to be granted opportunities for education to further expand and realize their potential and future. However, there is sparse or no existence of curriculum in family relationship education in our education system to equip individuals for their future marriage and/or parenthood during their formative years. From elementary, secondary, college to post graduate studies, individuals rarely receive any knowledge, if at all, in understanding family development or how to cope with family relationship difficulties until they find themselves in need of seeking counseling when problems arise, worsen and become unmanageable due to unmet expectations in family relationships. In such situations,
relationships have already deteriorated to the point of being “beyond repair,” where one oftentimes perceives no choice but to give up. Individuals who were already parents of grownups and were in seriously broken relationship with their own elderly parent literally expressed deep frustration as they were not able to meet the expectations of the elderly parent, even after much genuine effort of trying.

Parents with unmet expectations become open to frustration or depression, while children become open to discouragement or traumatization. Unmet expectations in marital relationships occur to the point where husband or wife can no longer live with the spouse, he/she was once deeply in love with. Consequently, the number of broken families increases. The brokenness of family relationships has become a major epidemic in this modern world. Gullotta and Blau (2008) noted that nearly 50% of children would experience the divorce of their parents before age 18 in the U.S., and children who are raised in a divorced family typically have poor adjustment compared to their counterparts in intact families (p. 143). This could well influence children’s fortunes in a range of outcomes, including academic success, self-esteem, self-confidence, and even physical and mental health (Davies & Cummings, 1994; Saarela & Finnäs, 2003). Research shows that parental marital discord is negatively related to an offspring’s marital harmony and is positively related to an offspring’s marital discord (Amato & Booth, 2001). Troxel and Matthews (2004) also stated that conflict surrounding divorce would influence children’s health even more than parental absence (p. 41).

The family is the primary learning environment for children. Children need warm, loving, and stable home conditions to grow and develop in a healthy manner (Thompson & Henderson 2007). However, given an inability to meet certain seemingly unreachable
Parental expectations and experiencing family discord due to parental expectation dysfunction, there are more and more children whose resentments increase towards their parents, who may be genuinely dedicated, and children who rather choose to stay single than married as a result of bearing deep unspoken hurt within themselves. In some extreme cases, they would even rather run away from home than live under the pressures of meeting such unbearable parental expectations and staying in families that are dysfunctional. Such brokenness continues to increase from family to family and generation to generation (Ren & Edwards, 2015).

**Statement of the Problem**

Parental expectations, particularly among Chinese family groups, are understood to be formative upon their children’s identity, behavior in family relationships, educational success, and decisions in career choices (Okubo, Yeh, Lin, Fujita & Shea, 2007). The long history of Chinese traditionalism in its social values, heavily based on the Confucian philosophy of the family, bears this out. Significant social changes, however, have taken place in recent years due to political shifts, modernization, capitalization, immigration, and government population control policies. But regrettably, parental expectation relating to the parent-child relationship is a topic in which both academic study and empirical research are still rather limited. The purpose of this study is to explore the influence of parental expectation on the parent-child relationship, and to investigate its potential and critical impact on family relationships among contemporary Chinese family groups.
The Current Research Database

In the conduct of this study, one of the major challenges encountered was the limitation of empirical literature with regard to current studies on the topic. The existing empirical articles on parental expectations were mostly focused on academic achievement (Costigan, Hua, & Su, 2010; Kim, Wang, Chen, Shen, & Hou, 2015; Liao & Wei, 2014; Quach, Epstein, Riley, Falconier, & Fang, 2015; Sheng, 2014) and social-emotional development (Gao, 2012; Ren & Edwards, 2015; Shek, 2002, 2008). Given this circumstance, the researcher explored the current research database via the following different search combinations.

A search of PsycINFO using criteria “parental expectation” and “academic achievement” yielded only 34 results out of 248 articles when the mediating term “Chinese” was entered. For “parental expectation” and “mental health,” 133 articles were found; and when “Chinese” was entered, only 9 results remained available. When using “parental expectation” and “family relationship”, 20 results were found; and when the criterion with “Chinese” was entered, only 1 result remained available. Searching further using “parental expectation” and “parent child relationship,” there were 45 articles found and when “Chinese” was entered, only 2 results remained available. No result was found under the screening term “parent-child relationship” when paired with the filtered term “Chinese.”

Another search that the researcher conducted was by using the combination of “curriculum” and “parent-child relationship” and “China.” One result was found. It is a study of “Empirical exploration on improving parent-child relationship by using Psychological-Suzhi-Education software” (Qi & Zhang, 2011). The researcher also used
“curriculum” and “family relationship” to search further on the related subject and only 1 result was found. It is a study titled “Influence of Taoist education on the subjective well-being of the elderly” (Zhou, Yao, & Xu, 2002), which addressed the area of Chinese culture that highly values the respect and care of the elderly. No result was found when using “curriculum,” “family relationship,” and “Taiwan.”

These results come to the conclusion that research on “parental expectation” relating to “parent-child relationship” or “family relationship” is extremely limited among Chinese cultural groups. In other words, to explore the influence of “parental expectation” and “family relationship” or “parent-child relationship” among Chinese groups is both imperative and potentially ground-breaking given that these Chinese groups represent a large population, one which comprises 20% of the population among all cultural groups (Shek & Ma, 2010).

Role and Purpose of the Study

One potential contribution of this study is to raise awareness and draw scholarly attention to further research regarding how expectations represent a critical factor in influencing relationships. This study focuses on parental expectations and parent-child relationships in a different dimensions of family relationships, particularly among Chinese cultural groups. The findings of this study will add a vital piece to the larger research picture of Chinese familial understanding of the challenges faced, which may on the one hand be unique to Chinese culture while on the other hand universal to child rearing.

The second potential contribution of this research is to develop an assessment as a useful tool that could create opportunities for reflective learning and review of the
childhood journey for individuals and lead to much needed discovery and discussion among family members in specific areas of childhood family experiences that have deep influence in life and family relationships. The hope is that constructive dialogue that can improve family relationships will come through the process of reflection and discussion. This is a particular boon due to the extremely limited assessment resources for Chinese parent-child relationships.

**Research Hypothesis and Questions**

Research pertinent to parental expectations and their influence on parent-child relationships is crucial and imperative as family is the primary growth environment for children (Klein & White, 1996). This study is focused on the exploration and investigation of the extent to which there are statistically significant measures of the influence of parental expectation on the parent-child relationship, and to what extent such parental expectations influence the parent-child relationship. This investigation focuses on the following questions:

- To what extent does a statistical significant relationship exist to indicate the influence between parental expectations and parent-child relationships?
- How do the descriptive statistics differ between paternal and maternal influences?
- To what extent do paternal and maternal differences in parental expectations exist?

**Focus of the Study**

There are three major limitations of this study. First, the assessment tools for a quantitative approach, particularly in evaluating family relationships, are very limited
not to mention the lack of instruments to assess parent-child relationships that include both English and Chinese versions. Secondly, theories of family structure/expectations are still emergent from the last decades and empirical research on the correlation between parental expectations and parent-child relationships is very limited as mentioned in previous database search results. This study is not designed to investigate potential causal inferences of parental expectations on parent-child relationships, but to explore the extent of any such relationships of the two variables. Last, but not least, due to the diversity of Chinese cultural groups all over the world (Bond, 1996; Roopnarine & Carter, 1992), such as American Born Chinese, Mainland China Chinese, Taiwanese Chinese, Cantonese Chinese, Singaporean Chinese, European Chinese, and so on, this study is purposely limited to three convenience-sample groups: American Born Chinese, Overseas Born Chinese in the U.S., and Taiwanese Chinese in Taiwan.

**Overview of Chapters**

This study focuses on the investigation of parental expectation and its influence upon parent-child relationships among Chinese family groups. Due to the complexity of the very reserved character traditional in Chinese culture, mixed methods are conducted which include both qualitative and quantitative methodology. The qualitative research methods involved both individual interviews and creative focus group studies. A questionnaire survey was employed for the quantitative approach, specifically designed to explore any possible correlation between parental expectation and parent-child relationships through 41 question items in Likert scale form in both paternal and maternal aspects.
In Chapter Two, the literature review addresses the theoretical construct, Chinese culture roots, government policy impact, issues due to modernization and capitalization, and challenges faced by immigrant families. The literature reviews consist of several empirical studies on family relationships with a synthesis and analysis provided by the researcher. Chapter three presents the methodology, research design, data collection and process. Chapter four addresses the results of the data. Chapter five discusses the results, strengths, limitations, implications, conclusions, and recommendations. An appendix includes administrative-related documents, interview consent form, as well as the employed questionnaire in both English and Chinese, which follows after said references.
Chapter Two: Literature Review

Theoretical Construct of Family Influence on Children

Family is the foremost learning environment for children. Hence, family relationship is crucial in nurturing the development of a child, and parents hold the primary influence in the lives of children. In most cases, parents are children’s first social contact and network. Prior and concurrent to school education, the influence of parents eventually broadens to children’s values, identities and growth in all aspects of life as their lives develop (Coser, 1964; Lewis & Rosenblum, 1979).

Society is composed of families. Families offer children their first contact with the world. In recent decades, the campaign for awareness of just how crucial families are to children’s development and mental health has become a national movement (Gullotta & Blau, 2008). According to the family theory of Klein and White (1996), White and Klein (2008), four major differences distinguish family as a social group from other associations and networks (pp. 21-23 and pp. 17-18):

- Families last for a considerably longer period of time than do most other social groups.
- Families are intergenerational.
- Families contain both biological and affinal (e.g., legal, common law) relationships between members.
- The biological (and affinal) aspects of families link them to a larger kinship organization.

Although there have been significant societal changes in family structure and dynamics, these four characteristics still remain evident and relevant.
Gullotta and Blau (2008) concluded that children’s development is affected by the types of parenting styles applied, which impacts their behavior, academic performance, and autonomy. Therefore, parenting competence is critical as conduct derived from parental expectations affects not only the emotional growth of children but also all their relationships. Lewis and Rosenblum (1979) affirmed that “A child’s social network forms a social environment from and through which pressure is extended to influence the child’s behavior and is also a vehicle through which the child exerts influence on others” (p. 25). In other words, expectation from the family shapes a child, and the influence continues to expand and become the perspective of the child which eventually develop the child’s expectation of others and the world of the child when s/he becomes a parent. Therefore, as the world becomes an integrated global village, it is imperative to understand the impact of parental expectation as such expectations influence generationally.

**Historical Roots of Parental Expectation in Chinese Culture and Value**

Expectation as a social construct is created and affected by culture and value. Culture and value are in turn two significant factors which shape a person. Chao (2001) commented that culture and value certainly influence the interactions and relationships between parents and their children. Among Chinese cultural groups, the traditional value and teaching of Confucius are still evident in models of socialization today, even though much of that was condemned during the early years of the People’s Republic of China (P.R.C.) and particularly during the Cultural Revolution (Miller, Wiley, Fung, & Liang, 1997; Wu, 1996, 1997). The three most highly stressed and deeply rooted expectations in Confucian principles among Chinese families are respect for the elderly, filial piety, and
the emphasis of education (Chuang & Tamis-LeMonda, 2013; Wang, 2014).

Respect for the elderly is highly emphasized in the Chinese family, according to traditional Chinese values derived from Confucian principles (Baggerly, Ray, & Bratton, 2010; Chao, 1994; Su & Costigan, 2009). Due to the teachings of Confucius that have been profoundly embedded in Chinese culture over the past 2,500 years, respect for the elderly is considered a philosophical virtue and intrinsic to “being Chinese.” With culture, society, and the family unit all imposing such a virtue on children, Chinese parents often command absolute authority and control over their children to follow parental expectations in different forms (Bates & Bates, 1995; Xu, Farver, Zhang, Zeng, Yu, & Cai, 2005). As Chao (2001) described, in Chinese culture, the style of parenting prescribes that children respect and obey their parents, rather than establishing closeness and intimacy with parents.

“Among all virtues, filial piety is the foremost” is a statement that is commonly taught and stressed in parenting according to historical Confucianist thought. Filial piety is therefore highly valued and strongly emphasized as a guiding principle among Chinese families in emphasizing respect for parents and all older people (Baggerly, Ray, & Bratton, 2010; Bond, 1996; Flanagan, 2011; Naftali, 2014; Shek, 2008; Su & Costigan, 2009; Yue & Ng, 1999). It is considered an indigenous Chinese virtue so favorably integrated in Chinese cultural history that it is perpetuated as a socialization pattern that is deeply intertwined with family relationship (Chan, & Tan, 2004; Fan, 2010; Yue & Ng, 1999), even becoming a qualification in the selection of suitable marital candidates to meet family expectations (Cheung & Pomerantz, 2011).

Confucianism likewise idealizes scholarly achievement and highly values
education (Wang, 2014). There is an old saying in Chinese culture, “Everything is lowly, but studying is supreme,” which describes how highly Chinese value academics above everything else. Numerous studies have noted how, due to the strong influence of Confucianism and its mandate of filial piety, children are expected by their parents to maintain high standards of academic achievement as a way to show respect for the elderly and bring honor to their families (Chen, 2014; Chen & Ho, 2012; Chen & Wong 2014). The emphasis becomes more distinctive as children grow older and the expression of parental expectation upon academic performance becomes greater. Filial piety and respect for elders become inextricably linked with a child’s academic achievement (Chen & Wong, 2014; Shek, 2007a). High academic performance becomes a classic gesture of filial piety in traditional Chinese families, viewed as a way of honoring the family.

Consequently, families perceive their children's failure in academic performance as an absence of filial piety or “causing shame to the family.” Children who do not practice filial piety or have any misdeeds are looked upon as a source of family shame and disgrace, and are often made to feel guilty (Slote & De Vos, 1998). Chinese parents’ educational expectations toward their children’s academic success have become uniquely complicated and compounded by their cultural and social views of what is honorable and virtuous. Researchers have commented that Chinese parents predictably demonstrate their love by providing all possible financial, material, and psychological support for the learning of their children, and their only expectation in return is their children’s success in academics (Chen & Ho, 2014; Chen & Wong, 2012). Chen (2014) stated that “because of Confucianism, schools, families, and the entire society have an interwoven education net to support and urge students to meet academic success” (p.78). The parents’
educational expectations of their offspring reflects an ulterior expectation of prosperity and blessing (through their children’s top career choices and professional success) that Chinese parents assume will result later in their children’s lives (Chu, 1999; Ramirez, 2008); this particular expectation will be discussed below, along with how it correlates to the parent-child relationship among Chinese families.

**Traditional Parenting Style and Involvement in the Chinese Family**

As described above, in traditional Chinese culture, parenting style often results in relationship dynamics that center on parental respect and meeting parental expectations rather than developing closeness and intimacy in the parent-child relationship (Chao, 2001). Darling and Steinberg (1993) have defined parenting style as a global construct reflected in the overall emotional tone of the parent-child relationship. Among Chinese families, respect oftentimes means obeying, satisfying and meeting parents’ expectations, especially the expectation of academic achievement and career choice (Samura, 2015; Shek, 2007a; Su & Costigan, 2009).

In addition, the pattern of socialization in parenting among Chinese families will adjust in function according to the child’s age (Barber, 2002). Thus, following Confucian teachings, respect and obedience are more strongly instilled as soon as children are able to comprehend (Wu, 1996). This change in attitude occurs when the child has reached the “age of understanding” or “reasoning.” usually at around four to six years of age (Gorman, 1998; Ho, 1986). For example, Chinese parents typically are lenient or indulgent in their attitude toward infants and young children, which is very different from the stricter discipline they impose on older children as parental expectation increases regarding their children’s academic commitment (Garcia, Meyer, & Brillon, 1995; Ho,
With respect to parental expectation and control, scholars have reported that parents may use a variety of strategies, including threatening, scolding, punishment, and shaming to achieve their goals (Ho, 1986; Shek, 2008a). Researchers have noted that, not only do parents shame their children, but Chinese teachers, even primary school ones, also use shaming as a discipline technique (Fung, 1999; Fung & Lau, 2009; Gershoff et al., 2010; Helwig, To, Wang, Liu, & Yang, 2014). Both at home and in school, the mechanisms of psychological control, particularly shaming, love withdrawal (i.e., threats of abandonment), authoritarian assertion, and placing guilt seem to be a prevalent part of Chinese children’s socialization. Some parents apparently believe that awareness of shame will motivate a child to improve his or her performance (Barber, 2002; Wang, Pomerantz, & Chen, 2007). As a consequence, children who have behavioral or social problems frequently undergo humiliation, privately or publicly, by their parents, teachers or peers (Barber, 2002; Helwig, et al., 2014). Further study of the various approaches to imposing guilt and shame is needed in order to completely understand the long-term effects on parents and children.

Speaking of parental involvement in children’s learning, Cheung and Pomerantz’s study (2011) indicates that American parents typically do not insist on checking over their children’s homework, for example, but allow their children to decide whether they want their parents to be involved. In contrast, Chinese parents often involve themselves in their children’s learning, but rarely give validation or praise. It is common for Chinese parents to take it for granted when their children receive top marks; anything less invites reproach. It is debatable whether the heightened involvement of Chinese parents is
conducive to the social competence and psychological well-being of their children. It certainly does differ from the typical American attitude toward involvement in their children’s homework (Cheung & Pomerantz, 2011; Shek, 2007a).

Changes in Family Structure and Dynamic in Recent Decades

Socialization is the process of social interaction which shapes one’s personality and lifestyle, and enables people to internalize norms, values, skills, beliefs and other behavioral patterns, but it takes time to adjust and adopt. In modernized society, culture, family, school, and mass media influence the transformation of children’s socialization. Among all the influences, family undoubtedly is the top vital social factor, as it shapes children’s primitive self-perception and their basic status, motives, values, and beliefs. However, due to significant socio-political changes in the Chinese traditional family structure and value, in addition to growing digital-age influence from western cultures, Chinese families find themselves facing unprecedented conflicts and challenges in parenting and family relationship-building (Wang & Liu, 2006).

In recent years in the P.R.C., Chinese families have experienced drastic changes and transitions regarding family structure due to modernization, urbanization and capitalization, and especially the government’s implementation of the One-Child policy (Fong, 2004; Roopnarine & Carter, 1992; Xu, et al., 2005). The One-Child policy was the world’s first strict and state-mandated birth control policy which was implemented in 1979. As a result, the vast majority of Chinese children, youth, and young parents born after 1979 are single children due to China’s One-Child policy (Fong, 2004; Hesketh et al., 2015). The One-Child policy’s single goal was population control, but the policy has unintentionally changed the family into a “four-two-one” structure, meaning four
grandparents, two parents and one child (Chen, Xiu, & Li, 2000; Chuang & Tamis-LeMonda, 2013). The majority of children born in China under the policy were forced to become the sole person carrying the expectations of the entire family, i.e., expectations from two parents plus two sets of grandparents, and sometimes even from uncles and aunts. With China facing the fastest-aging society in the world and a disproportionate boy-girl ratio, the concerned government changed tactics in October 2015 to launch its universal two-child policy (Hesketh et al., 2015; Reynolds, 2016). The impact of this policy change upon the Chinese family dynamic will eventually need to be investigated.

Another factor affecting the development of children in China today is that more mothers are highly educated and have joined the work force, so they leave their only and lonely children to the grandparents to look after. The benefit is that the lone child is well taken care of, but the disadvantage is that oftentimes, the child is spoiled and indulged by grandparents who try to lower expectations in general in order to make up for the loss of time and attention from the child’s own parents (Chuang & Tamis-LeMonda, 2013; Wang & Liu, 2006). This is a topic that has raised considerable attention in recent years, but a useful collation of research has yet to emerge.

**Sample Research Studies: An Overview of Findings and Limitations**

In 1986, a survey was conducted among a study group of families in the cities of Beijing, Tianjin, Shanghai, Nanjing, and Chengdu. The survey showed that the nuclear family has become conventional for the modernized family structure in China, particularly in urban areas (Wang & Liu, 2006). Unlike the traditional family where members of multiple generations co-habit together, the nuclear family is typically reduced to just three: parents and their single child. The overall family obligation carried
by parents in society is correspondingly reduced, and they can focus more time and resources on educating their one and only beloved child, fulfilling their Confucian concepts of proper child raising (Wang & Liu, 2006). In a later study, Liu (2011) noted that these children have become the center of attention and are often accused of being self-centered. Watson (2004) expressed the perception of a new generation of Chinese young people, each of whom grew up being the only child in the household, being known locally as “little emperors” or “little empresses.” However, Liu noted that the nation was taken by surprise when many of these young people responded with great compassion and responsibility during times of national crisis, exampled in the Wenchuan earthquake relief work and in such events as the 2008 Beijing Olympic Games, going beyond the expectation of their parents and the society in a positive manner (Liu, 2011). This surprising result suggests another area of need for future study, to investigate whether or not bearing all of their family’s affections, hopes, and expectations actually caused these solitary Chinese children to become ultra-responsible.

**The American Immigration Experience for Chinese Parents and Children**

In the middle of the nineteenth century, Chinese immigrants began to arrive in America in significant numbers. Most of these early immigrants lacked monetary resources and were drawn to California by the so-called “gold rush.” often in hopes of sending money back home or starting a new life. In addition to gold mining, some were employed in agriculture, factories, and clothing manufacture, but most were in railroad construction. Over 10,000 Chinese laborers were involved in the building of the western portion of the first transcontinental railroad from 1865 to 1869. These early immigrants faced outright racism and frequently bonded together in Chinatown (Lee & Son, 1999).
More than a century later, the Chinese American population grew from about 230,000 in 1960 to over one million by 1985 (Lee & Son, 1999; Li & Yu, 2012). In the 2010 U.S. census, over 4 million Chinese were recorded as residing in the United States (Li & Yu, 2012). A major portion of this population growth still derives from immigration rather than native births.

The Chinese immigrants of the last few decades have tended to settle in suburban neighborhoods with little connection to a Chinatown. They are typically more affluent, better educated, and more acculturated to Western capitalist society than the earlier immigrants. The second and third generations of Chinese immigrants have also achieved significant cultural assimilation in American society due to diminished racial barriers, bringing them much success educationally and professionally (Cao, 2005).

Accordingly, Chinese immigrant families pursue the legendary “American Dream,” just as many other ethnic groups have done. In the United States, immigrant children often become Americanized so quickly that their parents cannot keep up with them. Usually, there is fear in the older generation that their children will forget about their roots. This fear, however, has originated not from the process of acculturation, but from the immigration process itself. Immigrant children and their parents tend to identify their relationship with the new environment from different angles. The young generations are usually more adaptable and tend to focus on integration as they adjust. They learn how to quickly fit in and gain acceptance and validation from their American peers and social media. They observe American families and soon absorb the individuality and self-expression of the American culture. At times, the young generations of immigrant families feel embarrassed by their parents who seem to be “odd,” which often cause them
to appear not to fit in with the mainstream American culture and values. On the other hand, immigrant Chinese parents are usually most concerned with economic survival and making the best investments in a new environment while continuing to parent along the traditional family values of their culture. These parental expectations and concerns remain focused on emphasizing obedience and supporting scholastic achievement (Zhou, 1997), i.e., the old standards for filial piety and respect.

It is common that immigration families experience conflict, frustration, and misunderstanding. In Chinese immigrant families, the major argument is usually about the discretion over the new ways versus the rooted traditional parental expectation. This comes as no surprise, as researches have shown that intergenerational conflicts lead to diminishing of parental authority and the breakdown of family communications, which have significantly negative impact on children’s self-esteem, psychosocial well-being, and academic aspirations (Gil & Vega, 1996; Rumbaut, 1996; Szapocznik & Hernandez, 1988). Specifically, the conflict between the two social worlds of parent and child is the most commonly cited problem of intergenerational relations due to their difference in expectations. In fact, intergenerational conflicts are not simply a unique immigrant phenomenon (Berrol, 1995; Child, 1943); they are also a cultural phenomenon rooted in the American tradition of a “moral rejection of authority” (Gorer, 1963). This dilemma often becomes the main challenge for Chinese American families as parental expectations are not met by their children.

**Research on the Asian American College Student Identity Struggle**

Samura’s research (2015), though not focused exclusively on ethnic Chinese, provides a useful, related study of how expectations affect Asian American college
students, particularly in their social and academic lives. The data collection was focused on two types of expectations: students’ internal and external expectations. The students’ internal expectations were more related to how the students perceived themselves and their own expectations of their study and career choice. External expectations derived more from their family and society.

Meeting parental expectations has been an issue of common discussions among Asian families and is recognized as one that frequently affects the harmony of family relationships. Kao (2002) concluded that Asian parents and Chinese immigrant parents set extremely high expectations on their children. Asian American college students often internalize parental expectations, and they even habitually perceived these expectations to be higher than they actually are (Feliciano, 2006). However, research on the expectation of Asian American college students is very limited, not to mention the expectation which are originated from family or parents. Besides, there is paucity of research on the social/cultural implications of the various expectations.

Samura’s study had three goals. One was to provide an illustration on the diverse type of expectations which many Asian American college students wrestle with. A second was to specify and highlight these different types and sources of expectations. The third goal addressed how the students manage these expectations.

The directing research questions of Samura’s study were “How do Asian American students navigate through physical and social spaces of higher education?” and “How do Asian American college students understand what it means to be ‘Asian American’ today?” (Samura, 2015, p. 603). The reflexive and self-reflexive capacities of the students were emphasized. This approach allowed the researcher to focus on an
analysis of the effects of the interactions between students’ internal and external expectations of their racial identity as Asian Americans.

Samura’s study involved a sample collected through verbal announcements in classes, flyers around campus, email announcements, and Facebook pages. Snowball sampling enabled further recruitment of participants. There was a total of 36 college students, with data collected from interviews with 18 and data collected from the journaling and photos of 19. One participant participated in both types of data collection. The participants consisted of 31% male and 69% female. Most were mainly upper level students (3rd or 4th year college students).

Information on family income was not compiled. The students mostly claimed and categorized their families as either “middle class” or “upper middle class”. Seventy-eight percent indicated that English was their first language. Sixty-seven percent were born in the United States. The majority claimed that they were first generation (born outside of US) or second generation (born in the US with at least one parent who was born in another country). Among the 36 participants, 10 identified as first generation (28%), one identified as 1.5 generation (3%), and 17 identified as second generation (47%). There were about 28% who self-identified as mixed race or mixed ethnicity. Among the 36 participants, 16 (44%) identified as Chinese or part-Chinese. The rest of the participants included those who self-identified as Japanese, Vietnamese, Filipino, Cambodian, Korean, Taiwanese, Laotian, Thai, and Guamanian (Samura, 2015).

Semi-structured interviews on four topic sections were performed; included was an exploration of how students spent time, their academic development, social engagement, and lastly, their personal development. For photo journals, students were
instructed to take pictures of their daily lives (objects, people, and places that held significant meaning for them) for a minimum of one week, guided by a list of eight questions (Samura, 2015).

According to the data and findings from the interviews and photo journals, the researcher concluded that students in this study wrestled with both internal and external expectations. Although sources of expectations varied, they included implicit and explicit categories.

Regarding internal expectation, students mainly struggled with social issues, academic achievement, and post-college development. For social development, they often found themselves detached from previous expectations or initial intentions. Regarding college, Asian American students viewed college as a stage of self-discovery which would lead to their career development when a major was selected, or a degree obtained. The influence of personal expectations and parental aspirations in this area is not doubted but was too indirect to discern.

For external expectations, Samura mainly focused on family and societal expectations. For family expectations, parents’ expectation unquestionably emerged as the primary influence. Two expressions of parental expectations were noted—one concerned behavior and the other, academics. Prior to college, students’ behaviors are usually closely monitored by their parents. Then, after leaving home and parents, the students experienced much more freedom and choices in life in college, attributable largely to parents expecting them to be more independent and self-disciplined. Samura (2015) noted that, “College was a time during which control was transferred from parents to students, at least in theory” (p. 610). Indeed, during this phase, students expressed
experiencing a transitioning sense of control. Asian parents showed more leniency towards their college-age children’s social life as long as strong academic performance is attained. Parental expectations about academics remained high and unchanged.

The area of “academics” is often extended to the choice of majors and eventual career selection. Some of the participants expressed the thought that their parents would try to dominate or influence their choice of major and future career options, due to concerns regarding future job security. This frequently stemmed from the parents’ own struggle and hardship in their immigrant experience. Some students felt that their parents did not allow freedom but set an idealized “perfect” high standard. Some students expressed being unable to distinguish whether this standard was their own or still coming from their parents’ expectations. Samura noted that the findings from this study mostly aligned with existing research that points out the critical influence of family in the lives of Asian American students. Samura (2015) concluded, “even though I anticipated parents having some influence on their children, I was not expecting the large extent to which parents impacted these students’ lives” (p.614).

**Research on Parental Control and Parent-Child Relational Qualities**

Shek conducted a number of studies of parental control and parent-child relationship in Hong Kong (Shek, 2005, 2005b, 2006, 2007a, 2007b, 2007c, 2008a, 2008b; Siu & Shek, 2005). One of Shek’s (2005) studies focused on the correlation of parental control (including parental knowledge, expectation, monitoring, discipline, and demands) with parent-child relational qualities (satisfaction, child initiative, trust of child, and child’s trust). Shek considered two types of parental control: behavioral control and psychological control. The psychological means of parental control describes how
parents control their child’s activities in ways that could adversely impact or harm the child’s psychological development. This type of parental control is comprised of “intrusiveness, guilt induction, and love withdrawal, interferences with the child’s ability to become independent and to develop a healthy sense of self and personality” (Smetana & Daddis, 2002, p. 563). The other type of parental control, behavioral control, consists of “rules, regulations, and restrictions” (Smetana & Daddis, 2002, p. 563) that parents impose on their children.

Shek (as cited by Maccoby and Martin, 1983), identified at least five different forms of parental behavioral control, including (p. 636):

1. Parental knowledge, i.e., how much the parent knows about the situation of the child.
2. Parental expectations, i.e., parental rules and expectations of the parent.
3. Parental monitoring, i.e., parental surveillance and tracking and whether the parent takes initiative to understand the child.
4. Parental discipline, the reward/punishment of the child in relation to parental expectations; and
5. Global parental “demandingness,” based on the existing models of parenting.

Shek addressed several weaknesses and limitations in studies of parents’ behavioral control. One major issue was insufficient research on the topic of mutual trust between parents and their children and children’s readiness for communication with parents. This has not attracted much scholarly attention. Four limitations regarding parental control and parent-child relational qualities were pinpointed by Shek (2005).
First, the paternal and maternal control process has rarely been assessed separately. Second, the responses and perceptions of adolescents regarding parents has been studied in a mixed-gender group, but the result might be very different if the female and male adolescents were studied independently. Third, these related studies were mostly conducted from the context of a Western worldview and neglect the influence of critical cultural elements. Lastly, the studies of the correlation of parental socioeconomic status and parental educational expectations were conducted in the West, where living standards are higher than that of families in Asia in general. Any or all of these issues will affect the results.

Three research questions were presented in Shek’s 2005 study:

1. Do Chinese adolescents perceive paternal and maternal parental control and parent-child relational qualities to be different?
2. Do Chinese adolescent boys and girls differ in their perceived parental control processes and parent-child relational qualities?

Shek’s survey consisted of nine questionnaires which required 45-60 minutes to complete. The sample included confidential responses from 3,001 secondary school students (1,331 boys and 1,670 girls, the mean age being 12.65 years) in Hong Kong.

To analyze the Parental and Gender Differences in Perceived Parental Control, seven 2 (gender of parent) x 2 (gender of adolescent) ANOVAs were performed. The within-subject factor was parents, while the between-subject factor was gender of the respondents. The results indicated that parents’ gender had significant major effects. The
genders of the adolescents also had significant effects. Both gender and parents had significant interaction effects. Post-hoc comparison was performed based on Fisher’s Least Significant Difference Test (LSD) to confirm the results (Shek, 2005).

In addition, to analyze Parental and Gender Differences on Parent-Child Relational Qualities, four 2 (gender of parent) x 2 (gender of adolescent) ANOVAs were conducted. Parents remained as the within-subject factor, with gender of the respondents being the between-subjects factor. Post-hoc comparisons were also performed based on Fisher’s LSD test. The result showed that maternal trust was perceived higher than paternal trust by male adolescents, and the results appeared to be at a similar level of trust for female adolescents upon both father and mother accordingly. Adolescent girls perceived maternal responsiveness higher than boys did, even though there was no difference between adolescent boys and girls on perception of paternal responsiveness (Shek, 2005).

There was a total of eleven sets of measures, and the mean of the alpha scores for reliabilities was .80 (minimum = .68, maximum = .90) and standard deviation was .07. The eleven measures included: Paternal and Maternal Knowledge Scale, Paternal and Maternal Expectation Scale, Paternal and Maternal Monitoring Scale, Paternal and Maternal Discipline Scale, Paternal and Maternal Parenting Style Scale for both Responsiveness and Demandingness on both fathers and mothers, Paternal and Maternal Psychological Control Scale, Chinese Paternal and Chinese Maternal Control Scale, Satisfaction with Paternal and Maternal Control Scale, Readiness to Communicate with the Father and the Mother Scale, Paternal and Maternal Trust of Children Scale, and Children’s Trust of Father and Mother Scale. The data are presented in Table 1.
Table 1

Effects of Parents (Fathers vs. Mother) and Gender (Boys vs. Girls) on the Different Indicators of Parental Control and Parent-Child Relational Qualities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Fathers (means)</th>
<th>Mothers (means)</th>
<th>Post hoc comparisons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>Boys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental control measures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>18.61</td>
<td>18.46</td>
<td>21.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectation</td>
<td>19.61</td>
<td>19.07</td>
<td>20.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>16.26</td>
<td>15.75</td>
<td>19.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline</td>
<td>14.17</td>
<td>13.76</td>
<td>15.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demands</td>
<td>9.05</td>
<td>9.78</td>
<td>10.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent-child relational qualities measures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>11.57</td>
<td>11.94</td>
<td>12.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child’s initiative</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>5.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent’s trust of child</td>
<td>14.35</td>
<td>15.20</td>
<td>14.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child’s trust of parents</td>
<td>14.06</td>
<td>14.32</td>
<td>14.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental responsiveness measure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* S = Significant at the 1% level; N = Non-Significant at the 5% level.

The data collected from these measures on Parental Control indicate that the mean score for boys’ perception of paternal parental control was very close to that of girls, and the same for how the boys and girls perceived the Maternal Parental Control in Knowledge, Expectation, Monitoring and Discipline. Both mean scores of boys and girls on perceiving maternal Knowledge, Expectation, Monitoring, Discipline, and Demands
were higher than the scores for paternal equivalents in all five areas. The scores on how girls perceived the Parental Control in Demands were significantly higher than boys’ scores in both paternal and maternal scores. The mean score of boys on perceiving both paternal and maternal expectation was higher than that of girls, and the mean scores of boys’ perception on Parent-Child relational qualities were lower than the mean scores of girls’ in all four areas for both paternal and maternal (Satisfaction, Child Initiative, Trust of Child, and Child’s Trust). Boys’ perception of paternal responsiveness produced a significantly lower score than that of the girls in paternal responsiveness, but both genders’ perceptions of maternal responsiveness were similar. Finally, boys responded with higher scores on maternal responsiveness than for paternal.

The results indicated that mothers in general exercised more behavioral control than fathers on such indicators of Parental Control in knowledge, expectation, monitoring, discipline, and global “demandingness.” The widely held assumption of “Strict father, Kind mother” seems to be reversed, according to Shek’s research. Both Chinese fathers and mothers have higher expectations on boys than girls. However, both boys and girls have stronger parent-child relationship with mothers than with fathers.

A Spearman’s correlational analysis was conducted on Parental Education and Parental Control as well as Parent-Child Relational Qualities. The results indicated that parental control and parent-child relational qualities were significantly related to both paternal and maternal education, with $p < .001$ for factor on paternal education, and $p < .01$ for factor on maternal education (Shek, 2005).

**A Longitudinal Study on Parental Control and Parent-Child Relational Qualities**

Shek continued to conduct a number of related studies through 2008 (Shek,
2005b, 2006, 2007a, 2007b, 2007c, 2008a; Siu & Shek, 2005). Of relevance is his three-year longitudinal study, conducted among the same 16 schools of 3,017 Chinese Adolescents in Hong Kong, which is very worthwhile for discussion here. The three research questions in this particular study were (Shek, 2008b, p. 334):

- What are the relationships between different dimensions of parental behavioral control (including parental expectation, monitoring, discipline, and demandingness) and parental knowledge?

- Are parental monitoring and child’s readiness to communicate with the parent related to parental knowledge?

- In a broader context, are parental behavioral control domain and parent-child relationship domain related to parental knowledge?

The instruments involved include measures in identifying the parental behavioral control and parent-child relational qualities of both fathers and mothers. All participants responded to all the instrument scales in the self-administration format of questionnaires. Data was derived from the three years in three waves: Time 1, Time 2, and Time 3. This longitudinal study provided data based on the performed factor scores after Varimax rotation for data reduction which resulted in multiple regression analyses. The summary of results on the measures of the parental behavior control and parent-child relational qualities is included in Table 2 below.

The results indicated that there were high coefficients of congruence when the total sample was randomly split into two sub-samples. In addition, cross-time consistency was found by the results of means for all combinations of factors on Paternal Behavioral Control, Father-Child Relational Quality, Maternal Behavioral Control, and Mother-
Child Relational Quality were the same, $M = .99$ (Shek, 2008b).

### Table 2

**Varimax Rotated Factor Structures of The Measures of Parental Behavioral Control and Parent-Child Relational Qualities at Time 1, Time 2, and Time 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Paternal Variables</th>
<th>Maternal Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time 1</td>
<td>Time 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F1   F2</td>
<td>F1   F2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectation</td>
<td>.03  .85</td>
<td>.05  .85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>.36  .69</td>
<td>.37  .71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline</td>
<td>.07  .78</td>
<td>.09  .78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demands</td>
<td>.29  .66</td>
<td>.25  .69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>.81  .24</td>
<td>.85  .21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Initiative</td>
<td>.71  .34</td>
<td>.71  .35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust of the Child</td>
<td>.81  .01</td>
<td>.83  .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child’s Trust</td>
<td>.84  .15</td>
<td>.84  .20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. F1 = Factor 1 (Parental control factor); F2 = Factor 2 (Parent-child relational quality factor); $p < .001$

From Table 2, the results also indicated that all three measures of Paternal Variables of F1 (Paternal control factor) in Expectation showed significantly higher scores than Maternal Variables, even though the scores for the F2 (Parent-Child Relational Quality) factor in both Paternal and Maternal Variables were very similar. And, interestingly, in all three measures of Paternal Variables of F1 (Paternal control factor) and F2 (Parent-Child Relational Quality), the factor in Demands had significantly higher scores than Maternal Variables. Regarding Child’s Trust, all three measures of Paternal Variables and Maternal Variable in F1 (Paternal control) factor had similar
scores, while all three measures of Paternal Variables in F2 (Parent-Child Relational Quality) factor had higher scores than Maternal Variables. Apparently, these results indicate that these Hong Kong adolescents perceived their fathers having higher expectations than their mothers had, even though they perceived similar parent-child relationships with both fathers and mothers. These adolescents also perceived that fathers had higher demands than mothers, while their relational quality with fathers was better than with mothers regarding demands. According to the data, these children had similar trust levels toward fathers and mothers but reported better relational quality with fathers than with mothers.

Discussion and Synthesis

Research on parenting has centered mostly on parenting styles, parental involvement and parental control. Studies specifically focusing on parental expectation and its impact on parent-child relationship or family relationship, however, are rare and not extensive. The studies of Samura from 2015 and Shek from 2005 have served as pioneering efforts to investigate the effects of parental expectations on the parent-child relationship.

Samura’s work on how expectations affect Asian American college students provided a glimpse of the students’ struggles dealing with expectation, which was identified in two types (internal and external) and from two sources (parents and society). The study’s impetus is based on Herbert Blumer’s Symbolic Interactionism theory on how individuals interact among people and interpret the process to determine meanings, subsequently using the meanings to determine actions (Samura, 2015). Unfortunately, the extremely small sample size of 36 students neither represents a comprehensive analysis
of the phenomenon, nor is transferrable to other settings. Furthermore, the results to the initial research questions, “how do Asian American students navigate through physical and social spaces of higher education?” and “how do Asian American college students understand what it means to be ‘Asian American’ today?” were not discussed at inferential levels.

Samura’s research does contribute meaningfully to three areas, however. First, he observed that all the students in the study endeavored to compromise their internal expectations in order to balance external expectations. Secondly, although parental expectations took different forms, the impact on the external expectations placed upon their children continued to exert influence, only in more indirect ways. Lastly, the results indicate that these Asian American students seemed to be content with societal expectations regarding the racial stereotype of Asians as high academic achievers. Furthermore, Samura did investigate the “model minority” expectation that Asian Americans often encounter in society, i.e., that Asian Americans are often portrayed as and perceived as smart or hardworking in stereotype (Ma & Li, 2016). Another societal issue addressed was that some Asian American students intentionally separated themselves from the characteristics associated with this Asian stereotype by selecting majors opposite to what “stereotypical Asians” would select, such as science, engineering, mathematics, or technology. But by constantly trying to distance themselves from the stereotype, the students in fact made it central and reified it (Samura, 2015).

The culture Asian American college students represent has also become more and more diverse (Chen & Ho, 2012). Due to its wide range in both experiences and perspectives, further research on the subject to understand its variations is recommended.
Shek’s (2005) research on parental control and parent-child relational qualities indicated that there was a positive correlation between parents’ educational level and parental control in both Western and Chinese contexts. Also, Shek’s study included discussion of “Strict father, Kind mother,” which has been a stereotypic perception of Chinese culture (Ho, 1987; Cheung & Pomerantz, 2011; Shek, 2005). Shek demonstrated relevant understanding of the Chinese cultural background behind “Strict father, Kind mother” to promote further investigation of parental control and parent-child relational qualities. However, Shek’s findings did not support the “Strict father, Kind mother” assumption, but found “Strict mother, Kind father” instead (Shek, 2005). This aligned with the factors revealed in explaining why Chinese mothers were perceived by adolescents as more controlling than Chinese fathers. Yuwen and Chen (2013) conducted a study on different parenting styles between mothers and fathers among Chinese American adolescents and stated correspondingly that “mothers were perceived to be stricter than fathers, whereas fathers were perceived to be more relaxed and supportive” (p. 240). It was also found that children’s preferences were generally influenced by their dominant parent(s) (Chen, 2014). Still, whether there are positive impacts on children’s learning and achievement brought about by parents’ educational expectations and values, resulting in high academic performance, these were concluded to be dependent upon the student’s own beliefs and interpretations (Chen & Ho, 2012).

The findings of Shek’s (2005) research raise four suggestions stemming from the “Strict mother, Kind father” reversal. First, the results suggested redefining the cultural stereotype of parental control between mother and father. Second, in the socialization
process, mothers have traditionally had more participation in their children’s lives than fathers, who were often out of the home as breadwinners, but this is changing as more mothers work outside the home now too. Third, research to evaluate fathers’ beliefs about their paternal roles and responsibilities is needed to explain why they are less involved. Fourth, it is critical to study the parental control of fathers and mothers separately.

From Shek’s (2005) study, the quality of the mother-child relationship was found to be significantly more positive than the quality of the father-child relationship, specifically in these areas: children’s satisfaction with parental control, parent’s trust of the child, child’s trust of the parents, child’s readiness to communicate with the parent, and responsiveness. Shek (2005) further discussed the causes for difference in parental involvement and Chinese cultural background. Generally, mothers were free to be, or culturally or biologically expected to be more involved in the life of children than fathers, and they were also more emotionally expressive than fathers, which enabled the children to develop a stronger relationship and better trust in their mothers than in their fathers in general.

Other interesting remarks from Shek’s (2005) study included how adolescent boys and girls reflected maternal and paternal knowledge. In general, adolescent girls reflected higher maternal knowledge, paternal “demandingness,” and maternal “demandingness” than adolescent boys did. Regarding “demandingness,” Shek (2005) indicated that the chastity of girls is considered highly valuable in the traditional Chinese beliefs. This cultural perception is one definite reason why parents are more demanding when monitoring the leisure time of girls.

Two limitations were pointed out by Shek in his 2005 study. First, Shek suspected
that bias might be involved, since the assessment of parental control and parent-child relational qualities was based on self-reporting measures taken from the perspective of the child. Secondly, replication of the findings is needed in different cultural settings, since the sample of the 2005 study was limited to Hong Kong Chinese adolescents.

To conclude, Shek’s 2005 study serves as a pioneering effort and stimulus for more research evaluating parental control and parent-child relationship qualities in the Chinese family. Despite its limitations, Shek’s research can be respectfully considered as the leading study on the subject of parental and gender issues in Chinese culture. In particular, the study examined different gender-based perspectives in both parents and children. Later, Shek’s (2008) three-year longitudinal study added much to the investigation of parental expectations and parent-child relationships. Shek’s research separating the study by gender for both parents and children sets the stage for future studies, particularly among Chinese in locations beyond Hong Kong.

**Summary**

For better or worse, the family provides the primary learning environment for children. Children need warm, loving, and stable surroundings to grow and develop (Thompson & Henderson, 2007). Darling and Steinberg (1993) stated that societal expectations and values in the culture form and affect the attitudes and behaviors of parents. These social values and beliefs influence parenting styles and methods, which in turn play critical roles in the development of children (Harkness & Super, 1995.) The breadth of changes and the adaptations Chinese families and their society have undergone in response to those changes have been enormous and radical in recent decades, directly affecting parenting and parent-child relationships.
China has been a socialist country since the Communist Party of China assumed leadership in 1949, but in the late 1970s, after developing diplomatic and economic relations with the United States and other Western countries, the economic system of the P.R.C. has evolved from socialism to state-capitalism. While the one-party political system of the P.R.C. has remained unchanged, the social-economic transformation and new policy of openness has dramatically impacted the areas of education and family structure (Mazurek, Winzer, & Majorek, 2000). From an ancient heritage of traditional family values to the Cultural Revolution, to recent years of industrialization and urbanization, including the government’s 1979 implementation of the state-mandated One-Child policy and its subsequent 2015 revision to allow for a second child, plus the experiences of many who have immigrated to America — all of these changes and transitions have created unintended consequences and destabilized parent-child relationships (Roopnarine & Carter, 1992; Xu et al., 2005). Weakening competency in parenting skills is considered by critics as one complication that has resulted from the radical changes affected China’s transitioning to a modern market society that is now still evolving, a situation which adds tremendous perplexity. The examination of parental expectation and its impact on child development and family relationship through these changes is crucial for contemporary Chinese families to grasp and understand.

Chen and Ho (2012) through their research on Taiwanese students commented that the students may perceive themselves to be more capable academically and have a more positive self-identity when there is positive parental support and involvement. Furthermore, from the studies discussed, a truly Chinese context is clearly needed for balance as Shek has shown that most of the studies examining parental control and
parent-child relation qualities were conducted in a Western context (Shek, 2006, 2007a, 2007b, 2008). Meanwhile, studies involving Chinese families from the P.R.C. are extremely limited. Investigations like Shek’s are vitally significant and should be replicated, particularly for Mainland Chinese as today’s Mainland Chinese parents are in the midst of great transitions. They themselves are redefining their identities and values to face a changing world. These parents are in desperate need of guidance and strategies for healthy parenting and expectations over their children’s education and development.

In conclusion, much more investigation is needed; further studies will raise awareness and draw scholarly attention to help Chinese families understand how to navigate the unique difficulties they are facing and perhaps convince appropriate governing bodies to create innovative programs to support children and families at this pivotal time in Chinese history. With such help, parents can realize how to place expectations upon children according to a healthy and balanced understanding of each child’s unique individual development. They can preserve the intrinsic, positive side of traditional Chinese culture and values while promoting healthy parental expectations that will improve their parent-child relationship and benefit their children in today’s increasingly globalized world.
Chapter Three: Methodology

Introduction

The family is the primary learning environment for children. Parental expectation, particularly among Chinese family groups, is understood to be formative upon their children’s identity, behavior in family relationships, educational success, and decisions in career choices. China's long history of traditionalism in its social values, heavily based on a Confucian philosophy of the family, bears this out (Flanagan, 2011; Wang, 2014). Significant social changes inevitably have happened in recent years due to political shifts, modernization, capitalization, immigration, and government population control policies. However, expectation is an element on which both academic study and educational research are rather limited. Further study on the topic of parental expectation relating to the much-weakened parent-child relationship in family relationships among contemporary Chinese family groups is imperative and momentous in this globalizing world.

The purpose of this study is to investigate parental expectation and its influence upon parent-child relationship using mixed-methods as a means of exploring the complexity of a very reserved nature, that is, one rooted culturally in Chinese groups. The qualitative research methods involved both interviews and focus group studies. The quantitative research employed questionnaire surveys to explore the correlation between parental expectation and parent-child relationship through 41 question items in Likert scale for data analysis, in addition to an open-ended question allowing participants to express data beyond what the Likert scale could indicate. The participants involved were restricted by age, 18 or above, with Chinese heritage required to participate since the
topic is specifically designed to study the parent-child relationship and the influence of parental expectation among Chinese cultural groups through the reflection of childhood family experiences.

**Participants**

The participants in this study were drawn from a convenience sample with the requirements of Chinese heritage and at age of 18 or above, as the topic is the study of the influence of parental expectation on parent-child relationship among Chinese cultural groups. Explicitly, the design to limit the sample to adults for this research was based on three major considerations:

- Examination of a completed relationship for face validity (Vogt & Johnson, 2011)

  This study is to focus on assessing parent-child relationship through childhood family experiences. Therefore, the participants must be Chinese adults who are 18 or above, so the responses would be based on a completed, processed and sometimes reflected-upon childhood experience and relationships.

- Involvement with personal consent and decision for content validity (Vogt & Johnson, 2011)

  As adults, the participants could respond fully with their reflections and experiences and with their own consent and authority, which increases the content validity.

- Developmental stage consideration for population validity (Vogt & Johnson, 2011).
This research was explicitly and intentionally designed to focus on Chinese adults who are 18 or above so that the criterion variable on parent-child relationship could be a processed, completed and sometimes reflected-upon relationship. To assess children younger than 18 would mean that the parent-child relationship would still be in progress and therefore an unfinished process. Furthermore, among current studies assessing family relationships, particularly the parent-child relationship, many have already studied the sample population from the view of adolescents (Shek, 2005a; Shek, 2005b; Shek, 2006; Shek, 2008; Shek & Ma, 2010). This researcher had reservations as well as questions about the population validity (Vogt & Johnson, 2011) of previous studies involving adolescent participants. This researcher posits that adolescents are not settled developmentally but are undergoing shifting developmental stages in life in many areas, such as their evolving psychological identity and physical (hormonal) changes, such that there could be substantial resentment or significant conflicts in their relationship with parents (Kerr & Bowen, 1988; Lane & Beauchamp, 1959; Pomerantz et al., 2009; Zhao et al., 2015). Given that there appears to be a more passive cultural background, Chinese adolescents tend toward avoidance in the parent-adolescent relationship, and research indicates that self-development and family relationships frequently are affected by the parent-adolescent conflicts (Zhao et al., 2015).

Strom, Bernard, and Strom (1989) stated that those in adolescence will experience more conflict with their parents due to their developmental stage,
that is, one of going through identity and role confusion; they will often seek
to ultimately escape or sometimes even consider self-destruction.
Consequently, suicide has become a well-documented cause of fatality among
adolescents (Strom, Bernard, & Strom, 1989). Parent-adolescent relations
often suffer from tension or even disruptions due to conflicts and avoidance.
Therefore, the current study intentionally is limited to adults for its sample
participants because assessing parent-child relationship using adolescents as
the sample population potentially carries a high risk of volatile reliability and
validity for empirical research.

Vogt and Johnson (2011) stated that the nature of social science research
involving subjects relating to the “human element” is very challenging as the factors
investigated can change by year, month, date, or sometimes even hours. Therefore,
involving unstable developmental-stage participants such as adolescents, while needed, is
beyond the scope of this study. This research was designed to intentionally avoid such a
confounding variable. Given this consideration, a stable developmental stage, adulthood,
is the focus of this current research for criterion-related validity and population validity
(Vogt & Johnson, 2011).

Participants in the qualitative aspect of this study involved four individuals: one
male and three females from different age groups who were interviewed on four
questions. In addition, two focus groups were conducted on the same four questions. The
two focus groups involved one all-female group with ages ranging from 50 to 59 years
and a second group consisting of three males and nine females with ages ranging from 20
to 30 of age.
With respect to quantitative research, the Bilingual Childhood Family Experience Scale (Appendix A) was conducted among adults whose backgrounds included American Born Chinese, Overseas Born Chinese living in the U.S., and Taiwanese Chinese living in Taiwan, plus a small number of Chinese from other regions. The age range covered individuals from college-age (18) to retirees (79 being the oldest), of both male and female genders. A six-person sample pilot study (Pett, Lackey, & Sullivan, 2003) was recommended and conducted before the launch of the Bilingual Childhood Family Experience Scale, and this researcher has followed suit by launching a six-person (three males, three females) sample pilot study before the survey questionnaire.

**Research Hypothesis and Questions**

Research pertinent to parental expectation and its influence on parent-child relationships is crucial and imperative as family is the primary growth environment for children (Klein & White, 1996). This study is focused on exploring and investigating the extent to which there are statistically significant measures of the influence of parental expectation on the parent-child relationship, and to what extent parental expectation influences the parent-child relationship. This investigation focuses on the following questions:

- Does a statistical relationship exist between parental expectation and parent-child relationships, and if so, to what extent?
- To what extent do results differ between paternal and maternal influences?
- To what extent do paternal and maternal differences in parental expectations exist?
Methodology

The purpose of this study is to investigate the correlation between parental expectation and parent-child relationships. A combination of reasons went into selecting a methodology for this research, which is designed to effectively study a subject relating to human social science inquiry both quantitatively and qualitatively.

Granted that the topic is to study “relationship,” a social and behavioral human science “human element” subject focus (Creswell, 2015), a mixed-methods investigation model was engaged to the research the complexity of Chinese cultural groups. Secondly, this model did not only investigate family background influences, but also facilitated discussions toward the personal. Specifically considering that Chinese are usually more reserved and passive in comparison to Western cultural groups (Zhao et al., 2015), conducting both qualitative and quantitative researches provides a diverse approach that allows participants multiple avenues of response, which reduces potential limitations due to traditionally reserved natures or cultural concerns. Having both qualitative and quantitative research tools also provides a more comprehensive platform for researcher to creatively expand the research design for more extensive and powerful data collection.

The strengths of qualitative and quantitative research were well addressed by Ellis (2005). Ellis (2005) stated that quantitative tools allow researchers to generalize research findings from sample data and apply and replicate them on different populations. This permits a certain level of precision for predictions through numerical data with stronger credibility (Ellis, 2005). Complementarily, the strengths of qualitative research are that qualitative research provides useful data to describe a complex phenomenon, provides opportunities to explore people’s experiences of phenomena, and results in a rich data
source (Ellis, 2005). Quan-Hasse (2007) also commented that qualitative data enhances results and offers deeper perspectives of subjects. Hodgkin (2008) specified that such research can provide more powerful voices when both quantitative and qualitative methods are involved together. In the conduct of social science research, Creswell and Plano Clark (2007) argued, the integration of both qualitative and quantitative data collection provides researchers with a meatier and broader perception of the problem than with only one or the other set of data.

Both interviews and focus group studies were included in the qualitative tools of this research. For the quantitative aspect of this research, the Bilingual Childhood Family Experience Scale questionnaire research was employed. The Bilingual Childhood Family Experience Scale served as the main measure which involved 41 question groups where the questions were sub-divided by paternal, maternal, and family aspects into 90 items in a Likert scale; in addition, an open-ended question allowed participants to express data beyond what the Likert scale supplied.

The benefits of using questionnaires and interviews in mixed methods research are discussed in Tashakkori and Teddlie (2003). The strengths of using questionnaires include ease of administration to probability samples or groups, the welcome perception of anonymity by respondents, ease of data analysis for closed-ended items, and quick turnaround. The strengths of using interviews lie in their ability to provide in-depth information, to attain a relatively high response rate, to allow probing by the interviewer, and in being useful for exploration and confirmation. In sum, through both quantitative and qualitative analysis techniques, mixed methods data analysis granted this researcher greater vigor in studying a phenomenon (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2003).
Focus Group

As this research developed, the methods were expanded to conduct focus group interviews in consideration of exploring potential ministry opportunities in such a format. Gubrium and Holstein (2002) affirmed the use of focus groups as a widely accepted research method in social science. Due to the flexibility of focus group use in data collection, they offer a useful tool for obtaining detailed information regarding feelings, perceptions, and opinions.

Carey and Asbury (2012) also noted that “the focus group provides a more holistic approach to allow researchers to gain insights, contexts and perspectives for the study.” In addition, group interaction provides a more dynamic environment, a factor which enhances the level of interest and participation of the population sample (Carey & Asbury, 2012). Through employing the method of focus groups, this researcher experienced firsthand the unique “richness” of this qualitative research method and will address that matter in the discussion that follows.

There were concerns about the use of a high visible moderator, whether the group interview might become less natural than if members were interviewed individually. However, Gubrium and Holstein (2002) stated that this claim is not based on actual evidence and that assumptions/concerns can be resolved when the moderator is skillful in managing the interview process or while the participants are highly interested in being involved in the topic. Humbly speaking, the researcher has had over 30 years’ experience conducting group meetings and functions as moderator, and by relying on such extensive experience, was aware of these issues. The participants from pre-existing groups were open and engaged during the meeting process and produced beneficial and critical data
for this research. There may be debate about using pre-existing groups, but Gubrium and Holstein (2002) argued that pre-existing groups allow participants to engage discussion with in-depth information, particularly on controversial topics or cultural understandings, due to their shared experiences. This study has benefitted from such a theory as participants from both focus group interviews seemed comfortable with their group and exhibited openness in responding to the questions, leading to valuable in-depth data.

The researcher also observed that post-group discussion and feedback were very useful as the participants were comfortable and continued to stay engaged to share reflections. Constructive and important data was collected as a result. Greenbaum (1998) comments that reserving 15 to 20 minutes for a short debriefing for post-group discussion is important as the experience for group members is still fresh. The reflection and feedback from the participants enabled the moderator to evaluate if there were any serious disagreements or other further responses which might be relevant to the research.

In this research design, the interviews, focus groups and questionnaire investigations were conducted and developed concurrently. As a result, the responses from the interviews were used as an invaluable reference for the researcher to fine-tune questionnaire items in order to align the purpose of the study more closely to the population’s culture.

**Measures**

The instrument for this study was created by referring to three existing surveys: FACES IV (Family Adaptability and Cohesion Evaluation Scales IV) (Appendix D), FAD (Family Assessment Device), and FAM (Family Assessment Measure) (Grotevant & Carlson, 1989). FACES IV was developed by Olson (2011), FAD was developed by
Epstein, Baldwin, and Bishop (1983), and FAM was developed by Skinner, Steinhauer, and Santa-Barbara (2009). However, as none of them was designed to assess parent-child relationship, particularly regarding paternal and maternal interaction specificity in both English and Chinese translations (Appendix E), the Bilingual Childhood Family Experience Scale was developed by the researcher. The Bilingual Childhood Family Experience Scale consisted of two parts, A and B. Part A was developed to collect general demographic information while Part B was developed to investigate the Parental Expectation and its influence on Parent-Child Relationship in family relationships. Parts A and B were developed in both English and Chinese through all constructs and instructions.

The Bilingual Childhood Family Experience Scale, Part A, collects demographic information and includes questions for gender, age, birthplace origin, current country of residence, current family structure, education, and faith background. There was an optional page for a faith practice survey with five items. The items from Part A were collected to support data analysis in finding potential correlations among variables which might be pertinent to Parental Expectation and Parent-Child relationship.

The Bilingual Childhood Family Experience Scale, Part B, consisted of a 41 question items in addition to one open-ended question. The 41 questions were further sub-divided to cover paternal and maternal aspects, though some questions did ask for responses from the perspective of the family as a unit. The survey was designed with the intent to investigate how participants’ responses might differ when the same questions were posed specifically to their experience with their father or their experience with their mother. As a matter of fact, responses from the interviews indicated that participants had
distinctively different experiences and relationships with their father and mother. Therefore, items were developed not only to assess the themes and codes reflected from the interviews but were also further expanded by specifically dividing each item to allow respondents to answer by childhood experience of paternal and maternal interaction separately.

Shek (2005) has addressed several weaknesses and limitations in studies of parents’ behavioral control and parent-child relational qualities. First, research to assess paternal and maternal influence separately is rarely conducted among Chinese cultural groups. Second, the responses and perceptions of adolescents regarding their parents has been studied in a mixed-gender group, but the results might be very different if female and male adolescents were studied independently. Third, these related studies were mostly conducted in a Western context and the influence of critical cultural elements was neglected. Lastly, the studies of correlations between parental socioeconomic status and parental educational expectations were conducted in the West where living standards are higher than those of families in Asia in general.

The Bilingual Childhood Family Experience Scale was therefore designed to further investigate this rarely implemented study approach by collecting adult samples from American Born Chinese, Overseas Born Chinese in the U.S., and Taiwanese Chinese in Taiwan. The result of the data collection, as well as the reliability test of the Bilingual Childhood Family Experience Scale, will be discussed in Chapter 4.

**Procedure**

**Sample Selection**
Participants for both qualitative and quantitative investigations were recruited from convenient sample groups. For quantitative research, snowball sampling was also involved (Vogt & Johnson, 2011). Some participants had direct connections with the researcher, some were referred and invited from social networks such as religious groups, school groups, and Facebook groups. Snowball sampling obtained additional participants through the social contacts of these network groups.

For the qualitative research interview, four individuals, including one male and three females from different age groups, were interviewed with four questions. In addition, two focus groups were interviewed with four questions. The two focus groups involved Focus Group I, a group of 6 females, ages ranging from 50 to 59 years, and Focus Group II, consisting of three males and nine females, with ages ranging from college to post-college. For quantitative research, two measures were conducted. The Bilingual Childhood Family Experience Scale questionnaire was conducted among participants whose backgrounds were American Born Chinese, Overseas Born Chinese in the U.S., and Taiwanese Chinese in Taiwan. The age range was from 18 to 79 and included both males and females. A pilot group study with a sample of three males and three females was conducted before the official launch of the survey questionnaire.

**Qualitative Research**

**Data Collection through Interview Study**

One of the two qualitative data collection methods involved interviews posing the following four questions:

- Can you briefly describe the dynamic of your family of origin?
What were the major expectations from your parents (father and mother) that you remember the most?

How did you perceive your relationship with your parents? How did these expectations influence your family relationship back then?

How did these expectations influence your current life?

**Data Collection through Focus Group Study**

The second qualitative data collection method was conducted through focus group interviews. The following five questions were conducted for Focus Group I:

1. Thinking back over all the years, what is your fondest childhood memory with your parents? (The most enjoyable memory.)
2. Thinking back over the past years of childhood experience in your family, what do you remember most in regard to your parents’ expectation upon you? How did you respond to them?
3. What are the positive experiences and reflections from those expectations?
4. What are the disappointments or negative experiences from those expectations?
5. What influences do you see in your current life or current family? Positive/negative?

However, from the experience of the first focus group study, the researcher observed that question 3 and 4 could be combined to make the process more effective. After the questions were revised, the second interview proceeded much more efficiently, and the responses became more focused. Questions were revised as follows for the Focus Group II interview:
1. Thinking back over all the years, what is your fondest and most enjoyable childhood memory with your parents?

2. Thinking back over the past years of childhood experience in your family, what do you remember most in regard to your parents’ expectation upon you?

3. What are the positive and negative experiences and reflections from those expectations?

4. Overall, how do you see your parents’ expectation affecting your relationship with them, paternal versus maternal? How did it affect your family relationship? What influences do you see in your current life or current family? Positive/negative?

Overall, data from the responses of the two focus group interviews were relevant and valuable for the research. Some of the data collection has been incorporated in the Bilingual Childhood Family Experience Scale, in items such as:

- My father/mother’s expectation on me made me feel stressed.

- I wished that my father/mother had clearer or higher expectations on me to guide me.

- I became more appreciative of my father/mother’s expectation on me now that I am an adult.

- My relationship with my father/mother improved in my adulthood.

**Quantitative Research**

**Development of the Bilingual Childhood Family Experience Scale**

Stage I:
Due to reliability and validity concerns, the researcher originally intended to conduct a replication study using FACES IV as the survey questionnaire, except items were reduced to 30 in order to increase the participation rate as participants were by nature more reserved culturally.

As both English and Chinese versions were required for the cultural groups, the online survey was developed in two separate Google Forms for data collection.

Stage II:
The researcher launched the interviews and observed from the interviewees’ responses that the paternal parental expectation could be completely different from the maternal parental expectation. This led to a revision of some of the items in order to separate the potentially different results between paternal and maternal influence.

Stage III:
The researcher launched focus group studies. The data collected from the participants was very dynamic and discrete. While some participants expressed that their parents’ high expectations made them feel stressed, some in fact wished that their parents had more expectations of them so that they might become more motivated in pursuing higher academic success. Therefore, items related to such responses were added in order to assess the potential differences between families that exhibited high parental expectations as opposed to low parental expectations.

Stage IV:

Items were mostly either revised or replaced. FACES IV was used as reference only at this stage. In consequence, the survey became more relevant
to this rarely studied research topic on parental expectation and its correlation to parent-child relationship.

- The English and Chinese survey questionnaires on Google Forms were combined into one questionnaire due to the function limitation on data analysis between groups of the platform if data collection was done separately.

Stage V:

- Items were excessively revised and eventually recreated as the research proceeded according to the responses from the qualitative data collection and its indications.

- Items were further specified and targeted for assessment by developmental stages such as childhood or adolescence years of interaction with parents. The Bilingual Childhood Family Experience Scale became a measure with a set of 41 question items with each item subdivided by paternal, maternal, or family unit aspects in addition to one open-ended question.

The questionnaire is included in Appendix A.

**Data Collection through the Bilingual Childhood Family Experience Scale**

The Bilingual Childhood Family Experience Scale, which consists of 41 question items, was conducted to collect data from participants whose backgrounds included American Born Chinese, Overseas Born Chinese in the U.S., and Taiwanese Chinese in Taiwan. The participants’ age range was from 18 to 79 and included both males and
females. A pilot group study was conducted before the official launch of the survey questionnaire with a sample of six people, three males and three females.

Data Analysis

In this research model, the interview, focus group and questionnaire developments were conducted concurrently. Subsequently, the theming and coding of the qualitative studies from interview responses were taken as invaluable reference points by the researcher for effective development of variable items to align more closely with the missional intention of the study and the unique culture of the population.

For statistical data analysis, the data collected from the Bilingual Childhood Family Experience Scale was analyzed through SPSS. An Exploratory Factor Analysis was conducted for dimension reduction to uncover the underlying structure and relationships of the set of variables. The data analysis involved oblique rotation using Maximum Likelihood with Promax rotation for factor extraction. The factor loading was set at .30 to suppress the small coefficients. Cronbach’s alpha scores were calculated through SPSS to test the internal reliability of each factor for all constructs. The Bivariate Correlations were conducted to examine the Pearson’s $r$ correlation coefficients among the variables. The results are discussed in chapter 4.

Limitations and Focus of the Study

There are three major limitations of this study. First, assessment tools for a quantitative approach, particularly in evaluating family relationships, are very limited (Aarons, McDonald, Connelly & Newton, 2007; Shek & Ma, 2010), not to mention the paucity of instruments to specifically assess parent-child relationship by paternal and maternal influences, further compounded by the need to have both English and Chinese
versions. Secondly, theories of family structure are still very much emergent. Studies of the correlations between parental expectation and parent-child relationships are quite limited, as mentioned in the previous database review in Chapter 1. Therefore, this study was not designed to document cause and effect inferences of parental expectation on parent-child relationships, but to investigate the relationship of the two variables. Last, but not least, there is the matter of diversity of Chinese cultural groups all over the world (Bond, 1996; Roopnarine & Carter, 1992), such as American Born Chinese, Mainland China Chinese, Taiwanese Chinese, Cantonese Chinese, Singaporean Chinese, European Chinese, and so on. Due to manageability, timing and budget constraints, this research was limited in its focus to American Born Chinese, Overseas Born Chinese in the U.S., and Taiwanese Chinese in Taiwan, with a small portion of Chinese from other regions.
Chapter Four: Results

Chapter Overview

The purpose of this study is to investigate parental expectation and its influence upon the parent-child relationship through qualitative and quantitative mixed methods research among Chinese groups.

The qualitative research methods involved both interviews and focus group studies which took place concurrently with quantitative studies and supported the development of the measure. The quantitative research employed a questionnaire survey to explore correlations between parental expectation and parent-child relationship. The Bilingual Childhood Family Experience Scale was developed during the questionnaire research process. The Bilingual Childhood Family Experience Scale consisted of two parts, A and B. Part A was designed to collect general demographic information and Part B was developed as part of the present study to investigate parental expectation and its influence on the parent-child relationship utilizing a 41-item Likert scale, in addition to an open-ended question inviting parents to offer additional information. The participants involved were all of Chinese heritage and age 18 or above as the topic is specifically designed to study the influence of parental expectations on parent-child relationships among Chinese cultural groups through the reflection of childhood family experiences.

Research pertinent to parental expectations and their influence on parent-child relationships is crucial and imperative as the family is the primary nurturant environment for children which is an intergenerational social group (Klein & White, 1996; White 1991). This study focuses on the investigation of the extent of statistically significant differences of the influence of parental expectation on the parent-child relationship, and
to what extent such parental expectations influence that relationship. The investigation addresses the following questions: i) To what extent does a statistically significant relationship exist to indicate the influence between parental expectations and parent-child relationships; ii) To what extent do results differ between paternal and maternal influences; and iii) To what extent do paternal and maternal differences in parental expectations exist. The null hypothesis is that there is no statistical significance between parental expectation and parent-child relationship. The alternative hypothesis is that there is statistical significance between parental expectation and parent-child relationship.

This chapter reports the results chronologically as the qualitative research and quantitative research proceeded concurrently and supported the development of both research methods as well as confirming the hypothesis. The qualitative research session focuses on the results from both interviews and focus groups with a brief session of synthesis. The quantitative research session includes a comprehensive report on the descriptive statistics of the 41 question items from the Bilingual Childhood Family Experience Scale, followed by results from exploratory data analysis and a brief summary.

**Qualitative Research**

**Interviews**

Four interviews were conducted as a means of gathering qualitative data. The first interviewee was selected due to the fact that his family was experiencing major relationship issues, in addition to there being a relationship with the interviewer which allowed the interviewee to feel comfortable in accepting the interview invitation. The other three interviewees selected represented a distribution of different ages and
backgrounds; one represented an American Born Chinese background and two representing Taiwanese Chinese backgrounds with two different ages. The questions for the interview process included:

- Can you briefly describe the dynamic of your family of origin?
- What were the main expectations from your parents (father, mother) that you remember most? How did you perceive their relationship and their relationship with you?
- How did these expectations impact your family relationship back then?
- How does your family of origin influence your current family, work, life philosophy, and life in general?

The first interviewee, who represented an overseas born male Chinese, answered that, as the oldest son, he experienced high expectations from his father and was often expected to set an example for other siblings. Punishment and spanking were very common. Obedience and academic achievement were unquestionably expected, even though he said he felt he could never be able to meet the expectations. His close relationship with his mother, who he described as kind, brought important consolation in his childhood and adolescence, since two-way communication and discussion were not present in such a typical and traditional Chinese family. The interviewee expressed that such parenting style influenced how he raised his own children. Roles and rules have been set clearly for the current family of the interviewee. The interviewee expressed that his philosophy of life has been deeply influenced by his childhood family experiences.

The second interviewee, who represented an American born Chinese, expressed that her parents highly emphasized respect for others and had very strict family rules,
such as not being allowed to go to cinemas. Although her father passed away when she was 13, she found herself still imposing on herself those family rules, such as not going to cinemas for a film but waiting for it to come out on TV. The interviewee expressed gratefulness that her parents taught her to trust God and encouraged her to always strive to do her best academically and in other areas of life. Frustration at not receiving enough praise or confirmation was expressed as a regret, even though the goodwill of her parents was recognized. The consolation was that her mother would always kiss and hug her and her brother good night as an assurance of love and affection. The interviewee indicated that her parents’ influence was positive overall.

The third interviewee was a young adult in her early 20s, the youngest participant among the four. This Taiwanese Chinese participant currently lives in Taiwan. She indicated that both parents were open and would always encourage her to pursue happiness, as long as she made good choices and refrained from negative habits such as drinking or smoking. The parents did not emphasize academics as the number one concern; manners and social skills were valued higher. The interviewee expressed appreciation for such a philosophy, which raised her to be a happy person, even though she did experience some rebellious years as her parents were strict in discipline, and their expectations seemed to be higher during her middle school years. The interviewee explained that the reason for this was something she later discovered. Her father’s root reason was out of fear, because he himself went through some very rebellious and rough teenage years, which included some years of incarceration. However, later in her high school years, the interviewee said she experienced renewed trust from him, which helped her grow in her desire to pursue her own dreams and future.
The fourth interviewee is in her late fifties and living in Taiwan. She indicated that her sense of responsibility started in her childhood and has lasted all these years since having the role of being the oldest of many children. She was expected to care for her younger siblings and rules as well as roles were very clearly set in the family. Love from parents was expressed through actions but not language, such as their walking the children to school or waiting for them to come home. The roles of her parents were the combination of kind father and strict mother. The interviewee shared that the mother would hit the floor to scare the children instead of using true spanking. Academically, this interviewee indicated that the father would highly recognize the family achiever, even though both parents tried to be fair and understanding. Especially with one Down Syndrome girl in the family, there would be hurtful feelings for the “normal” kids who did not perform strongly. However, the interviewee indicated that there were no other specific expectations from her parents beyond academics. Looking back, the interviewee expressed that her appreciation for her parents and her understanding of their years of fighting for survival increased significantly as she became an adult. There were times she would sense some level of inferiority, but she said she later understood that the root cause might not have been from her parent-child childhood experiences, but from human weakness in her relationships overall. The interviewee expressed that there may be suppressed dreams and regrets in life, but the closeness of her childhood relationship with her parents are still what she appreciated and cherished the most.

**Focus Groups**

Two focus group studies were conducted. The first group consisted of six female participants between 50 to 59 years of age who were all Taiwanese Chinese, while the
second group consisted of 12 young adults between 20 to 30 years of age, with three males and nine females, mostly from China except for two of the males. Each group session lasted about 90 minutes. The purpose of each focus group was to gain additional understanding of the research topic on parental expectation and its potential influence on the parent-child relationship through a more dynamic conversational setting.

The focus group discussion questions included:

- Looking back over all the years, what is your fondest childhood memory with your parents? (The most enjoyable memory.)

- Looking back over the past years of childhood experience in your family, what do you remember most in regard to your parents' expectations upon you? What are the positive/ negative experiences and reflections from those expectations?

- Overall, how do you see your parents' expectations affecting your relationship with them, paternal vs. maternal? What about its effect on your family relationship? What influences do you see in your current life or current family? Positive/negative?

- One feedback question regarding the focus group interview: Do these questions help you sort through childhood experiences in positive ways?

In the first focus group, participants responded that their childhood lives were economically frugal in general but loving. Several participants indicated that the role and rules were very clearly set in their families. Some indicated that they felt loved but were not valued as much as their male siblings due to the number of children, or because of them being girls. Parents applied group punishment for discipline and mostly
implemented it as a strategy to intimidate the children from making mistakes. Four out of the six of the participants indicated that their parents did not place high expectations on them. They wished that their parents had higher expectations, which might have guided or encouraged them to pursue higher goals. Some indicated that their parents were more “strict father, kind mother,” while some had the reverse. One indicated that the mom had high expectations of her and her siblings and often made comparisons between them. Another indicated that the sudden loss of her father in her early years caused the increased expectations from her mother, who would often emphasize personal success as the best way to bring honor to the family. One indicated that both parents placed high expectations on her due to another sibling’s health issue, which affected their parent-child relationship significantly in a negative way. Another participant indicated that both her parents did not place many expectations on her, and she had an easy childhood. She reflected that this experience’s influence on her own parenting style is evident as she rarely had specific expectations for her own child. She however indicated that such an influence became a challenge in her marriage as there were disagreements with her husband over their different parenting styles. Closing feedback from this focus group’s participants included the following: 1) though high expectations caused pressure, they helped provide direction; 2) they felt it was very important to have a good balance between guidance and pressure; 3) love is the most important element regardless of high or low expectations; and 4) parents in the U.S. usually focus more on talent enhancement while Asian parents focus on academic achievement.

In the second focus group study, several participants indicated that their fondest times were from their early childhood years. They remembered those as the years their
parents spent more time and focused attention on them. However, one indicated that there was no happy childhood for her, and she was immediately in tears before starting her discussion. Regarding the subject of parental expectations, one indicated that her parents constantly emphasized filial piety and would take them to visit both paternal and maternal grandparents regularly, with the implication that their children, as adults, were expected to do the same in the future. The parents would emphasize character building more than academic success. While some participants indicated that their parents did not place high expectations on them, one indicated that his mother often had high expectations of him and as a result, he felt he became demanding of others. One of the female participants indicated that because her parents gave neither affirmation nor praise, she had to learn how to be more positive for herself and for others. Another female also indicated that her parents never provided compliments and would frequently warn her to avoid becoming prideful. She spoke of feeling a craving for affirmation. One other female indicated that her father spanked her so severely that she didn’t call him for over 10 years. In this focus group, all the girls were from China and mostly experienced a high level of spanking, which caused lingering fear and hurt even up to their current college and young adult stage. The feedback discussion from this second focus group entailed: 1) the realization of being not the only person to have had such painful upbringing; 2) starting to appreciate their parents' love and understanding the reasons behind their parents’ actions; and 3) becoming closer to their parents after growing up.

**Data Synthesis**

Through coding and theming techniques, the interview findings aided the development of the Bilingual Childhood Family Experience Scale with respect to several
critical constructive decisions and item development. First, the discussion and reflections related to “strict father, kind mother” and “kind father, strict mother” confirmed the need to divide each item in order to show answers with experiences from paternal or maternal interactions separately. This aligns with the recommendation from Shek’s study regarding the need to assess the parent-child relationship according to paternal and maternal reflections to distinguish the differences (Shek, 2005). Secondly, the parent-child relationship covered should range from early childhood through elementary years and end on the teenage years. Strom, Bernard, and Strom (1989), stated that subjects in adolescence experience more conflict with their parents due to being in a developmental stage that is undergoing identity and role confusion. Therefore, items were further divided to reflect the “when I was a child” and “when I was a teenager” stages, which would allow participants to answer very precisely, since the parent-child relationship in adolescence can be distinctly different from what it is in childhood years. Last, but not least, some of the items were developed to not only assess childhood family experiences, but also to evaluate how participants reflect upon and discover parental influences in their adulthood stage.

Quantitative Research

Pilot Study

For quantitative study after the Bilingual Childhood Family Experience Scale was developed, items were reviewed by five members and a pilot study (Pett, Lackey, & Sullivan, 2003) was conducted among a sample of six members. Four of the pilot group members have doctorate degrees, which are in education, psychology, computer science, and social science. The fifth has a bachelor’s degree and the sixth has a high school
diploma. This pilot group provided a sufficiently wide spectrum of the sample population in order to obtain relevant feedback for any potential problems.

During the pilot study, most of the participants indicated that the number of items were adequate while one expressed that it was long. The pilot group was mostly able to finish the survey in 10 to 15 minutes, though one indicated that it took him 45 minutes to finish due to his dedication in answering the open-ended question. Other feedback from the pilot group includes: 1) there were minor grammatical corrections needed; 2) some items needed to be further polished for clarity; 3) technical issues happened on some of the items which required correction on the setting of answer requirement from the online platform; and 4) boundary descriptions to indicate the “childhood” and “teen” age ranges were needed, so the researcher supplemented age information by the definitions “children: under 13” and “teen: 13-19” prior to the items’ session. All the feedback critically helped the researcher adjust and make corrections in the survey prior to launching it among the research populations.

Feedback from the pilot study was invaluable as it significantly supported the perceived value of the research and corrected the issues mentioned above. The pilot study helped alleviate this research from potential complications and enabled the increase of participation and completion of this online survey in a very vigorous approach. As a result, the goal of 150 responses was reached within six days, and another 906 responses were received in the following three days. A total of 1,056 responses were collected for data analysis in less than ten days (Appendix F). Had a pilot study not been conducted, the technical issues in particular would certainly have gone undetected and resulted in tremendous loss of data collection and extensive delay of research results.
Reliability of the Bilingual Childhood Family Experience Scale

Test reliability is fundamental for using instruments in research (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2007). Pett, Lackey and Sullivan (2003) stated that all assessments are subject to measurement error, particularly those examining behavioral science issues. Reliability coefficients are obtained from the aspects of instruments with respect to internal consistency, stability and equivalence, which represent how well the items of the assessment fit together (Pett, Lackey, & Sullivan, 2003). In other words, if items are relatively homogeneous, it is very likely that the correlations among the items would be high, therefore the instrument is concluded to have high internal consistency (Pett, Lackey, & Sullivan, 2003).

The researcher conducted the reliability test on the Bilingual Childhood Family Experience Scale via SPSS for both paternal and maternal items. The Cronbach’s alpha based on standardized items of reliability test on 41 paternal items was .945, which indicated excellent internal consistency of the items (Salkind & Rasmussen, 2007). The Cronbach’s alpha based on standardized items of reliability test on 41 maternal items was .943, which also indicated excellent internal consistency of the items (Salkind & Rasmussen, 2007). This robust result of the Bilingual Childhood Family Experience Scale strongly indicates that the items are measuring the same thing (Vogt & Johnson, 2011). The results of Cronbach’s alpha support that the instrument used to study relationships among the items related to the topic and hypothesis through the Bilingual Childhood Family Experience Scale was reliable.

Sample Collection
A total of 1,056 responses were collected through both convenience sampling
(Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2007; Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2003) and snowball sampling (Vogt &
Johnson, 2011; Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2003). The return rate was not measurable since
the Bilingual Childhood Family Experience Scale was designed to allow participants to
respond through an online platform, and was passed out via the social network of the
researcher and her connections, with a brief vision and purpose statement of the research
to encourage participation via the social network of any recipients. To consider the
validity in the Exploratory Factor Analysis, the sample size was reduced to 846
responses, mainly due to some items being incomplete.

The completion rate and the drop-out rate of each assessment page were recorded
as follows:

- 121 cases were removed where participants only finished the items on
demographic information, which indicated 11.5% of participants dropping out
  after page one.

- 50 cases were removed where participants only finished up to item 24 on
  pages one and two, which indicated 5.4% participants dropping out after
  finishing pages one and two.

- 23 cases were removed where participants only finished up to item 34 on
  pages one, two and three, which indicated 2.6% participants dropping out after
  finishing pages one, two and three.

- 11 cases were removed where participants only finished pages one, two, three
  and four, up to item 44, which indicated 1.3% participants dropping out after
  finishing pages one, two, three and four.
5 cases were removed due to invalid age information. Therefore, a total of 846 cases were retained for the quantitative studies of data analysis by Exploratory Factor Analysis on SPSS.

The results from the descriptive statistics of the collected 1,056 responses are very robust. The rich data and brief indications from the items are reported as follows, with the findings and implications to be further discussed in chapter 5.

**Results from Descriptive Statistics**

The Bilingual Childhood Family Experience Scale was developed and conducted for the questionnaire research portion of the topic to collect samples from Chinese groups mainly in the U.S. and Taiwan, and later expanded to some other areas such as China and Southeast Asia with small samples.

A total of 1,056 responses were collected for this research, but only 846 were implemented for the data analysis due to incompletion of survey items and invalid age ranges in the rest (of the responses). Among the 846 participants, 36.2% were male and 63.8% were female. The mean age (in years) of the 846 cases was 41.80, the minimum was 18, maximum was 79, mode was 50, range was 61, and standard deviation was 13.55.

The number of male participants remained lower than female participants throughout the data collection process. The gender ratio started around 35% male when the survey was first launched. The sample size goal was 150. As the ratio of male participants was low from the beginning, the researcher had intervened through sending more invitations to male participants and promoting the survey through social networks that had greater connections to male samples. The male gender ratio marginally increased
up to 41.45% when the goal of 150 was reached for data collection. However, after such intervention, the ratio of male participants dropped immediately during the rest of the snowball sampling to under 28.61% at the lowest point when the sample size reached over 500. The ratio again had a second marginal increase to above 30% after the sample size reached 600, and following that, the percentage of male participants remained around 35% which was lower than the number of female participants throughout the data collection process (see Table 3).

Table 3

*Gender Ratio of Participants by Percentage (%)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender ratio during sample size</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Notation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>36.30</td>
<td>63.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>41.45</td>
<td>58.55</td>
<td>A message to encourage male participation was sent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>544</td>
<td>28.68</td>
<td>71.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>654</td>
<td>32.42</td>
<td>67.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1056</td>
<td>36.46</td>
<td>63.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For age distribution, the 45 to 55-year-old age group had the highest number of respondents, followed by the 25 to 30-year-old age group. Among the entire sample population, most were between the age range of 20 to 60 years, with a small sample population aged 60 to 70 years or older.

Regarding the education background of the 1,056 participants, 12 indicated that they had “some high school,” 121 indicated that they had “completed high school,” 45 indicated that they had an “AA degree/certificate,” 436 indicated that they had a
“bachelor’s degree,” 305 indicated that they had a “master’s degree,” 47 indicated that they had a “professional degree,” 66 indicated that they had a “doctoral degree” and 24 indicated “other.” This number slightly changed after the incomplete responses were removed. Among the 846 valid sample populations, the education level of the sample consisted of 349 with a bachelor’s (41.29%), 256 with a master’s (28.89%), and 55 (6.25%) with a doctorate (see Table 4).

Table 4

*Education of Participants by Percentage (%). Sample Size: 1056*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some high school</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed high school</td>
<td>11.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA degree/certificate</td>
<td>4.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>41.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master</td>
<td>28.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional degree</td>
<td>4.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding current residency, 73.96% of participants live in Taiwan, 18.37% live in the U.S., 3.88% in China, and a few live in other areas. Regarding participants’ current family structure, 41.67% indicated that they are married with children, 36.93% indicated as single, 15.06% indicated as married without children, 2.75% indicated as single with
children, and 3.6% indicated as “other”. Among the participants, 22.43% indicated “none” for their faith background, 20.82% indicated “Buddhism,” 0.19% indicated “Islam,” .086% indicated Catholic, 2.85% indicated “other,” while 52.85% indicated “Christianity.”

The following is a report on the descriptive statistics results of the 41 questions (see Table 5). The report may appear to be lengthy and repetitive, but due to the results being rich and robust, it is necessary to report them in their entirety for the reference of readers as well as benefit of future research. These results will also be further discussed in chapter 5 for related findings, implications, strengths, limitations and recommendations. In order to make the report of these sizable results easy to read, the report of the items involved will focus on the different percentage results from paternal and maternal reflections, the total percentage of agreement versus disagreement comparison, and a brief summary indicated by bullet points instead of paragraph text, in order to provide a comfortable visual structure for the readers. The following are the statistical descriptive results of the 41 items with brief data comparison.
Table 5
Response Ratio of Each Survey Item by Percentage (%). Sample Size: 1056.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Items</th>
<th>Father/ Mother</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q15: My parent could calmly discuss problems with me, when I was a child.</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>13.58</td>
<td>25.43</td>
<td>34.38</td>
<td>21.77</td>
<td>4.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>童年時期，我父母親能心平氣和地跟我討論問題。</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>15.18</td>
<td>31.78</td>
<td>32.32</td>
<td>16.81</td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q16: My parent expressed affection with me, when I was a child.</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>21.98</td>
<td>34.59</td>
<td>29.74</td>
<td>10.13</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>童年時期，我父母親會對我們表達關愛之情。</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>32.33</td>
<td>39.76</td>
<td>20.04</td>
<td>6.57</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17: My parents set clear rules and roles in our family, when I was a child.</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>24.03</td>
<td>39.66</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>8.94</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>童年時期，在我們家，我父母親定有清楚的規矩和角色。</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>24.22</td>
<td>42.16</td>
<td>25.73</td>
<td>5.95</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18: My parent was fair in disciplining me, when I was a child.</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>19.03</td>
<td>39.46</td>
<td>25.81</td>
<td>11.94</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>童年時期,我父母親的管教是公平的。</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>16.81</td>
<td>39.41</td>
<td>24.43</td>
<td>13.19</td>
<td>4.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q19: My parent was strict with me, when I was a child.</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>8.72</td>
<td>29.49</td>
<td>37.35</td>
<td>19.16</td>
<td>5.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>童年時期,我父母親對我是嚴厲的。</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>7.80</td>
<td>28.74</td>
<td>38.32</td>
<td>19.59</td>
<td>6.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20: Once my parent made a decision, it was very difficult for me to change</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>19.68</td>
<td>35.48</td>
<td>31.18</td>
<td>11.83</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>their mind, when I was a child. 童年時期,我很難去改變他們的決定。</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>14.32</td>
<td>35.20</td>
<td>35.20</td>
<td>13.46</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q21: When I was a child, the main leader of our family was:</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>29.51</td>
<td>32.92</td>
<td>26.11</td>
<td>8.51</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>童年時期，我們家的主要領導者是：</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>18.18</td>
<td>35.66</td>
<td>33.22</td>
<td>9.91</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q22: Meeting my parent's expectations was difficult, when I was a child.</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>6.71</td>
<td>19.81</td>
<td>39.39</td>
<td>26.68</td>
<td>5.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>童年時期,要達到父母親的期望很難。</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>6.04</td>
<td>21.47</td>
<td>39.37</td>
<td>27.18</td>
<td>5.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q23: My parent's expectations of me made me feel stressed, when I was a</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>7.98</td>
<td>19.63</td>
<td>35.17</td>
<td>28.59</td>
<td>8.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>child. 童年時期,父母親對我的期望使我感到有壓力。</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>7.40</td>
<td>20.28</td>
<td>35.30</td>
<td>28.86</td>
<td>8.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q24: Compared with my childhood, my parent had higher expectations of me</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>8.41</td>
<td>34.38</td>
<td>36.75</td>
<td>16.59</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>when I was a teenager. 比較孩童時期，我父母親提高了對我的期望。</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>8.06</td>
<td>33.87</td>
<td>38.82</td>
<td>16.02</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q25: My parents were always calm when they had disagreements with me during</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>24.17</td>
<td>33.98</td>
<td>27.82</td>
<td>8.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my teenage years. 青少年時期，當我與父母親有衝突時，他們總是很冷靜。</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>34.24</td>
<td>27.78</td>
<td>11.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q26: My parents made me feel guilty when I wanted to spend time away from</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>24.63</td>
<td>33.64</td>
<td>26.91</td>
<td>7.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>home during my teenage years. 青少年時期，如果我想花時間在外，我父母親</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>9.06</td>
<td>30.12</td>
<td>28.54</td>
<td>26.27</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>would make me feel guilty.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q27: My grandparents were able to influence my parent's decisions about me</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>13.44</td>
<td>21.07</td>
<td>35.08</td>
<td>27.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>when I was a child. 童年時期，我的祖父母能夠影響我父母親的決定。</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>14.06</td>
<td>22.56</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>26.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q28: My parent and I fought over their expectations for my college, major</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>9.02</td>
<td>23.40</td>
<td>40.98</td>
<td>23.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and/or career choice. 我父母親與我因為他們對我如何選擇學校，主修或</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>8.62</td>
<td>24.04</td>
<td>40.14</td>
<td>23.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q29: Looking back on my childhood, I wished that my parent’s expectations</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>10.40</td>
<td>59.20</td>
<td>23.66</td>
<td>4.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>had been stronger. 回想我的童年,我真希望我父母親對我的期望</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>10.65</td>
<td>59.12</td>
<td>21.97</td>
<td>4.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q30: I had a close relationship with my parent, when I was a child. 童年時期，我跟我父母親的關係很親密。</td>
<td>父親</td>
<td>15.13</td>
<td>31.74</td>
<td>32.76</td>
<td>13.08</td>
<td>7.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>母親</td>
<td>23.52</td>
<td>40.11</td>
<td>24.43</td>
<td>7.73</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q31: I had a close relationship with my parent, when I was a teenager. 青少年時期，我跟我父母親的關係很親密。</td>
<td>父親</td>
<td>8.44</td>
<td>24.97</td>
<td>41.73</td>
<td>15.74</td>
<td>9.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>母親</td>
<td>14.40</td>
<td>35.15</td>
<td>31.86</td>
<td>12.13</td>
<td>6.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q32: I tried to avoid contact with my parent, when I was a child. 童年時期，我試著避免與父母親接觸。</td>
<td>父親</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>9.11</td>
<td>22.89</td>
<td>39.98</td>
<td>22.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>母親</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>7.38</td>
<td>19.18</td>
<td>44.04</td>
<td>26.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q33: I tried to avoid contact with my parent during my teenage years. 青少年時期，我試著避免與父母親接觸。</td>
<td>父親</td>
<td>7.76</td>
<td>19.86</td>
<td>29.00</td>
<td>30.71</td>
<td>12.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>母親</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>17.55</td>
<td>25.25</td>
<td>36.13</td>
<td>15.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q34: My parent was supportive of me when I had difficult times when I was a child. 小時候當我有困難時，我的父母親會支持我。</td>
<td>父親</td>
<td>22.75</td>
<td>41.18</td>
<td>25.37</td>
<td>7.39</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>母親</td>
<td>26.96</td>
<td>42.32</td>
<td>21.62</td>
<td>7.17</td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q35: My relationship with my parent has improved since I became an adulthood. 在我成年後，我與父母親的關係進步了。</td>
<td>父親</td>
<td>18.78</td>
<td>47.07</td>
<td>23.59</td>
<td>6.81</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>母親</td>
<td>23.40</td>
<td>47.26</td>
<td>20.95</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q36: Looking back on my childhood, I am satisfied with how my parent communicated with me. 回想我的童年時期，我很滿意父母親與我之間的溝通。</td>
<td>父親</td>
<td>10.16</td>
<td>27.92</td>
<td>33.88</td>
<td>19.86</td>
<td>8.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>母親</td>
<td>11.40</td>
<td>34.30</td>
<td>29.19</td>
<td>18.84</td>
<td>6.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q37: Looking back on my teenage years, I am satisfied with how my parent communicated with me. 回想我的青少年時期，我很滿意父母親與我之間的溝通。</td>
<td>父親</td>
<td>7.37</td>
<td>26.90</td>
<td>32.40</td>
<td>22.69</td>
<td>10.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>母親</td>
<td>8.94</td>
<td>31.24</td>
<td>29.50</td>
<td>21.60</td>
<td>8.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q38: Even when angry, my parent seldom said mean words to me. 既使在生氣時，我的父母親也很少對我說刻薄的話語。</td>
<td>父親</td>
<td>19.88</td>
<td>33.45</td>
<td>21.99</td>
<td>15.56</td>
<td>9.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>母親</td>
<td>17.56</td>
<td>31.63</td>
<td>19.42</td>
<td>19.77</td>
<td>11.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q39: My parent was a good listener. 我父母親是很好的聆聽者。</td>
<td>F. to me</td>
<td>9.77</td>
<td>24.07</td>
<td>33.02</td>
<td>21.16</td>
<td>11.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M. to me</td>
<td>11.85</td>
<td>30.89</td>
<td>28.80</td>
<td>18.58</td>
<td>9.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F. to M.</td>
<td>7.80</td>
<td>25.77</td>
<td>32.86</td>
<td>20.45</td>
<td>13.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M. to F.</td>
<td>9.45</td>
<td>30.70</td>
<td>30.22</td>
<td>18.06</td>
<td>11.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q40: My parent discussed ideas and beliefs, when I was a child. 小時候，我的父母親會討論想法和信念。</td>
<td>F. to me</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>24.50</td>
<td>35.12</td>
<td>24.15</td>
<td>10.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M. to me</td>
<td>7.90</td>
<td>29.97</td>
<td>34.73</td>
<td>19.40</td>
<td>8.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F. to M.</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>27.18</td>
<td>38.26</td>
<td>18.95</td>
<td>9.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M. to F.</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td>28.67</td>
<td>39.69</td>
<td>17.06</td>
<td>8.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q41: Looking back on my childhood, I am satisfied with the amount of time that my parent spent with me. 回想我的童年時期，我很滿意父母親能與我在一起的時間量。</td>
<td>父親</td>
<td>16.94</td>
<td>39.14</td>
<td>25.35</td>
<td>12.73</td>
<td>5.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>母親</td>
<td>16.84</td>
<td>32.74</td>
<td>29.06</td>
<td>15.42</td>
<td>5.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q42: Looking back on my teenage years, I am satisfied with the amount of time that my parent spent with me. 回想我的青少年時期，我很滿意父母親能與我在一起的時間量。</td>
<td>父親</td>
<td>12.31</td>
<td>28.52</td>
<td>34.08</td>
<td>16.80</td>
<td>8.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>母親</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>34.15</td>
<td>31.82</td>
<td>14.69</td>
<td>6.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q43: Looking back on my childhood, I am satisfied with the closeness of my relationship with my parent. 回想我的童年時期，我很滿意我與父母親之間的親近關係。</td>
<td>父親</td>
<td>14.04</td>
<td>35.67</td>
<td>29.01</td>
<td>13.57</td>
<td>7.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>母親</td>
<td>17.76</td>
<td>41.24</td>
<td>24.65</td>
<td>11.33</td>
<td>5.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q44: Looking back on my teenage years, I am satisfied with the closeness of my relationship with my parent. 回想我的青少年時期，我很滿意我與父母親之間的親近關係。</td>
<td>父親</td>
<td>9.12</td>
<td>29.59</td>
<td>31.70</td>
<td>18.60</td>
<td>10.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>母親</td>
<td>11.86</td>
<td>35.70</td>
<td>28.49</td>
<td>16.51</td>
<td>7.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q45: I have become more appreciative of my parent’s expectations of me, now that I am an adult. 現在我成年了，比較能夠感謝我父母親對我的期望。</td>
<td>父親</td>
<td>22.87</td>
<td>45.50</td>
<td>23.82</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>母親</td>
<td>25.71</td>
<td>46.92</td>
<td>20.73</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q46: The main person who managed our family finance when I was a child was…</td>
<td>父親</td>
<td>35.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>母親</td>
<td>64.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q47: My parent’s expectations of me were helpful to my academic success. 我父母親對我的期望，對我的學習成就是有幫助的。</td>
<td>父親</td>
<td>15.62</td>
<td>36.45</td>
<td>33.14</td>
<td>10.53</td>
<td>4.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>母親</td>
<td>16.90</td>
<td>38.77</td>
<td>30.26</td>
<td>10.05</td>
<td>4.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q48: The influence my parent’s expectations of me on our parent-child relationship had been (positive to negative) 我父母親對我的期望，對我們之間親子關係的影響</td>
<td>父親</td>
<td>12.75</td>
<td>34.71</td>
<td>40.85</td>
<td>9.33</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>母親</td>
<td>13.80</td>
<td>37.15</td>
<td>38.44</td>
<td>8.73</td>
<td>1.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q49: The influence my parent’s expectation of me on our family relationship had (positive to negative)
我父母親對我的期望，對我們過去家庭關係的影響

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Father</th>
<th>11.22</th>
<th>37.07</th>
<th>39.67</th>
<th>9.45</th>
<th>2.60</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>12.15</td>
<td>39.74</td>
<td>37.50</td>
<td>8.49</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q50: The influence my parent’s marriage relationship on me today (positive to negative)
我父母婚姻關係，對我現在的影響

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Father</th>
<th>18.26</th>
<th>33.57</th>
<th>26.38</th>
<th>16.37</th>
<th>5.42</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>18.26</td>
<td>32.86</td>
<td>29.92</td>
<td>15.43</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q51: The influence my parent’s expectations of me on my emotional health today has been (positive to negative)
我父母親對我的期望，對我現在的情緒健康的影響

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Father</th>
<th>15.67</th>
<th>33.83</th>
<th>36.16</th>
<th>12.72</th>
<th>2.24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>15.43</td>
<td>37.93</td>
<td>32.16</td>
<td>12.01</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q52: The influence my parent’s expectation of me on my confidence today has been (positive to negative)
我父母親對我的期望，對我現在的自信心的影響

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Father</th>
<th>15.11</th>
<th>34.83</th>
<th>34.12</th>
<th>13.11</th>
<th>2.83</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>16.04</td>
<td>36.56</td>
<td>32.19</td>
<td>12.74</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q53: The influence my parent’s expectation of me on my success today has been (positive to negative)
我父母親對我的期望，對我現在的成就的影響

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Father</th>
<th>16.16</th>
<th>38.56</th>
<th>37.85</th>
<th>5.66</th>
<th>1.77</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>40.85</td>
<td>34.71</td>
<td>6.02</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q54: My parent was often absent when I was a child.
我父母親在我童年時期常常不在家。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Father</th>
<th>14.98</th>
<th>24.76</th>
<th>16.51</th>
<th>26.18</th>
<th>17.57</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>6.01</td>
<td>12.85</td>
<td>14.39</td>
<td>34.91</td>
<td>31.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q55: My parent was often absent when I was a teenager.
我父母親在我青少年時期常常不在家。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Father</th>
<th>13.00</th>
<th>23.76</th>
<th>19.50</th>
<th>26.60</th>
<th>17.14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>6.60</td>
<td>13.07</td>
<td>16.73</td>
<td>34.04</td>
<td>29.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In item 15, “my parent could calmly discuss problems with me when I was a child,” the results from the responses indicated:

- Paternal: 13.58% strongly agree, 25.43% agree, 34.38% neutral, 21.77% disagree, and 4.85% strongly disagree.

- Maternal: 15.18% strongly agree, 31.78% agree, 32.32% neutral, 16.81% disagree, and 3.90% strongly disagree.

- Of the total paternal vs. maternal percentage, 39.01% expressed that they agree or strongly agree that their father could calmly discuss problems with them when they were children, while 46.96% expressed that they agree or strongly agree that their mother could calmly discuss problems with them when they were children. Of the total paternal vs. maternal percentage, 26.62% expressed that they disagree or strongly disagree that their father could calmly discuss problems with them when they were children, while
20.71% expressed that they disagree or strongly disagree that their mother could calmly discuss problems with them when they were children.

- The data showed that 7.95% agreed or strongly agreed that it was their mother who could calmly discuss problems with them in childhood, rather than their father. The data also indicated that the percentage indicating disagree or strongly disagree for the maternal is 5.91% less than for the paternal. The data suggests that mothers could calmly discuss problems with children more than fathers.

In item 16, “my parent expressed affection with me when I was a child,” the results from the respondents indicated:

- Paternal: 21.98% strongly agree, 34.59% agree, 29.74% neutral, 10.13% disagree, and 3.56% strongly disagree.

- Maternal: 32.33% strongly agree, 39.76% agree, 20.04% neutral, 6.57% disagree, and 1.29% strongly disagree.

- Of the total paternal vs. maternal percentage, 55.57% expressed that they agree or strongly agree that their father expressed affection with them when they were children, while 72.09% expressed that they agree or strongly agree that their mother expressed affection with them when they were children. Of the total paternal vs. maternal percentage, 13.69% expressed that they disagree or strongly disagree that their father expressed affection with them when they were children, while 7.86% expressed that they disagree or strongly disagree that their mother expressed affection with them when they were children.
The data showed that 16.52% more participants agree or strongly agree that their mother, rather than their father, expressed affection with them when they were children. The data indicated that the percentage indicating disagree or strongly disagree for the maternal is only 5.83% less than for the paternal.

In item 17, “my parents set clear rules and roles in our family when I was a child,” the results from the respondents indicated:

- Paternal: 24.03% strongly agree, 39.66% agree, 25.00% neutral, 8.94% disagree, and 2.37% strongly disagree.
- Maternal: 24.22% strongly agree, 42.16% agree, 25.73% neutral, 5.95% disagree, and 1.95% strongly disagree.
- Of the total paternal vs. maternal percentage, 63.69% expressed that they agree or strongly agree that their father set clear rules and roles in their family when they were children, while 66.38% expressed that they agree or strongly agree that their mother set clear rules and roles in their family when they were children. Of the total paternal vs. maternal percentage, 11.33% expressed that they disagree or strongly disagree that their father set clear rules and roles in their family when they were children, while 7.90% expressed that they disagree or strongly disagree that their mother set clear rules and roles in their family when they were children.
- The results indicated that approximately 2 out of 3 participants expressed that they agree or strongly agree that both their father and mother set clear rules and roles in their family when they were children. The data further indicated that the percentage regarding the maternal is higher than for the paternal. The
data also indicated that the percentage of disagreement or strong disagreement regarding the paternal is higher than the maternal by 4.43%. In other words, more participants expressed that their mother, rather than their father, set clear rules and roles in their family when they were children.

In item 18, “my parent was fair in disciplining me when I was a child,” the results from the respondents indicated:

- Paternal: 19.03% strongly agree, 39.46% agree, 25.81% neutral, 11.94% disagree, and 3.76% strongly disagree.

- Maternal: 18.81% strongly agree, 39.14% agree, 24.43% neutral, 13.19% disagree, and 4.43% strongly disagree.

- Of the total paternal vs. maternal percentage, 48.49% expressed that they agree or strongly agree that their father was fair in disciplining them when they were children, while 57.95% expressed that they agree or strongly agree that their mother was fair in disciplining them when they were children. Of the total paternal vs. maternal percentage, 15.70% expressed that they disagree or strongly disagree that their father was fair in disciplining them when they were children, while 17.62% expressed that they disagree or strongly disagree that their mother was fair in disciplining them when they were children.

- The results indicated that about 1 out of 2 participants expressed that they agree or strongly agree that their parents were fair in disciplining them when they were children. The percentage regarding the maternal is higher than for the paternal. The percentage disagreeing or strongly disagreeing regarding the maternal is higher than for the paternal as well.
In item 19, “my parent was strict with me when I was a child,” the results from the respondents indicated:

- Paternal: 8.72% very strict, 29.49% strict, 37.35% neutral, 19.16% kind, and 5.27% very kind.
- Maternal: 7.00% very strict, 28.74% strict, 38.32% neutral, 19.59% kind, and 6.35% very kind.
- Of the total paternal vs. maternal percentage, 38.21% expressed that their father was strict or very strict with them when they were children, while 35.74% expressed that their mother was strict or very strict with them when they were children. Of the total paternal vs. maternal percentage, 24.43% expressed that their father was kind or very kind with them when they were children, while 25.94% expressed that their mother was kind or very kind with them when they were children.
- The results indicated that over 1 out of 3 participants expressed that both their father and mother were strict or very strict with them when they were children, while about 1 out of 4 participants expressed that both their father and mother were kind or very kind with them when they were children.

In item 20, “once my parents made a decision, it was very difficult for me to change their minds when I was a child,” the results showed:

- Paternal: 19.68% strongly agree, 35.48% agree, 31.18% neutral, 11.83% disagree, and 1.83% strongly disagree.
- Maternal: 14.32% strongly agree, 35.20% agree, 35.20% neutral, 13.46% disagree, and 1.83% strongly disagree.
• Of the total paternal vs. maternal percentage, 55.16% expressed that they agree or strongly agree that it was very difficult for them to change their father’s mind once the father made a decision when they were children, while 49.52% expressed that they agree or strongly agree that it was very difficult for them to change their mother’s mind once the mother made a decision when they were children. Of the total paternal vs. maternal percentage, 13.66% expressed that they disagree or strongly disagree that it was very difficult for them to change their father’s mind once the father made a decision when they were children, while 15.29% expressed that they disagree or strongly disagree that it was very difficult for them to change their mother’s mind once the mother made a decision when they were children.

• The results indicated that 1 out of 2 participants expressed that they agree or strongly agree that it was very difficult for them to change their parents’ mind once the parents made a decision when they were children. Only 5.64% more participants expressed that they agree or strongly agree that it was very difficult for them as children to change their father’s mind, rather than their mother’s mind, once that parent’s decision was made. Only 2.63% less participants expressed that they disagree or strongly disagree that it was very difficult for them as children to change their father’s mind, rather than their mother’s mind, once that parent’s decision was made.

In item 21, “when I was a child, the main leader of our family was,” the results showed:
▪ Father: 29.51% strongly agree, 32.92% agree, 26.11% neutral, 8.51% disagree, and 2.95% strongly disagree.

▪ Mother: 18.18% strongly agree, 35.66% agree, 33.22% neutral, 9.91% disagree, and 3.03% strongly disagree.

▪ Equal leadership: 7.75% strongly agree, 24.55% agree, 31.14% neutral, 28.55% disagree, and 8.01% strongly disagree.

▪ Of the total paternal vs. maternal percentage, 62.43% expressed that they agree or strongly agree that the main leader of their family was their father when they were children, while 53.84% expressed that the main leader of their family was their mother when they were children. Of the total paternal vs. maternal percentage, 11.46% expressed that they disagree or strongly disagree that the main leader of their family was their father when they were children, while 12.94% expressed that they disagree or strongly disagree that the main leader of their family was their mother when they were children. The results indicated that more than 1 out of 2 participants agree or strongly agree that both their father and mother were leaders of the family when they were children. And the total of paternal and maternal leadership is more than 100%.

▪ A total of 32.30% agree or strongly agree that their parents shared equal leadership when they were children. A total of 36.56% disagree or strongly disagree that their parents shared equal leadership when they were children.

In item 22, “meeting my parents’ expectations was difficult when I was a child,” the results showed:
▪ Paternal: 6.71% strongly agree, 19.81% agree, 39.39% neutral, 28.68% disagree, and 5.41% strongly disagree.

▪ Maternal: 6.04% strongly agree, 21.47% agree, 39.37% neutral, 27.18% disagree, and 5.93% strongly disagree.

▪ Parents argued: 2.88% strongly agree, 10.94% agree, 24.54% neutral, 43.43% disagree, and 18.20% strongly disagree.

▪ Of the total paternal vs. maternal percentage, 26.52% expressed that they agree or strongly agree that meeting their father’s expectations was difficult when they were children, while 27.51% expressed that they agree or strongly agree that meeting their mother’s expectations was difficult when they were children. Of the total paternal vs. maternal percentage, 34.09% expressed that they disagree or strongly disagree that meeting their father’s expectations was difficult when they were children, while 33.11% expressed that they disagree or strongly disagree that meeting their mother’s expectations was difficult when they were children.

▪ Of the total paternal vs. maternal percentage, 13.82% agree or strongly agree that when they were children, their parents often argued due to holding conflicting parental expectations, while 61.63% disagree or strongly disagree that in childhood, their parents often argued due to holding conflicting parental expectations.

▪ The results indicated that more participants expressed disagreement or strong disagreement, rather than agreement or strong agreement, that meeting their parents’ expectations was difficult when they were children. However, the
difference of ratio between agree/strongly agree and disagree/strongly disagree is less than 10%. Also, more participants expressed that they disagree/strongly disagree, rather than agree/strongly agree, that meeting their parents' expectations was difficult when they were children.

In item 23, “my parents’ expectations of me made me feel stressed when I was a child,” the results showed:

- Paternal: 7.98% strongly agree, 19.63% agree, 35.17% neutral, 28.59% disagree, and 8.63% strongly disagree.
- Maternal: 7.40% strongly agree, 20.28% agree, 35.30% neutral, 28.86% disagree, and 8.15% strongly disagree.
- Of the total paternal vs. maternal percentage, 27.61% expressed that they agree or strongly agree that their father’s expectations of them made them feel stressed when they were children, while 27.68% expressed that they agree or strongly agree that their mother’s expectations of them made them feel stressed when they were children. Of the total paternal vs. maternal percentage, 37.22% expressed that they disagree or strongly disagree that their father’s expectations of them made them feel stressed when they were children, while 37.01% expressed that they disagree or strongly disagree that their mother’s expectations of them made them feel stressed when they were children.
- The results indicated that more participants expressed that they disagree or strongly disagree than agree or strongly agree that their parents' expectations of them made them feel stressed when they were children.
In item 24, “compared with my childhood, my parent had higher expectations of me when I was a teenager,” the results from the respondents indicated:

- Paternal: 8.41% strongly agree, 34.38% agree, 36.75% neutral, 16.59% disagree, and 3.88% strongly disagree.

- Maternal: 8.06% strongly agree, 33.87% agree, 38.82% neutral, 16.02% disagree, and 3.23% strongly disagree.

- Parents argued: 2.33% strongly agree, 9.55% agree, 28.75% neutral, 42.26% disagree, and 7.11% strongly disagree.

- Of the total paternal vs. maternal percentage, 42.79% expressed that they agree or strongly agree that their father had higher expectations of them in their adolescence as compared with their childhood, while 41.93% expressed that they agree or strongly agree that their mother had higher expectations of them in their adolescence as compared with their childhood. Of the total paternal vs. maternal percentage, 20.47% expressed that they disagree or strongly disagree that their father had higher expectations of them in their adolescence as compared with their childhood, while 19.25% expressed that they disagree or strongly disagree that their mother had higher expectations of them in their adolescence as compared with their childhood.

- Of the total percentage, 11.88% agree or strongly agree that their parents often argued due to different expectations of them in their adolescence as compared with their childhood, while 59.37% disagree or strongly disagree that their parents often argued due to different expectations of them in their adolescence as compared with their childhood.
• The results indicated that more than 40% of participants expressed that they agree or strongly agree that both their father and mother had higher expectations of them in their adolescence as compared with their childhood. More participants disagreed than agreed that their parents often argued due to different expectations of them in their adolescence as compared with their childhood.

In item 25, “my parents were always calm when they had disagreements with me during my teenage years,” the results from the respondents showed:

• Paternal: 5.25% strongly agree, 24.17% agree, 33.98% neutral, 27.82% disagree, and 8.78% strongly disagree.

• Maternal: 4.76% strongly agree, 22.00% agree, 34.24% neutral, 27.78% disagree, and 11.22% strongly disagree.

• Of the total paternal vs. maternal percentage, 29.42% expressed that they agree or strongly agree that their father was always calm when he had disagreements with them during their teenage years, while 26.76% expressed that they agree or strongly agree that their mother was always calm when she had disagreements with them during their teenage years. Of the total paternal vs. maternal percentage, 36.60% expressed that they disagree or strongly disagree that their father was always calm when they had disagreements with him during their teenage years, while 39.00% expressed that they disagree or strongly disagree that their mother was always calm they had disagreements with her during their teenage years.
The results indicated that fewer participants expressed agreement, rather than
disagreement, that their parents were always calm when the parents had
disagreements with them during their teenage years.

In item 26, “my parents made me feel guilty when I wanted to spend time away
from home during my teenage years,” the results showed:

- Paternal: 7.75% strongly agree, 24.63% agree, 33.64% neutral, 26.91%
disagree, and 7.07% strongly disagree.
- Maternal: 9.06% strongly agree, 30.12% agree, 28.54% neutral, 26.27%
disagree, and 6.00% strongly disagree.
- Of the total paternal vs. maternal percentage, 32.38% expressed that they
agree or strongly agree that their father made them feel guilty when they
wanted to spend time away from home during their teenage years, while
39.18% expressed that they agree or strongly agree that their mother made
them feel guilty when they wanted to spend time away from home during their
teenage years. Of the total paternal vs. maternal percentage, 33.98% expressed
that they disagree or strongly disagree that their father made them feel guilty
when they wanted to spend time away from home during their teenage years,
while 32.27% expressed that they disagree or strongly disagree that their
mother made them feel guilty when they wanted to spend time away from
home during their teenage years.
- The results indicated that about one third of the participants expressed
agreement or strong agreement that their parent made them feel guilty when
they wanted to spend time away from home during their teenage years, while
one third expressed disagreement or strong disagreement, and about one third expressed neutrality.

In item 27, “my grandparents were able to influence my parents' decisions about me when I was a child,” the results from the respondents indicated:

- Paternal: 3.08% strongly agree, 13.44% agree, 21.07% neutral, 35.08% disagree, and 27.33% strongly disagree.

- Maternal: 3.40% strongly agree, 14.06% agree, 22.56% neutral, 33.33% disagree, and 26.64% strongly disagree.

- Of the total paternal vs. maternal percentage, 16.52% expressed that they agree or strongly agree that their grandparents were able to influence their father's decisions about them when they were children, while 17.46% expressed that they agree or strongly agree that their grandparents were able to influence their mother's decisions about them when they were children. Of the total paternal vs. maternal percentage, 62.41% expressed that they disagree or strongly disagree that their grandparents were able to influence their father's decisions about them when they were children, while 69.97% expressed that they disagree or strongly disagree that their grandparents were able to influence their mother's decisions about them when they were children.

- The results indicated that only about 16%-17% of participants have this issue. About 2 out of 3 participants expressed that they disagree or strongly disagree that their grandparents were able to influence their parents' decisions about them when they were children.
In item 28, “my parent and I fought over their expectations for my college, major and/or career choice,” the results from the respondents indicated:

- Paternal: 3.08% strongly agree, 9.02% agree, 23.40% neutral, 40.98% disagree, and 23.52% strongly disagree.

- Maternal: 3.63% strongly agree, 8.62% agree, 24.04% neutral, 40.14% disagree, and 23.58% strongly disagree.

- Of the total paternal vs. maternal percentage, 12.10% expressed that they agree or strongly agree that they fought with their father over his expectations for their college, major and/or career choice, while 12.25% expressed that they agree or strongly agree that they fought with their mother over her expectations for their college, major and/or career choice. Of the total paternal vs. maternal percentage, 64.50% expressed that they disagree or strongly disagree that they fought with their father over his expectations for their college, major and/or career choice, while 63.72% expressed that they disagree or strongly disagree that they fought with their mother over her expectations for their college, major and/or career choice.

- The results indicated that only about 12% have this issue. About 2 out of 3 participants expressed that they disagree or strongly disagree that they fought with their parents over the parents' expectations for their college, major and/or career choice. The data suggested that this item does not have strong influence in the study.

In item 29, “Looking back on my childhood, I wish that my parents' expectations had been…,” the results from the respondents indicated:
- Paternal: 1.94% much lower or less specific, 10.40% lower or less, 59.20% neutral, 23.66% higher or specific, and 4.80% much higher or more specific.
- Maternal: 3.28% much lower or less specific, 10.65% lower or less, 59.12% neutral, 21.97% higher or specific, and 4.98% much higher or more specific.
- Of the total paternal vs. maternal percentage, 12.34% expressed that they wished their father’s expectations had been much lower/less specific or lower/less when looking back on their childhood, while 13.93% expressed that they wished their mother’s expectations had been much lower/less specific or lower/less when looking back on their childhood. Of the total paternal vs. maternal percentage, 28.46% expressed that they wished their father’s expectations had been much higher/more specific or higher/specific when looking back on their childhood, while 26.95% expressed that they wished their mother’s expectations had been much higher/more specific or higher/specific when looking back on their childhood. Responses of neutrality for both paternal and maternal studies turned out to be equally high at around 59%.
- Surprisingly, the results indicated that over 1 out of 4 participants expressed the wish that their parents' expectations had been much higher/more specific or higher/specific when looking back on their childhood than much lower/less specific or lower/less. Furthermore, there was less than 2% on the paternal and less than 4% on the maternal where participants wished the parental expectations to be much lower or less specific.
In item 30, “I had a close relationship with my parent when I was a child,” the results from the respondents showed:

- Paternal: 15.13% strongly agree, 31.74% agree, 32.76% neutral, 13.08% disagree, and 7.28% strongly disagree.

- Maternal: 23.52% strongly agree, 40.11% agree, 24.43% neutral, 7.73% disagree, and 4.20% strongly disagree.

- Of the total paternal vs. maternal percentage, 46.87% expressed agree or strongly agree that they had a close relationship with their father when they were children, while 53.63% expressed agree or strongly agree that they had a close relationship with their mother when they were children. Of the total paternal vs. maternal percentage, 20.36% expressed disagree or strongly disagree that they had a close relationship with their father when they were children, while 11.93% expressed disagree or strongly disagree that they had a close relationship with their mother when they were children.

- The results showed that about 1 out of 2 participants expressed that they had a close relationship with their parents when they were children. More participants expressed that they disagree for having a close relationship with their father than with their mother when they were children. The data suggested that the maternal parent-child relationship is closer than the paternal parent-child relationship.

In item 31, “I had a close relationship with my parent when I was a teenager,” the results from the respondents showed:
• Paternal: 8.44% strongly agree, 24.97% agree, 41.73% neutral, 15.74% disagree, and 9.12% strongly disagree.

• Maternal: 14.40% strongly agree, 35.15% agree, 31.86% neutral, 12.13% disagree, and 6.46% strongly disagree.

• Of the total paternal vs. maternal percentage, 33.43% expressed agree or strongly agree that they had a close relationship with their father in their adolescence, while 49.55% expressed agree or strongly agree that they had a close relationship with their mother in their adolescence. Of the total paternal vs. maternal percentage, 24.86% expressed disagree or strongly disagree that they had a close relationship with their father in their adolescence, while 18.59% expressed disagree or strongly disagree that they had a close relationship with their mother in their adolescence.

• The results indicated that 1 out of 3 participants expressed that they had a close relationship with their father in their adolescence, while 1 out of 2 participants expressed that they had a close relationship with their mother in their adolescence. The data suggested that the maternal parent-teen relationship is closer than the paternal parent-teen relationship. However, the parent-teen relationship of the participants is measurably less close than the parent-child relationship when compared with item 30.

In item 32, “I tried to avoid contact with my parent when I was a child,” the results from the respondents showed:

• Paternal: 5.24% strongly agree, 9.11% agree, 22.89% neutral, 39.98% disagree, and 22.78% strongly disagree.
▪ Maternal: 2.84% strongly agree, 7.38% agree, 19.18% neutral, 44.04% disagree, and 26.56% strongly disagree.

▪ Of the total paternal vs. maternal percentage, 14.35% expressed agree or strongly agree that they tried to avoid contact with their father when they were children, while 10.22% expressed agree or strongly agree that they tried to avoid contact with their mother when they were children. Of the total paternal vs. maternal percentage, 62.76% expressed disagree or strongly disagree that they tried to avoid contact with their father when they were children, while 70.60% expressed disagree or strongly disagree that they tried to avoid contact with their mother when they were children.

▪ The results indicated that while there is a majority of participants who expressed that they did not try to avoid contact with their parents when they were children, there is still a surprising quantity who expressed that they tried to avoid contact with their father (over 14%) and mother (over 10%) when they were children.

In item 33, “I tried to avoid contact with my parent during my teenage years,” the results from the respondents showed:

▪ Paternal: 7.76% strongly agree, 19.86% agree, 29.00% neutral, 30.71% disagree, and 12.67% strongly disagree.

▪ Maternal: 5.55% strongly agree, 17.55% agree, 25.25% neutral, 36.13% disagree, and 15.52% strongly disagree.

▪ Of the total paternal vs. maternal percentage, 27.62% expressed agree or strongly agree that they tried to avoid contact with their father during their
teenage years, while 23.10% expressed agree or strongly agree that they tried to avoid contact with their mother during their teenage years. Of the total paternal vs. maternal percentage, of 43.38% expressed disagree or strongly disagree that they tried to avoid contact with their father during their teenage years, while 51.65% expressed disagree or strongly disagree that they tried to avoid contact with their mother during their teenage years.

- The results indicated that less participants agree than disagree that they tried to avoid contact with their parents during their teenage years. In other words, more did not try to avoid contact with their parents than those who did try to avoid contact with their parents during their teenage years.

In item 34, “My parent was supportive of me when I had difficult times when I was a child,” the results indicated:

- Paternal: 22.75% strongly agree, 41.18% agree, 25.37% neutral, 7.39% disagree, and 3.30% strongly disagree.

- Maternal: 26.96% strongly agree, 42.32% agree, 21.62% neutral, 7.17% disagree, and 1.93% strongly disagree.

- Of the total paternal vs. maternal percentage, 63.93% expressed agree or strongly agree that their father was supportive of them when they had difficult times as children, while 69.28% expressed agree or strongly agree that their mother was supportive of them when they had difficult times as children. Of the total paternal vs. maternal percentage, 10.69% expressed disagree or strongly disagree that their father was supportive of them when they had difficult times as children, while 9.10% expressed disagree or strongly
disagree that their mother was supportive of them when they had difficult times as children.

- The results indicated that about 2 out of 3 participants expressed agree or strongly agree that their parents were supportive of them when they had difficult times as children. There were only 10% or less of participants who expressed disagreement or strong disagreement that their parents were supportive of them when they had difficult times as children.

In item 35, “My relationship with my parent has improved since I became an adult,” the results from the respondents indicated:

- Paternal: 18.78% strongly agree, 47.07% agree, 23.59% neutral, 6.81% disagree, and 3.76% strongly disagree.

- Maternal: 23.40% strongly agree, 47.26% agree, 20.95% neutral, 6.17% disagree, and 2.21% strongly disagree.

- Of the total paternal vs. maternal percentage, 65.85% expressed agree or strongly agree that their relationship with their father improved since they became an adult, while 70.66% expressed agree or strongly agree that their relationship with their mother improved since they became an adult. Of the total paternal vs. maternal percentage, 10.57% expressed disagree or strongly disagree that their relationship with their father improved since they became an adult, while 8.38% expressed disagree or strongly disagree that their relationship with their mother improved since they became an adult.

- The results indicated that 2 out of 3 participants expressed agree or strongly agree that their relationship with their parents improved since they became an
adult. Only 10% or less expressed disagree or strongly disagree that their relationship with their parents improved since they became an adult. The data suggested that relationships with parents improve after offspring become adults.

In item 36, “Looking back on my childhood, I am satisfied with how my parent communicated with me,” the results were:

- Paternal: 10.16% strongly agree, 27.92% agree, 33.88% neutral, 19.86% disagree, and 8.18% strongly disagree.

- Maternal: 11.40% strongly agree, 34.30% agree, 29.19% neutral, 18.84% disagree, and 6.28% strongly disagree.

- Of the total paternal vs. maternal percentage, 38.08% expressed agree or strongly agree that they are satisfied with how their father communicated with them when looking back on their childhood years, while 35.70% expressed agree or strongly agree that they are satisfied with how their mother communicated with them when looking back on their childhood years. Of the total paternal vs. maternal percentage, 28.04% expressed disagree or strongly disagree that they are satisfied with how their father communicated with them when looking back on their childhood years, while 25.02% expressed disagree or strongly disagree that they are satisfied with how their mother communicated with them when looking back on their childhood years.

- The results indicated that approximately 1 out of 4 participants expressed disagree or strongly disagree that they are satisfied with how their father or mother communicated with them when looking back on their childhood years.
There were only slightly more than 10% of participants who expressed strong agreement that they are satisfied with how their father and mother communicated with them when looking back on their childhood years.

In item 37, “Looking back on my teenage years, I am satisfied with how my parent communicated with me,” the results from the respondents showed:

- Paternal: 7.37% strongly agree, 26.90% agree, 32.40% neutral, 22.69% disagree, and 10.64% strongly disagree.
- Maternal: 8.94% strongly agree, 31.24% agree, 29.50% neutral, 21.60% disagree, and 8.71% strongly disagree.
- Of the total paternal vs. maternal percentage, 34.27% expressed agree or strongly agree that they are satisfied with how their father communicated with them when looking back on their teenage years, while 40.23% expressed agree or strongly agree that they are satisfied with how their mother communicated with them when looking back on their teenage years. Of the total paternal vs. maternal percentage, 33.33% expressed disagree or strongly disagree that they are satisfied with how their father communicated with them when looking back on their teenage years, while 30.31% expressed disagree or strongly disagree that they are satisfied with how their mother communicated with them when looking back on their teenage years.
- The results indicated that 1 out of 3 participants expressed disagree or strongly disagree that they are satisfied with how their father or mother communicated with them when looking back on their teenage years. There were less than 10% who expressed strong agreement that they are satisfied with how both
their father and mother communicated with them when looking back on their teenage years.

In item 38, “Even when angry, my parent seldom said mean words to me,” the results from the respondents showed:

- Paternal: 19.88% strongly agree, 33.45% agree, 32.99% neutral, 15.56% disagree, and 9.12% strongly disagree.

- Maternal: 17.56% strongly agree, 31.63% agree, 19.42% neutral, 19.77% disagree, and 11.63% strongly disagree.

- Of the total paternal vs. maternal percentage, 53.33% expressed agree or strongly agree that their father seldom said mean words to them even when angry, while 49.19% expressed agree or strongly agree that their mother seldom said mean words to them even when angry. Of the total paternal vs. maternal percentage, 24.68% expressed disagree or strongly disagree that their father seldom said mean words to them even when angry, while 31.40% expressed disagree or strongly disagree that their mother seldom said mean words to them even when angry.

- The results indicated that more participants experienced their father seldom saying mean words to them even when angry, compared with their mother. And more participants expressed that they disagree or strongly disagree that their mother seldom said mean words to them even when angry. The data suggested that mothers say mean words more than fathers do when angry.

In item 39, “My parent was a good listener,” the results from the respondents showed:
▪ Father as good listener: 9.77% strongly agree, 24.07% agree, 33.02% neutral, 21.16% disagree, and 11.98% strongly disagree.

▪ Mother as good listener: 11.85% strongly agree, 30.89% agree, 28.80% neutral, 18.58% disagree, and 9.87% strongly disagree.

▪ Father as good listener for mother: 7.80% strongly agree, 25.77% agree, 32.86% neutral, 20.45% disagree, and 13.12% strongly disagree.

▪ Mother as good listener for father: 9.45% strongly agree, 30.70% agree, 30.22% neutral, 18.06% disagree, and 11.57% strongly disagree.

▪ Of the total paternal vs. maternal percentage, 33.84% expressed agree or strongly agree that their father was a good listener for them, while 42.74% expressed agree or strongly agree that their mother was a good listener for them. Of the total paternal vs. maternal percentage, 33.57% expressed agree or strongly agree that their father was a good listener for their mother, while 40.15% expressed agree or strongly agree that their mother was a good listener for their father.

▪ Of the total percentage, 33.14% expressed disagree or strongly disagree that their father was a good listener for them, while 28.45% expressed disagree or strongly disagree that their mother was a good listener for them. Of the total percentage, 33.57% expressed disagree or strongly disagree that their father was a good listener for their mother, while 39.63% expressed disagree or strongly disagree that their mother was a good listener for their father.
• The data indicated that more participants expressed agree or strongly agree that their mother was a good listener for them and their father, compared with their father as a good listener for them and their mother.

In item 40, “My parent discussed ideas and beliefs when I was a child,” the results from the respondents showed:

• Father discussed with me: 6.07% strongly agree, 24.50% agree, 35.12% neutral, 24.15% disagree, and 10.15% strongly disagree.

• Mother discussed with me: 7.90% strongly agree, 29.97% agree, 34.73% neutral, 19.40% disagree, and 8.01% strongly disagree.

• Father discussed with mother: 6.08% strongly agree, 27.18% agree, 38.26% neutral, 18.95% disagree, and 9.54% strongly disagree.

• Mother discussed with father: 5.92% strongly agree, 28.67% agree, 39.69% neutral, 17.06% disagree, and 8.65% strongly disagree.

• Of the total paternal vs. maternal percentage, 30.57% expressed agree or strongly agree that their father discussed ideas and beliefs with them when they were children, while 37.87% expressed agree or strongly agree that their mother discussed ideas and beliefs with them when they were children. Of the total paternal vs. maternal percentage, 33.26% expressed agree or strongly agree that their father discussed ideas and beliefs with their mother when they were children, while 34.59% expressed agree or strongly agree that their mother discussed ideas and beliefs with their father when they were children.
• Of the total percentage, 34.30% expressed disagree or strongly disagree that their father discussed ideas and beliefs with them when they were children, while 27.41% expressed disagree or strongly disagree that their mother discussed ideas and beliefs with them when they were children. Of the total percentage, 28.49% expressed disagree or strongly disagree that their father discussed ideas and beliefs with their mother when they were children, while 25.71% expressed disagree or strongly disagree that their mother discussed ideas and beliefs with their father when they were children.

• The results indicated that mothers discussed ideas and beliefs with children more than fathers, and that mothers discussed ideas and beliefs with fathers more than father did with mothers.

In item 41, “Looking back on my childhood years, I am satisfied with the amount of time that my parent spent with me,” the results indicated:

• With father: 11.77% strongly agree, 29.95% agree, 29.84% neutral, 18.53% disagree, and 9.91% strongly disagree.

• With mother: 16.94% strongly agree, 39.14% agree, 25.35% neutral, 12.73% disagree, and 5.84% strongly disagree.

• As a family: 16.84% strongly agree, 32.74% agree, 29.06% neutral, 15.42% disagree, and 5.93% strongly disagree.

• Of the total paternal vs. maternal percentage, 41.72% expressed agree or strongly agree that they are satisfied with the amount of time their father spent with them when looking back on their childhood years, while 46.08% expressed agree or strongly agree that they are satisfied with the amount of
time their mother spent with them when looking back on their childhood years. Of the total percentage, 49.58% expressed agree or strongly agree that they are satisfied with the amount of time they spent together as a family when looking back on their childhood years.

- Of the total paternal vs. maternal percentage, 28.44% expressed disagree or strongly disagree that they are satisfied with the amount of time their father spent with them when looking back on their childhood years, while 18.57% expressed disagree or strongly disagree that they are satisfied with the amount of time their mother spent with them when looking back on their childhood years. Of the total percentage, 21.35% expressed disagree or strongly disagree that they are satisfied with the amount of time they spent together as a family when looking back on their childhood years.

- The results indicated that almost 1 out of 2 participants expressed agreement or strong agreement that they are satisfied with the amount of time they spent with father, mother, and especially together as a family, when looking back on their childhood years.

In item 42, “Looking back on my teenage years, I am satisfied with the amount of time that my parent spent with me,” the results from the respondents indicated:

- With father: 10.40% strongly agree, 24.88% agree, 35.75% neutral, 18.93% disagree, and 10.05% strongly disagree.

- With mother: 12.82% strongly agree, 34.15% agree, 34.82% neutral, 14.69% disagree, and 6.53% strongly disagree.
• As a family: 12.31% strongly agree, 28.52% agree, 34.08% neutral, 16.80% disagree, and 8.28% strongly disagree.

• Of the total paternal vs. maternal percentage, 35.28% expressed agree or strongly agree that they are satisfied with the amount of time their father spent with them when looking back on their teenage years, while 36.97% expressed agree or strongly agree that they are satisfied with the amount of time their mother spent with them when looking back on their teenage years. Of the total percentage, 40.83% expressed agree or strongly agree that they are satisfied with the amount of time they spent together as a family when looking back on their teenage years.

• Of the total paternal vs. maternal percentage, 28.98% expressed disagree or strongly disagree that they are satisfied with the amount of time their father spent with them when looking back on their teenage years, while 21.22% expressed disagree or strongly disagree that they are satisfied with the amount of time their mother spent with them when looking back on their teenage years. Of the total percentage, 25.08% expressed disagreement or strong disagreement that they are satisfied with the amount of time they spent together as a family when looking back on their teenage years.

• The results indicated that more than one out of four of participants expressed disagree or strongly disagree that they are satisfied with the amount of time they spent with father, mother, or together as a family when looking back on their teenage years. More participants expressed agreement or strong agreement that they are satisfied with the amount of time they spent together
as a family when looking back on their teenage years as compared with those expressing satisfaction with the amount of time spent with father or mother when looking back on their teenage years. The data also suggested that satisfaction with the amount of time spent with father, mother or together as a family when looking back on teenage years was lower than for childhood years.

In item 43, “Looking back on my childhood, I am satisfied with the closeness of my relationship with my parent,” the results from the respondents indicated:

- **Paternal:** 14.04% strongly agree, 35.67% agree, 13.57% neutral, 13.57% disagree, and 7.72% strongly disagree.

- **Maternal:** 17.76% strongly agree, 41.24% agree, 24.65% neutral, 11.33% disagree, and 5.02% strongly disagree.

- Of the total paternal vs. maternal percentage, 49.71% expressed agree or strongly agree that they are satisfied with the closeness of their relationship with their father when looking back on their childhood years, while 59.00% expressed agree or strongly agree that they are satisfied with the closeness of their relationship with their mother when looking back on their childhood years. Of the total paternal vs. maternal percentage, 21.29% expressed disagree or strongly disagree that they are satisfied with the closeness of their relationship with their father when looking back on their childhood years, while 14.35% expressed disagree or strongly disagree that they are satisfied with the closeness of their relationship with their mother when looking back on their childhood years. The results indicated that more than 1 out of 2 of
participants expressed agree or strongly agree that they are satisfied with the closeness of their relationship with their parents when looking back on their childhood years. One out of five of participants expressed disagree or strongly disagree that they are satisfied with the closeness of their relationship with their father when looking back on their childhood years. Also, the data suggested that the relationship with fathers is less satisfactory than the relationship with mothers.

In item 44, “Looking back on my teenage years, I am satisfied with the closeness of my relationship with my parent,” the results from the respondents indicated:

- Paternal: 9.12% strongly agree, 29.59% agree, 31.70% neutral, 18.60% disagree, and 10.99% strongly disagree.

- Maternal: 11.86% strongly agree, 35.70% agree, 28.49% neutral, 16.51% disagree, and 7.44% strongly disagree.

- Of the total paternal vs. maternal percentage, 38.71% expressed agree or strongly agree that they are satisfied with the closeness of their relationship with their father when looking back on their teenage years, while 47.56% expressed agree or strongly agree that they are satisfied with the closeness of their relationship with their mother when looking back on their teenage years. Of the total paternal vs. maternal percentage, 29.59% expressed disagree or strongly disagree that they are satisfied with the closeness of their relationship with their father when looking back on their teenage years, while 23.95% expressed disagree or strongly disagree that they are satisfied with the
closeness of their relationship with their mother when looking back on their teenage years.

- The results indicated that more than 1 out of 4 of participants expressed disagree or strongly disagree that they are satisfied with the closeness of their relationship with their parents when looking back on their teenage years. And the data suggested that the relationship with fathers was less satisfactory than the relationship with mothers. In addition, the data also suggested that parental relationships during teenage years was much less satisfactory than in childhood years when compared with item 43.

In item 45, “I have become more appreciative of my parents' expectations of me now that I am an adult,” the results from the respondents showed:

- Paternal: 22.87% strongly agree, 45.50% agree, 23.82% neutral, 5.45% disagree, and 2.37% strongly disagree.

- Maternal: 25.71% strongly agree, 46.92% agree, 20.73% neutral, 4.98% disagree, and 1.66% strongly disagree.

- Of the total paternal vs. maternal percentage, 68.37% expressed agree or strongly agree that they have become more appreciative of their father's expectations of them now that they are adults, while 72.63% expressed agree or strongly agree that they have become more appreciative of their mother's expectations of them now that they are adults. Of the total paternal vs. maternal percentage, 7.82% expressed disagree or strongly disagree that they have become more appreciative of their father's expectations of them now that they are adults, while 6.64% expressed disagree or strongly disagree that they
have become more appreciative of their mother's expectations of them now that they are adults.

- The results indicated that many more participants expressed agreement or strong agreement that they have become more appreciative of their parents' expectations of them now that they are adults than the ones who disagreed or strongly disagreed.

In item 46, “The main person who managed our family finances when I was a child was,” the results from the respondents indicated that 35.29% of participants listed their father as the one who managed the family finances, while 64.71% listed their mother as the one who managed the family finances. The results indicated that more families had mothers managing finances than fathers.

In item 47, “My parents' expectations of me were helpful to my academic success,” the results showed:

- Paternal: 15.62% strongly agree, 36.45% agree, 33.14% neutral, 10.53% disagree, and 4.26% strongly disagree.
- Maternal: 16.90% strongly agree, 38.77% agree, 30.26% neutral, 10.05% disagree, and 4.02% strongly disagree.

- Of the total paternal vs. maternal percentage, 52.07% expressed agree or strongly agree that paternal expectations were helpful to their academic success, while 55.67% expressed agree or strongly agree that maternal expectations were helpful to their academic success. Of the total paternal vs. maternal percentage, 14.79% expressed disagree or strongly disagree that paternal expectations were helpful to their academic success, while 14.07%
expressed disagree or strongly disagree that maternal expectations were helpful to their academic success.

- The results indicated that more participants expressed agree or strongly agree that parental expectations were helpful to their academic success than disagree or strongly disagree.

In item 48, “The influence of my parents' expectations of me on our parent-child relationship has been…,” the results indicated:

- Paternal: 12.75% strongly positive, 34.71% positive, 40.85% neutral, 9.33% negative, and 2.36% strongly negative.
- Maternal: 13.80% strongly positive, 37.15% positive, 38.44% neutral, 8.73% negative, and 1.89% strongly negative.
- Of the total paternal vs. maternal percentage, 47.46% responded that the influence of paternal expectations on their parent-child relationship is positive or strongly positive, while a total of 50.95% responded that the influence of maternal expectations on their parent-child relationship is positive or strongly positive. Of the total paternal vs. maternal percentage, only 11.69% responded that the influence of paternal expectations on their parent-child relationship is negative or strongly negative, while only 10.62% responded that the influence of maternal expectations on their parent-child relationship is negative or strongly negative. These results indicated that the influence of parental expectations on parent-child relationships is more positive than negative.

In item 49, “The influence my parents' expectations of me on our family relationship has been…,” the results from the respondents indicated:
Paternal: 11.22% strongly positive, 37.07% positive, 39.67% neutral, 9.45% negative, and 2.60% strongly negative.

Maternal: 12.15% strongly positive, 39.74% positive, 37.50% neutral, 8.49% negative, and 2.12% strongly negative.

Of the total paternal vs. maternal percentage, 48.29% responded that the influence of paternal expectations of them on their family relationship is positive or strongly positive, while 51.91% responded that the influence of maternal expectations of them on their family relationship is positive or strongly positive. Of the total paternal vs. maternal percentage, only 10.81% responded that the influence of paternal expectations of them on their family relationship is negative or strongly negative, while 14.48% responded that the influence of maternal expectations of them on their family relationship is negative or strongly negative.

This result indicated that the influence of parental expectations on family relationship is much more positive than negative. However, 14.48% of those who have experienced maternal expectations of them as a negative influence on their family relationship, were still considered a sizable population.

In item 50, “The influence my parents' marital relationship has on me today has been…,” the results from the respondents indicated:

Influence on emotional health: 18.26% strongly positive, 33.57% positive, 26.38% neutral, 16.37% negative, and 5.42% strongly negative.

Influence on confidence: 18.26% strongly positive, 32.86% positive, 29.92% neutral, 15.43% negative, and 3.53% strongly negative.
Of the total percentage, 51.83% responded that the influence of their parents' marital relationship on their emotional health today is positive or strongly positive, and 51.12% responded that the influence of their parents' marital relationship on their confidence today is positive or strongly positive. Of the total percentage, 21.79% responded that the influence of their parents' marital relationship on their emotional health today is negative or strongly negative, and 18.96% responded that the influence of their parents' marital relationship on their confidence today is negative or strongly negative.

This result indicated that the influence of the parents' marital relationship on the participants’ emotional health and confidence today has been more positive than negative, but the 21.79% who indicated that the influence of their parents' marital relationship on their emotional health today is negative or strongly negative is however more than 1 out of 5 participants! This is definitely a significant number. The results implied that there is a large number of people who suffer emotional health issues due to their parents' marital condition. The 18.96% of responses expressing the influence of the parents' marital relationship on confidence today as negative or strongly negative also indicated a significant population of people suffering negative impacts on personal confidence due to their parents' martial relationship.

In item 51, “The influence my parents' expectations of me has on my emotional health today is…,” the results indicated:

- Paternal: 15.67% strongly positive, 33.22% positive, 36.16% neutral, 12.72% negative, and 2.24% strongly negative.
- Maternal: 15.43% strongly positive, 37.93% positive, 32.16% neutral, 12.01% negative, and 2.47% strongly negative.

- Of the total paternal vs. maternal percentage, 48.89% responded that the influence of paternal expectations on their emotional health today is positive or strongly positive, while 53.36% responded that the influence of maternal expectations on their emotional health today is positive or strongly positive.

- These results indicated that the influence of parental expectations on the respondents’ emotional health today is much more positive than negative. However, 14.48% is still a considerably substantial percentage to be suffering a negative impact on emotional health due to parental expectations.

In item 52, “The influence my parents' expectations of me has on my confidence today is...,” the results indicated:

- Paternal: 15.11% strongly positive, 34.83% positive, 34.12% neutral, 13.11% negative, and 2.83% strongly negative.

- Maternal: 16.04% strongly positive, 36.56% positive, 32.19% neutral, 12.74% negative, and 2.48% strongly negative.

- Of the total paternal vs. maternal percentage, 49.94% responded that the influence of paternal expectations on their confidence today is positive or strongly positive, while 52.60% responded that the influence of maternal
expectations on their confidence today is positive or strongly positive. Of the total paternal vs. maternal percentage, 15.94% responded that the influence of paternal expectations on their confidence today is negative or strongly negative, while 15.22% responded that the influence of maternal expectations on their confidence today is negative or strongly negative. This result indicated that the influence of parental expectations on their confidence today is much more positive than negative.

In item 53, “The influence my parents' expectations of me has on my success today is…,” the results indicated:

- Paternal: 16.16% strongly positive, 38.56% positive, 37.85% neutral, 5.66% negative, and 1.77% strongly negative.

- Maternal: 17.00% strongly positive, 40.85% positive, 34.71% neutral, 6.02% negative, and 1.42% strongly negative.

- Of the total paternal vs. maternal percentage, 54.72% responded that the influence of paternal expectations on their success today is positive or strongly positive, while 57.85% responded that the influence of maternal expectations on their success today is positive or strongly positive. Of the total paternal vs. maternal percentage, 7.73% responded that the influence of paternal expectations on their success today is negative or strongly negative, while 7.44% responded that the influence of maternal expectations on their success today is negative or strongly negative. This result indicated that the influence of parental expectations on the respondents’ success today is much more positive than negative.
In item 54, “My parent was often absent when I was a child,” the results from the respondents showed:

- Paternal: 14.98% strongly agree, 24.76% agree, 16.51% neutral, 26.18% disagree, and 17.57% strongly disagree.

- Maternal: 6.01% strongly agree, 12.85% agree, 14.39% neutral, 34.91% disagree, and 31.84% strongly disagree.

- Of the total paternal vs. maternal percentage, 39.74% indicated agree or strongly agree that their father was often absent when they were children, while 18.86% expressed that they agree or strongly agree that their mother was often absent when they were children. Of the total paternal vs. maternal percentage, 43.75% indicated disagree or strongly disagree that their father was often absent when they were children, while 66.75% expressed that they disagree or strongly disagree that their mother was often absent when they were children.

In item 55, “My parent was often absent when I was a teenager,” the results showed:

- Paternal: 13.00% strongly agree, 23.76% agree, 19.50% neutral, 26.60% disagree, and 17.14% strongly disagree.

- Maternal: 6.60% strongly agree, 13.07% agree, 16.73% neutral, 34.04% disagree, and 29.56% strongly disagree.

- Of the total paternal vs. maternal percentage, 36.76% indicated agree or strongly agree that their father was often absent when they were teenagers, while 19.67% expressed that they agree or strongly agree that their mother
was often absent when they were teenagers. Of the total paternal vs. maternal percentage, 43.74% indicated disagree or strongly disagree that their father was often absent when they were teenagers, while 63.60% expressed that they disagree or strongly disagree that their mother was often absent when they were teenagers.

**Results from Exploratory Factor Analysis**

Exploratory factor analysis was conducted for dimension reduction on 41 items. Due to the theoretical relatedness and high correlations among the variables, oblique rotation was chosen over orthogonal (independent) rotation (Field, 2013). Maximum Likelihood extraction method with Promax rotation was used. Coefficient display format was set to suppress small coefficients at the absolute value below .30. Therefore, during the factors evaluating and refining process, factors loading weaker than .30 were eliminated due to their insufficient correlation score with other items in the matrix (Pett, Lackey, & Sullivan, 2003). A total of 22 items were removed while 19 items were retained. Both the Scree Plot and Correlation Matrix indicated that there are three distinctive factors.

Regarding the results of the participants’ responses related to their interactions with father (referred to paternal interactions thereafter), the Kaiser-Meyer-Oklin measure verified the sampling adequacy for the analysis, $KMO = .923$, a score which is identified as ‘marvelous’ according to the Hutcheson and Sofroniou (1999). An initial analysis was run to obtain Eigenvalues for each factor in the data. Five factors had eigenvalues over Kaiser’s criterion of 1 and in combination explained 63.10% of variance. Items deleted were those that cross-load (i.e., have small factor loadings on multiple factors) and items
with very low factor loadings (< .30) in each successive attempt. The purpose is to retain items that load clearly on one factor while having no or small loading on other factors to improve the clarity of the factor structure. This step was also guided by careful consideration of whether the retained items are theoretically meaningful and consistent with the hypothesized factor structure. The final pattern matrix suggested a 3-factor structure, with eigenvalues over 1 and in combination that explained 53.19% of variance.

Regarding the results of participants’ responses related to their interactions with mother (referred to maternal interactions thereafter), the Kaiser-Meyer-Oklin measure verified the sampling adequacy for the analysis, $KMO = .924$, which is ‘marvelous’ according to Hutcheson and Sofroniou (1999). An initial analysis was run to obtain eigenvalues for each factor in the data. Five factors had eigenvalues over Kaiser’s criterion of 1 and in combination explained 61.68% of variance. Again, cross-loading items and items with very low factor loadings were deleted (< .30) in each successive attempt to improve the clarity of the factor structure. The final pattern matrix suggested a 3-factor structure, with eigenvalues over 1 and in combination that explained 49.07% of variance.

The 3-factor structure obtained from maternal and paternal interactions were similar with some non-overlapping items. Since a future goal is to administer the survey with the same items to assess respondents’ experiences with their mother and father across multiple samples, the non-overlapping items (items 15, 17, 20, 21, 24, 25, 27, 29, 30, 31, 35, 36, 38, 39, 40, 43, 44, 49, 50) between the paternal pattern matrix and the maternal pattern matrix were deleted. These items will also allow for between-group comparison (e.g., paternal expectations vs. maternal expectations). It should be noted that
for future studies different samples should be used to gather evidence to verify or confirm the obtained factor structure.

The final loadings are shown in Table 6, and the paternal and maternal Pattern Matrix are included in the Appendix section. The items that clustered on the same factor suggested that factor 1 represents the outcomes of Parental Influences, factor 2 represents Relationship Quality, while factor 3 represents Parental Expectations. The 3-factor structure largely supports the research hypotheses that the survey items were measuring parental expectations and parent-child relationships.

In questionnaire research study, reliability is crucial for both the assessment developer and the user (McDonald, 2002). Therefore, six reliability analyses were conducted to examine the reliability of internal consistency for each of the three factors for both paternal and maternal interactions.

Regarding Paternal Influences (Factor 1), Cronbach’s alpha for the six items was .90 which is considered excellent. Cronbach’s alpha for the 8-item Paternal Relationship Quality (Factor 2) was .87, which is considered good. Regarding the 5-item on Paternal Expectations (Factor 3), Cronbach’s alpha based was .77, which is in the range of acceptable to good.

Regarding Maternal Influences (Factor 1), Cronbach’s alpha for the six items was .89 which is considered good to excellent. Cronbach’s alpha for the 8-item Maternal Relationship Quality (Factor 2) was .89, which is considered good to excellent. Regarding the 5-item on Maternal Expectations (Factor 3), Cronbach’s alpha based was .74, which is in the range of acceptable to good.
Table 6

Summary of Exploratory Factor Analysis Results for Bilingual Childhood Family Experience Scale Using Maximum Likelihood Estimation (N = 846)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Factor 1 Dad/Mom</th>
<th>Factor 2 Dad/Mom</th>
<th>Factor 3 Dad/Mom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q16: My parent expressed affection with me when I was a child.</td>
<td>.453/.625</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18: My parent was fair in disciplining me when I was a child.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.345/.489</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q19: My parent was strict with me when I was a child.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.668/.534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q22: Meeting my parents' expectations was difficult when I was a child.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.714/.688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q23: My parents' expectations of me made me feel stressed when I was a child</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.820/.782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q26: My parents made me feel guilty when I wanted to spend time away from home during my teenage years.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.579/.549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q28: My parent and I fought over their expectations for my college, major and/or career choice.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.534/.448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q32: I tried to avoid contact with my parent when I was a child.</td>
<td>.429/.599</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q33: I tried to avoid contact with my parent during my teenage years.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.394/.557</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q34: My parent was supportive of me when I had difficult times when I was a child.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.430/.630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q37: Looking back on my teenage years, I am satisfied with how my parent communicated with me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.413/.483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q41: Looking back on my childhood, I am satisfied with the amount of time that my parent spent with me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.943/.808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q42: Looking back on my teenage years, I am satisfied with the amount of time that my parent spent with me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.903/.793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q45: I have become more appreciative of my parents' expectations of me, now that I am an adult.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.647/.591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q47: My parents' expectations of me were helpful to my academic success.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.704/.615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q48: The influence my parents' expectations of me on our parent-child relationship had been…</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.595/.558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q51: The influence my parents' expectations of me on my emotional health today has been…</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.812/.774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q52: The influence my parents' expectation of me on my confidence today has been…</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.906/.855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q53: The influence my parents' expectation of me on my success today has been…</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.989/.939</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Extraction Method: Maximum Likelihood. Rotation Method: Promax with Kaiser Normalization.a  
a. Rotation converged in 6 iterations for maternal; Rotation converged in 5 iterations for paternal.
The correlation coefficients among the factors for both the paternal and maternal were also conducted through Bivariate Correlations on SPSS to examine the Pearson’s $r$ correlation coefficient as *rough rules of thumb* (Holcomb, 2014). For the correlations among three paternal factors, the Pearson’s $r$ correlation coefficient between *Paternal Expectations* and *Paternal Relationship Quality* is .44, which is considered strong. The correlation between *Paternal Relationship Quality* and *Paternal Influences* is .71, which is considered very strong. The correlation between *Paternal Expectations* and *Parental Influences* is .32, which is considered moderate. The 2-tailed correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (see Table 7).

**Table 7**

*Paternal Factors—Pearson’s $r$ Correlations Coefficients*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Expectations</th>
<th>Relationship Quality</th>
<th>Influences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expectation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.439**</td>
<td>.319**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Quality</td>
<td>.439**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.706**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influences</td>
<td>.319</td>
<td>.706**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).**

For the correlations among three maternal factors, the Pearson’s $r$ correlation coefficient between *Maternal Expectations* and *Maternal Relationship Quality* is .45, which is considered strong. The correlation between *Maternal Relationship Quality* and *Maternal Influences* is .70, which is considered very strong. The correlation between *Maternal Expectations* and *Maternal Influences* is .34, which is considered moderate. The 2-tailed correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (see Table ).
Table 8

*Mater nal Factors—Pearson’s r Correlations Coefficients*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Expectations</th>
<th>Relationship Quality</th>
<th>Influences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expectation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.450**</td>
<td>.338**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Quality</td>
<td>.450**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.702**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influences</td>
<td>.338**</td>
<td>.702**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The results from the Exploratory Factor Analysis are considered robust overall, which has supported and confirmed the hypothesis of this research regarding parental expectation and its influence upon parent-child relationships.

**Summary**

The purpose of this study is to investigate parental expectation and its influence upon the parent-child relationships of Chinese groups through mixed methods. The hypothesis is to examine whether there is statistical significant difference from the influence of parental expectation on parent-child relationships due to the complications of the Chinese groups with a very reserved nature rooted in their culture. The above chronological report of the results from concurrent administration and analyses of both qualitative and quantitative research studies supported the research hypothesis.

From the qualitative study, a number of participants indicated that they experienced some level of influence and stress from their parents’ expectations in their childhood family experiences, while some indicated that they had little experience of such. From the quantitative study, the results from exploratory data analysis and
Pearson’s $r$ correlation coefficients confirmed the influence of parental expectation on parent-child relationships to be considered statistically significant. The null hypothesis was rejected, i.e., the hypothesis that there is no statistically significant difference regarding the influence of parental expectation on parent-child relationship, was rejected. The alternative hypothesis, that there is a statistical significant difference regarding the influence of parental expectation on parent-child relationship, is confirmed by data analysis. Conclusively, both the qualitative research results from interviews and quantitative research results from the questionnaire survey support the hypothesis.

The results of Exploratory Factor Analysis also indicate that there is a third factor, *Parental Influences*, which appears to be an outcome from the parent-child relationship. This factor included the following six items: “appreciate parent’s expectations when I became an adult,” “parent’s expectations had positive influence on my academic success,” “parent’s expectations had positive influence on our parent-child relationship,” “parent’s expectations have a positive influence on my emotional health today,” “parent’s expectations have a positive influence on my confidence today,” and “parent’s expectations have a positive influence on my success today.” This salient finding and its implication will be further discussed in chapter 5.

In closing this chapter, the experience of conducting this study by the researcher has been a delightful and fruitful adventure with abundant blessings. In particular, the data collection process was spectacularly efficient with 1,056 responses collected in less than ten days. This large and rich data set led to considerably robust results within a remarkably short time frame, exceeding the researcher’s own expectations. Further discussion on the extent of the results pertinent to the topic of the influence of parental
expectations upon parent-child relationships, in additional to the findings, implications, strengths, limitations and recommendations, will be addressed in the next chapter.
Chapter Five: Discussion

Chapter Overview

This chapter addresses the results from chapter 4, with interpretation of the findings and implications, as well as the strengths and limitations of the study.

The purpose of this study was to investigate parental expectation and its influence upon parent-child relationships utilizing a mixed methods approach. Participants in the study were adults of Chinese ethnicity from the United States, Taiwan, and China. The qualitative research methods involved both interviews and focus group studies. The quantitative research employed questionnaire surveys to explore the correlation between parental expectation and parent-child relationship through 41 question groups in Likert scale form. The participants involved were required to be at age 18 or above, with Chinese heritage as a requirement since the topic is specifically designed to study the influence of parental expectation among Chinese cultural groups through the reflection of childhood family experiences.

The discussion focuses on the development and design of the instruments, and the data collection development and results. Discussion of the findings and implications will focus on the comparison of paternal and maternal differences, developmental stage differences, and a few other salient findings. A number of recommendations will be made for future research and study at the end of this chapter.

Discussion

Development of Paternal and Maternal Measures on Items

The qualitative and quantitative research methods were conducted concurrently, which strongly supported the development of both investigations. In the development of
the current research as discussed in chapter 3, a number of assessments were examined. In particular, three instruments that are related in assessing family relationship, with FACES IV (Family Adaptability and Cohesion Evaluation Scales IV) (Olson, 2011) became the main reference for the development of the Bilingual Childhood Family Experience Scale in this research due to its availability and quality in both English and Chinese.

FACES IV is one of the very few assessments of family relationships which has been translated into Chinese, though the researcher believes the translation could further be refined. The quality of the assessment items was considered adequate overall. However, after more thorough examination, the researcher discovered that some items needed to be more specific to assess individual relationships, such as father-child, mother-child, father-mother, or siblings. To assess the family as a unit posed potential difficulties for individuals responding to some of the questions. For instance, a respondent might have had a close relationship with the mother but not the father as a child/teen, or vice versa. Some items were deemed too ambiguous, such as number 6, “we never seem to get organized in our family.” Such statement could either be applied to the organization of the family schedule in time management or the organization of household items for tidiness. Likewise, in item 22 on “family members have little need for friends outside the family,” the comment could be applied to a need for time with friends, resources from friends, or it could be interpreted for something else. Item 45 on “family members express affection to each other” was identified as being difficult to be given a uniformed response, due to the multiple relationships that are often involved in a family. Experiences as a child or teen might have been involved with one parent
expressing affection abundantly while the other parent not as much but being strict and cold or distant. Therefore, even though this instrument is regarded as one of the well-developed assessments for family relationships, the items and translation needed further refinement for optimal efficiency and accuracy in implementation. For reference, see Appendices D and E for all FACES IV items in both English and Chinese.

With the launch of the interview research, the researcher observed that the responses from participants on paternal parental expectation could be markedly different from the maternal parental expectation. In consideration of the need to assess the differences between paternal and maternal parental expectations upon the parent-child relationship, items were immediately categorized for “Father” or “Mother” to distinguish between and facilitate the collection of potentially different responses for paternal and maternal expectation. After much revision of many of the items during the research design process, the Bilingual Childhood Family Experience Scale was developed for the purpose of this study and customized for the unique cultural mindset of Chinese families. This, in fact, was the recommendation from Shek’s research (Shek, 2005). As a result, items were designed to assess the different interaction among family members: paternal, maternal, father-to-mother, mother-to-father, and the family as a unit.

**Development of Measure by Specifying Developmental Stages on Items**

During the pilot study, participants responded that “childhood” was too broad a range to cover. Taking into account the key developmental stages of childhood that include early childhood, elementary years and teenage years, and to avoid excessive items which might increase the incompletion rate, items were fine-tuned to assess childhood family experiences specifically before the generally accepted age of the onset
of puberty (under 13 years) and adolescence (13-18 years). These age ranges encompass the main years of one’s interaction with parents.

The Bilingual Childhood Family Experience Scale became a measure of 41 sets of questions items. Questions were further divided into inquiries of aspects on the paternal, maternal, or family as a whole unit. 18 sets of the questions specifically focused on asking “when I was a child” and 8 sets of questions specifically focused on asking “when I was a teenager.” The Bilingual Childhood Family Experience Scale items are included in Appendix A.

Specifying questions according to the developmental stages for the measure enabled the researcher to examine how respondents related their family experiences accordingly from when they were children to when they were teens. The following are the six pairs of questions which were developed to accomplish this, and the results will be further discussed in the “Findings and Implications” session.

- Item 30 and 31, “I had a close relationship with my parent, when I was a child/teenager.”
- Item 32 and 33, “I tried to avoid contact with my parents when I was a child/during my teenage years.”
- Item 36 and 37, “Looking back on my childhood/teenage years, I am satisfied with how my parent communicated with me.”
- Item 41 and 42, “Looking back on my childhood/teenage years, I am satisfied with the amount of time that my parents spent with me.”
• Item 43 and 44, “Looking back on my childhood/teenage years, I am satisfied with the closeness of my relationship with my parent.”

• Item 54 and 55, “My parent was often absent when I was a child/teenager.”

Data Collection Platform and Strategy - Internet Survey as Platform and Online Social Network as Medium

The quantitative research was designed to be conducted using an online survey platform. The Bilingual Childhood Family Experience Scale was initially loaded on Google Forms in two versions, English and Chinese, according to the language background of the participants. The two versions were then combined into one as the platform had the capability of combining both languages into one form. This free platform, however, was rather limited in its functions for design, data collection and data analysis capacity. Consequently, another survey platform, Survey Monkey, was selected and it was truly revolutionary as well as user-friendly. Survey Monkey allowed for a more sophisticated design and more comprehensive functions which not only enabled customizing items for a more professional presentation, but also allowed for specific responses for paternal, maternal, and family-as-a-unit responses in the questionnaire design. This made data collection more effective and efficient that resulted in faster data analysis within ten days of the data collection, with only minor adjustments on naming variables when imported to SPSS.

Instead of sending the survey invitation via the Survey Monkey’s platform that first could be perceived as a commercial email, which might further ask for personal information that could result in being declined outright by participants, the researcher decided to send out the survey link directly from personal email account by group,
personal social network platforms such as LINE and Facebook, and through personal connections among the social network of the researcher. This approach led to several key successes. First, it allowed people to participate in the online survey without having to provide personal email addresses or set up an account. This greatly reduced the drop-out rate as people nowadays are very reluctant to provide personal information which includes email address. Second, by passing out the invitation through researcher’s social network as a group, total anonymity was achieved since respondents had no direct interaction with the researcher. Third, the survey link included a short message which encourages participants to mobilize and pass the link around in their own social circles which drew in more participants and last of all, the short message that also included a brief statement regarding the vision and purpose of the research, effectively motivated and helped people see the value of their participation. This design demonstrated substantially the expansion of the snowball sample effect (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2003; Vogt & Johnson, 2011).

As this research is to study relationships, this data collection process also shows that relationship is the key factor which generated prompt and passionate responses. The first 150 responses were collected within six days. Out of those, half of the respondents had already made commitment to complete the questionnaire even before it was ready due to their pre-existing relationships with the researcher and her recruiters. The most remarkable phase came in the three days that followed the initial collection of the 150 responses, when about 850 more people responded to the survey. To calculate the response rate of those three days, it translates to an average of 11.8 responses per hour. Most of these 850 respondents had absolutely no direct relationship with the researcher.
They were invited to participate through their connection to individuals in the social network of the researcher, which indicated the significance of social networks. Furthermore, responses continued to arrive even after the data was downloaded and the analysis process was underway. For reference, see Appendix F for the figure on data collection progress.

The completion rate did pose a challenge. As mentioned in chapter 4, among the 1,056 responses, 121 cases were removed because the respondent only finished up to the items on demographic information, which meant 11.5% of participants dropped out after page one. Fifty cases were removed because the respondents only finished up to item 24 on pages one and two, showing that 5.4% of participants dropped out after finishing pages one and two. Twenty-three cases were removed because the respondents only finished up to item 34 on pages one, two and three, showing that 2.6% of participants dropped out after finishing pages one, two and three. Eleven cases were removed because the respondents only finished pages one, two, three and four, up to item 44, showing that 1.3% of participants dropped out after finishing pages one, two, three and four. Also, 5 cases were removed due to missing age information. Therefore, only a total of 846 cases, about 80% of all the responses collected, were retained for data analysis in the quantitative research.

The technical design of the survey is designed in the way that the responses would be saved by page whenever the “next page” was clicked at the end of each page. To avoid any internet issues or unexpected circumstances of interruption, the researcher designed the survey in such a way that it would allow respondents ample opportunity to save their responses if they were temporarily disrupted in the middle of the survey for whatever
reasons. Furthermore, in order to increase the completion rate, the number of pages was kept at a minimum. As a result, there were a total of nine pages, which includes a brief two-line welcome message, a brief description of the purpose of the survey research with IRB number, the researcher’s contact, and survey instructions. Then, demographic items and optional faith practice items are followed by four pages of the 41 question sets with an optional open-ended question at the end. The entirety of this content was set up in both English and Chinese to ensure that all respondents would be able to understand the descriptions and question items. Many of the respondents expressed that the length was adequate, and the survey was easy to complete.

Findings and Implications

Findings and Implications from the Descriptive Statistical Results

Findings and Implications from the Population Distribution

The gender ratio was unbalanced from the beginning of the data collection process. The ratio imbalance started at around 30% of participation for male respondents with the rest being female. With some intervention through textual encouragement and invitation, male participation increased to 41% around the time 650 responses were received but fell back to around 35% as time went on. The lowest point was 27%. The result of this gender ratio difference implies that men may be less interested in participating in questionnaire surveys or family relationship research, or both.

Larger formal education sample segment: among the 846 valid samples, the education distribution of the sample population consisted of 349 respondents with a bachelor’s degree (41.29%), 256 with master’s (28.89%), and 55 (6.25%)
with a doctoral degree. These higher education groups made up 76.43% of the entire sample (see Table 4). The result could suggest that people who have higher education tend to have higher motivation when it comes to participating research questionnaire surveys.

**Findings and Implications on Paternal and Maternal Comparison**

The descriptive statistical results indicate that there are substantial differences between the childhood family experiences of paternal and maternal parental expectations in the parent-child relationship and parent-child interactions of the respondents.

According to the responses of the participants:

- Item 15 implied that mother was calmer than the father by 7.95% discussing problems when the respondents were children.
- Item 16 implied that mother expressed affection more than father by 16.52%.
- Item 17 implied that more respondents were in agreement that the mother, rather than father, set the roles and rules in the family, but only by 2.71%.
- Item 18 implied that mother was fairer than the father in discipline by 9.46%.
- Item 19 implied that the father was stricter than the mother, but only by 2.47%. However, in the comparison between strictness and kindness, 13.78% more respondents expressed that father was stricter than kind, while 9.80% more respondents expressed that mother was stricter than kind. The results imply that the respondents experienced “strict father, strict mother” from their childhood family experiences. The finding differed from Shek’s research (2005) finding on “kind father, strict mother.”
Item 20 indicated that one out of two respondents expressed that it was very difficult to change their parent’s mind once a decision was made on both paternal and maternal sides. The result implied that Chinese parents are often firm and to some extent inflexible in their decisions.

Item 21 indicated that 62.43% responded that their father was the main leader of the family while 53.84% expressed that their mother was the main leader of the family. Only 32.33% agreed that their parents shared equal leadership. The finding implied that fathers and mothers are both strong leaders in the Chinese family, since ratios for both paternal and maternal are high. The total of both paternal and maternal together was 116.26%. The anomalous result seems to suggest that a power struggle may have existed in certain families.

Item 22 on whether meeting parents’ expectations was difficult yielded a total of 34.09% who expressed disagreement on paternal expectations while 26.52% expressed agreement. A total of 33.11% expressed disagreement on maternal expectations while 27.51% expressed agreement. The results indicated that more respondents disagreed than agreed that meeting parent’s expectations was difficult. The disagreement on paternal expectations was higher than on maternal expectations, while the agreement on paternal expectations was lower than on maternal expectations. This implied that meeting the father’s expectation was very slightly easier than meeting the mother’s, as the measurable difference is within 1%.

Item 23 on whether parent’s expectation caused stress, a total of 37.22% expressed disagreement on paternal expectations while 27.61% expressed
agreement. A total of 37.01% expressed disagreement on maternal expectations while 27.68% expressed agreement. The results indicated that a larger number of respondents disagreed than agree that parental expectations made them feel stressed. With this highly educated participant population, the results for whether parental expectations made the respondents feel stressed were quite a surprise, in light of the common assumption that childhood/adolescent stress stems from the burden of parental expectations in Chinese families.

- Item 25 on calmness of parents when parent-child disagreement was experienced, data indicated that only 2.66% more respondents expressed that their father was calmer than their mother when their parents had disagreements with them during their teenage years. However, a total of 7.18% more respondents expressed disagreement rather than agreement that their father was calm, while a total of 12.24% more respondents expressed disagreement rather than agreement that their mother was calm. The results indicated that respondents disagreed more than they agreed on their parent’s calmness when their parents had disagreements with them during their teenage years. The results implied that the communication of the respondents with their parents during their teenage years was not as calm and peaceful as in their childhood years.

- Item 38 indicated that a total of 53.33% of respondents expressed agreement that their father seldom said mean words to them even when angry, while a total of 49.19% expressed agreement that their mother seldom said mean
words to them even when angry. The results implied that mothers would say mean words more than fathers when angry by 4.14%.

Findings and Implications on the Developmental Stage Comparison

- Comparing between items 30 and 31, the responses indicated that of the total percentage, 46.87% expressed “agree” or “strongly agree” that they had a close relationship with their father when they were children, while 33.43% expressed “agree” or “strongly agree” that they had a close relationship with their father when they were a teenager. A total of 53.63% expressed “agree” or “strongly agree” that they had a close relationship with their mother when they were children, and a total 49.55% expressed “agree” or “strongly agree” that they had a close relationship with their mother when they were a teenager. Subtracting the percentages between the childhood and teenage years, the percentage representing a close relationship with the father dropped a total of 13.44% during teenage years while dropping only 4.08% for the mother during teenage years. This finding indicated that the relationship with the father is weaker than with the mother, and weaker for both parents during the teenage years than during the childhood years.

- Comparing between items 32 and 33, responses indicated that a total of 14.35% participants expressed “agree” or “strongly agree” that they tried to avoid contact with their father when they were children, while 27.62% expressed “agree” or “strongly agree” that they tried to avoid contact with their father during their teenage years. Only a total of 10.22% expressed “agree” or “strongly agree” that they tried to avoid contact with their mother
when they were children, and 23.10% expressed “agree” or “strongly agree” that they tried to avoid contact with their mother during their teenage years. The change from childhood to teenage years on avoiding the father increased a total of 13.27%, while the increase for avoiding the mother is 12.78%. This finding indicated that there is an increase of more than 10% in avoidance of both father and mother during the teenage years of the respondents.

- Comparing between items 36 and 37, a total 38.08% of respondents expressed “agree” or “strongly agree” that they were satisfied with how their father communicated with them when looking back on their childhood years, while 34.27% expressed “agree” or “strongly agree” that they were satisfied with how their father communicated with them when looking back on their teenage years. Of the total percentage, 35.70% of respondents expressed “agree” or “strongly agree” that they were satisfied with how their mother communicated with them when looking back on their childhood years, while 40.23% expressed “agree” or “strongly agree” that they were satisfied with how their mother communicated with them when looking back on their teenage years. The results indicated that the respondents’ satisfaction with how they communicated with their father dropped 3.81% during their teenage years, while their satisfaction with how they communicated with their mother actually increased by 4.53%.

- Comparing between items 41 and 42, a total of 41.72% of respondents expressed “agree” or “strongly agree” that they were satisfied with the amount of time that their father spent with them when looking back on their childhood
years, while 35.28% expressed “agree” or “strongly agree” that they were satisfied with the amount of time their father spent with them when looking back on their teenage years. Of the total percentage, 46.08% expressed “agree” or “strongly agree” that they were satisfied with the amount of time their mother spent with them when looking back on their childhood years, while 36.97% expressed “agree” or “strongly agree” that they were satisfied with the amount of time their mother spent with them when looking back on their teenage years. This item further examined the amount of time that respondents spent together as a family. Of the total percentage, 49.58% expressed “agree” or “strongly agree” that they were satisfied with the amount of time they spent together as a family when looking back on their childhood years, while 40.83% expressed “agree” or “strongly agree” that they were satisfied with the amount of time they spent together as a family when looking back on their teenage years. There was a decrease of 6.44% in satisfaction of time spent with the father, a 9.11% decrease in time spent with the mother, and an 8.75% decrease in time spent as a family from childhood to teenage years when respondents looked back.

• Comparing between items 43 and 44, a total of 49.71% of respondents expressed “agree” or “strongly agree” that they were satisfied with the closeness of their relationship with their father when looking back on their childhood years, while 38.71% expressed “agree” or “strongly agree” that they were satisfied with the closeness of their relationship with their father when looking back on their teenage years. A total of 59% of respondents
expressed “agree” or “strongly agree” that they were satisfied with the
closeness of their relationship with their mother when looking back on their
c rampage years, while 47.56% expressed “agree” or “strongly agree” that
they were satisfied with the closeness of their relationship with their mother
when looking back on their teenage years. From childhood to teenage years
when respondents looked back, there was a 11% satisfaction decrease on the
close relationship with the father, and a decrease of 11.44% with the mother.
This finding indicated that, from childhood to teenage years, there was a total
decrease of over 10% in satisfaction with the close relationship to both father
and mother among the respondents.

- Comparison between 54 and 55, a total of 39.74% of respondents expressed
  “agree” or “strongly agree” that their father was often absent when they were
  children, while 36.76% expressed “agree” and “strongly agree” that their
  father was often absent when they were teenagers. A total of 18.86% of
  respondents expressed that they “agree” and “strongly agree” that their mother
  was often absent when they were children, while 19.67% expressed that they
  “agree” and “strongly agree” that their mother was often absent when they
  were teenagers. The results indicated that there was only a 2.98% decrease on
  the responses regarding the father’s absence from childhood to teenage years,
  but an increase of 0.81% regarding responses on the mother’s absence. Both
  changes were considered small. However, from childhood to teenage years,
  the percentage on the father’s absence was much higher than the mother’s
  absence by around 17% - 20%.
In addition to these six identical pairs of questions comparing adolescence to childhood reflections, items 15 and 25 also fell in the same category of questioning, except they measured the calmness of parents. Of the total percentage, 39.01% of respondents expressed “agree” or “strongly agree” that their father could calmly discuss problems with them when they were children, while 29.42% expressed that they “agree” or “strongly agree” that their father was always calm when they had disagreements with them during their teenage years. A total of 46.96% of respondents expressed that they “agree” or “strongly agree” that their mother could calmly discuss problems with them when they were children, while 26.76% expressed that they “agree” or “strongly agree” that their mother was always calm when they had disagreements with them during their teenage years. From childhood to teenage years, the responses approximately indicated a 10% decrease regarding the father’s calmness and a 20% decrease regarding the mother’s calmness. This salient finding indicated that there was a significant decrease on calm communication in both paternal and maternal relationships. Furthermore, the decrease was greater for the maternal than the paternal.

Item 24 on whether parents had higher expectations for them as teenagers than as children, there was a total increase of 22.32% on responses in agreement regarding the father and a total increase of 22.68% regarding the mother. The results implied that, from childhood family experiences to adolescence, the respondents experienced a major increase of expectations from both fathers and mothers.
These findings indicated that between childhood and teenage years, the parent-child interactions decreased, and parent-child relationship weakened overall. This result confirmed the reservations/questions of the researcher, discussed in chapter 3 in the section on “participants,” about the population validity (Vogt & Johnson, 2011) of previous studies using adolescents as the sample population (Shek, 2005, 2005b, 2006, 2008; Shek & Ma, 2010). The researcher posited that there could be substantial resentment or significant conflicts in the parent-child relationships of adolescents and their parents which could cause validity issues for research results, because adolescents are going through changes in many areas of life due to their unsettled developmental stage (Kerr & Bowen, 1988; Lane & Beauchamp, 1959; Pomerantz, Qin, Wang, & Chen, 2009; Zhao et al., 2015). Their psychological identity is still unstable and evolving as they are undergoing powerful physical (hormonal) changes. Research has indicated that Chinese adolescents tend to choose avoidance in their parent-adolescent relationship. Another complication is that their self-development and family relationships were frequently affected by parent-adolescent conflicts (Zhao et al., 2015).

Strom, Bernard, and Strom (1989) stated that adolescents would experience more conflicts with their parents due to their developmental stage of going through identity and role confusion. Parent-adolescent relations often suffer from tension or even disruptions due to conflicts and avoidance.

Therefore, this study was intentionally limited to adults for its sample participants because assessing parent-child relationship using adolescents as the sample population carries a high risk of reliability and validity issues for empirical research. The findings from this research validated these reservations through its statistical results.
Findings and Implications on Cultural Roots Influence Diminution

In item 27 “my grandparents were able to influence my parent’s decisions about me when I was a child,” 62.41% expressed that they “disagree” or “strongly disagree” that their grandparents were able to influence their father’s decisions about them when they were children, while 69.97% expressed that they “disagree” or “strongly disagree” that their grandparents were able to influence their mother’s decisions about them when they were children. Only a total of 16.52% expressed that they “agree” or “strongly agree” that their grandparents were able to influence their father’s decisions about them when they were children, while 17.46% expressed that they “agree” or “strongly agree” that their grandparents were able to influence their mother’s decisions about them when they were children. The results showed that only about 16% - 17% of participants indicated that their parents were influenced by their grandparents on decision-making. About 2 out of 3 participants expressed that they “disagree” or “strongly disagree” that their grandparents were able to influence their parents’ decisions about them when they were children. This finding suggested that grandparents do not have much influence on the decisions of the respondents’ parents that concern the respondents. However, it was mentioned in chapter 2 that filial piety is highly valued and strongly promoted as a guiding principle among Chinese families, emphasizing respect for parents and all older people (Baggerly, Ray, & Bratton, 2010; Flanagan, 2011; Naftali, 2014; Shek, 2008; Su & Costigan, 2009; Yue & Ng, 1999). The finding from item 27 may imply that the Chinese elderly may no longer have as much influence on their children or grandchildren as before in the modernized Chinese society of today. The researcher recommends further
investigation on this item, particularly in mainland Chinese households, due to the trends in childcare practices in the country (Wang & Liu, 2006).

**Findings and Implications from Exploratory Factor Analysis Results**

The Exploratory Factor Analysis indicated that there are 3 factors from the dimension reduction on the 41 items. The items clustered on the same factor suggested that factor 1 represents the outcomes of *Parental Influences*, factor 2 represents *Relationship Quality*, while factor 3 represents *Parental Expectations*. The 3-factor structure largely supports the research hypotheses that the survey items were measuring parental expectations and parent-child relationships.

The strengths of the influence are indicated by the Pearson’s $r$ correlation coefficients as follows (see Table 7 and Table 8):

- The correlation coefficient on *Paternal Expectations* and *Paternal Relationship Quality* is .44, which is considered strong.

- The correlation coefficient on *Maternal Expectations* and *Maternal Relationship Quality* is .45, which is considered strong.

- The correlation coefficient on *Paternal Relationship Quality* and *Paternal Influences* is .71, which is considered very strong.

- The correlation coefficient on *Maternal Relationship Quality* and *Maternal Influences* is .70, which is considered very strong.

- The correlation coefficient on *Paternal Expectations* and *Parental Influences* is .32, which is considered moderate.

- The correlation coefficient on *Maternal Expectations* and *Maternal Influences* is .34, which is considered moderate.
The results of correlation coefficients indicated that the influence of Paternal Expectations on Paternal Relationship Quality is considered strong, and the influence of Paternal Expectations on Parental Influences is only moderate. However, the influence of Paternal Relationship Quality on Paternal Influences is very strong, which is the strongest among the three.

The results of correlation coefficients indicated that the influence of Maternal Expectations on Maternal Relationship Quality is considered strong, and the influence of Maternal Expectations on Maternal Influences is only moderate. However, the influence of Maternal Relationship Quality on Maternal Influences is very strong, which is the strongest among the three.

The results indicated that while parental expectations have strong influence on parent-child relationship, the parent-child relationship has even stronger influence on the outcomes of the items on parental influences, such as emotional health, confidence and success, than the other factors. The results of the Exploratory Factor Analysis and Pearson’s $r$ correlation coefficient confirmed that parental expectation has statistical significant influence on the parent-child relationship, and the parental-child relationship has influence on the future emotional health, confidence and success of the child.

To summarize on the findings from Exploratory Factor Analysis, the results confirmed that Parental Expectation has influence on the parent-child Relationship Quality. Furthermore, the Parental Influence as an outcome is strongly influenced by the parent-child Relationship Quality on respondents’ academic success, emotional health, confidence and success from item 45, 47, 48, 51, 52, and 53. This robust empirical outcome is extremely striking and invaluable. The results implied that the parent-child
relationship could be the fundamental influence on building the self-efficacy and self-esteem that many researchers have been investigating in the past decades.

Conclusions and Recommendations

From the above discussion and indications of the results, the current research hypothesis pertinent to parental expectation and its influence on parent-child relationships was confirmed. There was a correlation between parental expectations and parent-child relationships. The results specifically indicated a number of differences between paternal and maternal influence through comparison on the descriptive statistics results of the survey items and the Exploratory Factor Analysis, which confirmed the results from the interview research of this study. The findings also uncovered differences between childhood and adolescent years in relation to parental expectations and parent-child relationships. To conclude this research study, a discussion of the strengths and limitations of this research and recommendations for future research will follow below.

Strength

▪ The philosophy and design of using adults as the sample group was successful and relevant as this provided results from completed parent-child relationships.

▪ Findings addressed Shek’s research (2005) in the study of parent-child relationship where the need to investigate paternal and maternal aspects separately was discussed. Findings confirmed that investigating these aspects separately is the more correct approach.

▪ Items addressed “children” specifically in the 0-12 years category and teenage years in the 13-18 years category, which helped distinguish responses between
two distinctively different stages of the respondents’ childhood family experiences.

- The survey was conducted in English and Chinese to help and ensure a diverse population of participants from both English and Chinese speaking background.

- The survey was conducted via an online platform where participants could answer by computer, phone, or iPad at their convenience, which heightened effectiveness.

- Participants’ ability to return to the same page if interrupted allowed respondents to continue the survey easily, which became an important factor in increasing the completion rate.

- Survey items were designed to answer through Likert scale, which made responding and completion easier.

- Items were mostly kept to one to two sentences, which made the survey easy and specific for participants to read and respond to. In particular, many responded via their smart phones as soon as the link was sent to them via a social network platform and they responded immediately. This implies that having succinct content is critical for online surveys.

- The survey was conducted via Survey Monkey, which provided a well-structured and professional presentation.

- Including an IRB number with contact information of the researcher and professor which helped earn the trust of participants.
• Deep level sharing during focus group studies was achieved due to pre-existing close relationships with the researcher. These relationships allowed participants to respond with strong level of openness and sincerity.

• Instrument design – due to concerns about the culture and language background of the participants, the survey was designed to be presented in a bilingual setting to enhance clarity and comprehension. Many participants expressed appreciation for the opportunity to see the survey in both languages as it helped them ascertain their understanding of the items. For data collection purposes, the bilingual structure was more efficient as all the data could be compiled together and made ready for clean-up and analysis.

• Qualitatively, the research provided rich and insightful non-quantifiable data.

• The qualitative and quantitative research methods, being conducted concurrently, strongly supported the mutual development of both areas of research (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2007).

Limitations

• Due to the nature of the online snowball invitation, a response rate was not attainable.

• One respondent answered, “My childhood was very sad, and I preferred not to participate in the study.” This result might imply that: i) respondents who had a more positive childhood are more likely to participate; and ii) people who had more negative childhood family experiences are more likely to decline participation and/or not go any further after the demographic items in the questionnaire, which may explain the drop-out rate.
• 121 drop-out cases happened right after demographic items and right before the faith background questions. It is possible that answering faith background questions offended some participants, even though the faith background questions were optional.

• Due to the convenience sample strategy, the researcher and her recruiters recruited from their social circles tended to be similar in faith background and/or educational level and therefore not possibly as diverse as desired.

• Interruptions happened during interview due to the close relationships in the first focus group.

• Data collection issue—unequal sample sizes for the qualitative and quantitative data collection. Qualitatively, the sample had more females than males, so the gender ratio was not balanced. Quantitatively, a total of 73.96% of participants live in Taiwan, a ratio that represents an unbalanced sample population as nearly three-quarters of the responses are from Taiwan.

**Recommendations**

This study was proposed and conducted to raise awareness and draw scholarly attention to how expectations represent a critical factor in influencing relationships and stimulate interest in further research. The study focused on parental expectations and parent-child relationships in the context of family relationships, specifically targeting the ethnic Chinese groups. The findings of this study respectfully aimed to add a vital piece to the larger research picture of the challenges faced in Chinese familial ways of thought, which may on the one hand be unique to the Chinese culture, but on the other hand universal to child-rearing and family relationship-building.
Further research studies related to parental expectation and its influence on parent-child relationships is vital and imperative, as the family is the primary growth environment for children (Klein & White, 1996), yet topics related to expectations and its influence on relationship are rarely studied. The results of this study indicate that while parental expectation has influence on parent-child relationships, the parent-child relationship strongly influences the future emotional health, confidence and success of the child.

Recommendations for further research pertinent to topics relating to expectations and family relationship include:

- Comparing samples of American Born Chinese with Mainland Chinese.
- Comparing parental expectations and parent-child relationship between other cultural groups.
- Investigation of unmet parental expectation and its relationship to parental depression.
- Investigation of unmet parental expectation and its influence on children’s emotional traumatization.
- Comparison studies on parental expectation between intact and non-intact families.
- Investigation of spousal expectation and its influence on marital relationship.
- Correlation between family expectation and choice of homelessness.
Summary

In conclusion, the researcher would like to highlight a sobering statistic from item 32, “I tried to avoid contact with my parent when I was a child.” More than 10% of respondents, 1 out of 10, tried to avoid their parents when they were children. This implies fear as well as detachment from parents for these respondents. The researcher holds that if generalizable to a large community, 10% is a percentage that could have a significant impact on that community. Furthermore, 25% of respondents tried to avoid their parents during their teenage years. As discussed in chapter two, family is the primary learning environment for children and family relationships are critical in nurturing all aspects of development in children. Primary influence is from parents and since parents are the first contact for a child, their influence can impact the development of a child in numerous ways (Gullotta & Blau, 2008). Parents are the first social network for children. Prior to and concurrent with a school education, the influence of parents will deeply affect the values, identity and growth in all aspects of a child’s life (Coser, 1964; Lewis & Rosenblum, 1979).

This leads to the second potential contribution of the current research: to serve as a useful measuring tool that can create opportunities for reflective learning from and review of the childhood journey. Through these reflections and reviews, this measuring tool will enable individuals to proceed on a much-needed path of self-discovery and/or recovery from the influence of childhood family experiences. Furthermore, through the discussion and reflections among family members in any specific area of childhood family experiences that may have deeply affected their own lives, marital relationship or family relationships, the process could potentially bring consolation, confirmation,
constructive dialogue, and healing to improve family relationships and bless the next generation—the children.
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Appendix A

Bilingual Childhood Family Experience Scale

Welcome message:

Welcome to this Childhood Family Experience Survey!

The mission of this survey is intended for the use of a research on family relationship.

There are two sessions to be completed:
I. background information,
II. your childhood experiences.

Guideline and Instructions:
1. All participants must be age 18 or above with Chinese heritage to participate.
2. Please complete the survey with no prior discussion with others on the question or answer.
3. Completion of this computer-based survey will indicate your consent to participate in this study.
4. Information will be presented in summary format and your answers will not be identified or associated with you.
5. When you submit, you will see this message: "Your survey has been successfully submitted!" as completion confirmation.

Thank you for your Participation!

For any further concerns or questions, please contact
Researcher: Sharon Chiang at kidssharon@spu.edu, or
Sponsor: Dr. Arthur Ellis at aellis@spu.edu
from Seattle Pacific University

歡迎參與這份童年家庭經驗問卷訪查!

懇請您透過以下兩部分的問卷，點選回應您童年時家人互動的概況:
I. 背景資料，
II. 童年家庭經驗。

問卷填寫說明與注意事項：
1. 所有參與者需要是年齡滿18歲，具華人背景的成人。
2. 請各自獨立完成問卷，進行問卷以前請勿與他人討論題目或答案。
3. 點選完成的步驟將視為同意參與此問卷的確認。
4. 本問卷所有問題皆為不記名資訊。絕不會收集或追蹤任何參與者的個人資料。
5. 當點選完成此問卷時，您將會收到"謝謝您的參與! 您的問卷已經完成!"的訊息。

謝謝您的參與!

Part I, Demographic Questions:

1. Gender 性別:
2. Age 年齡:
3. I was born in 我出生在:
4. I currently live in 我目前居住在:
5. I moved to the U.S. when I was 我幾歲移居到美國:
6. In my family, I was the (birth order) 小時候我是家裡排行:
7. Currently, I am (status) 目前我是():
8. Education 教育:
9. Faith/Religion 宗教信仰
   If not a Christian, please skip to question 15 如果不是基督徒請跳到問題 15:
10. Currently, I (church attendance) 目前我(是否參加教會):
11. I started attending church when I was 幾歲開始參加教會:
12. I was baptized when I was 幾歲受洗:
13. I started my daily devotion when I was 幾歲開始每日靈修:
14. Our family devotion started when I was 幾歲開始家庭靈修:

Part II, Survey Items:

Please respond by choosing whichever best describes you. There is no right/wrong or high/low score difference.
The choice only reflects personal childhood family experiences.
(Childhood: under 13; teenage: 13-19)

請點選最合適自己的回答。

以下的問題沒有對錯或分數高低。

所有的回答僅代表個人不同的童年家庭經驗。

(童年:十三歲以下; 青少年:十三到十九歲)

Q15: My parent could calmly discuss problems with me, when I was a child.

童年時期，我父母親能心平氣和地跟我們討論問題。

Q16: My parent expressed affection with me, when I was a child.

童年時期，我父母親會對我們表達關愛之情。

Q17: My parent set clear rules and roles in our family, when I was a child.

童年時期，在我們家，我父母親定有清楚的規矩和角色。

Q18: My parent was fair in disciplining me, when I was a child.

童年時期，我父母親的管教是公平的。

Q19: My parent was strict with me, when I was a child.

童年時期，我父母親對我是嚴厲的。

Q20: Once my parent made a decision, it was very difficult for me to change their mind, when I was a child.

童年時期，我父母親一旦做出決定，我很難去改變他們的決定。

Q21: When I was a child, the main leader of our family was

童年時期，我們家的主要領導者是:

Q22: Meeting my parent’s expectations was difficult, when I was a child.

童年時期，要達到父母親的期望很難。

Q23: My parent’s expectations of me made me feel stressed, when I was a child.

童年時期，父母親對我的期望使我覺得有壓力。

Q24: Compared with my childhood, my parent had higher expectations of me when I was a teenager.

比較孩童時期，青少年時父母親提高了對我的期望。

Q25: My parents were always calm when they had disagreements with me during my teenage years.

青少年時期，當我與父母親有衝突時，他們總是很冷靜。

Q26: My parents made me feel guilty when I wanted to spend time away from home during my teenage years.

青少年時期，如果我想花時間在外，我父母親會讓我有罪惡感。

Q27: My grandparents were able to influence my parent's decisions about me, when I was a child.

童年時期，我的祖父母能夠影響我父母親對我的決定。
童年時期，我的祖父母能夠影響我父母關於我的決定。
Q28: My parent and I fought over their expectations for my college, major and/or career choice.
Q29: Looking back on my childhood, I wished that my parent’s expectations had been回想我的童年，我真希望我父母親對我的期望
Q30: I had a close relationship with my parent, when I was a child.回想我的童年時期，我跟父母親的關係很親密。
Q31: I had a close relationship with my parent, when I was a teenager.青少年時期，我跟父母親的關係很親密。
Q32: I tried to avoid contact with my parent, when I was a child.童年時期，我試著避免與父母親接觸。
Q33: I tried to avoid contact with my parent during my teenage years.青少年時期，我試著避免與父母親接觸。
Q34: My parent was supportive of me when I had difficult times when I was a child.小時候當我有困難時，我的父母親會支持我。
Q35: My relationship with my parent has improved since I became an adulthood.在我成年後，我與父母親的關係進步了。
Q36: Looking back on my childhood, I am satisfied with how my parent communicated with me.回想我的童年時期，我滿意父母親與我之間的溝通。
Q37: Looking back on my teenage years, I am satisfied with how my parent communicated with me.回想我的青少年時期，我滿意父母親與我之間的溝通。
Q38: Even when angry, my parent seldom said mean words to me.既使在生氣時，我父母親也很少對我說刻薄的話語。
Q39: My parent was a good listener.我父母親是很好的聆聽者。
Q40: My parent discussed ideas and beliefs, when I was a child.小時候，我的父母親會討論想法和信念。
Q41: Looking back on my childhood, I am satisfied with the amount of time that my parent spent with me.回想我的童年時期，我滿意父母親能與我在一起的時間量。
Q42: Looking back on my teenage years, I am satisfied with the amount of time that my parent spent with me.回想我的青少年時期，我滿意父母親能與我在一起的時間量。
Q43: Looking back on my childhood, I am satisfied with the closeness of my relationship with my parent.
回想我的童年時期，我滿意我與父母親之間的親近關係。
Q44: Looking back on my teenage years, I am satisfied with the closeness of my relationship with my parent.
回想我的青少年時期，我滿意我與父母親之間的親近關係。
Q45: I have become more appreciative of my parent’s expectations of me, now that I am an adult.
現在我成年了，比較能夠感謝我父母母親對我的期望。
Q46: The main person who managed our family finance when I was a child was
童年時期我們家主要負責管理財務的人是
Q47: My parent’s expectations of me were helpful to my academic success.
我父母親過去對我的期望，對我的學業成就是有幫助的。
Q48: The influence my parent’s expectations of me on our parent-child relationship had been
我父母親對我的期望，對我們之間過去親子關係的影響
Q49: The influence my parent’s expectation of me on our family relationship had
我父母親對我的期望，對我們過去家庭關係的影響
Q50: The influence my parent’s marriage relationship on me today
我父母婚姻關係，對我現在的影響
Q51: The influence my parent’s expectations of me on my emotional health today has been
我父母親對我的期望，對我現在的情緒健康的影響
Q52: The influence my parent’s expectation of me on my confidence today has been
我父母親對我的期望，對我現在的自信心的影響
Q53: The influence my parent’s expectation of me on my success today has been
我父母親對我的期望，對我現在的成就的影響
Q54: My parent was often absent when I was a child.
我父母親在我童年時期常常不在家。
Q55: My parent was often absent when I was a teenager.
我父母親在我青少年時期常常不在家。
Q56: Is there anything that you would like to add: (up to 100 characters)
其它關於父母親的期望對你的影響: (100 字以內)
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Dear Ms. Chiang and Dr. Ellis:

Your research project "A Mixed-methods Investigation on the Parental Expectation and Parent-child Relationship among Chinese Groups" has been approved. This study was approved under exempt review as it met the criteria listed in the SPU IRB User Guidelines (2012, p. 5). The following category applies to your research:

Category 2: Research that involves the exclusive use of anonymous surveys, educational tests, interviews, and/or observations of public behavior. In addition, only adults age 18 or older will participate in your study, which eliminates the need for parental approval.

Your approval is in effect until what time any methods of the study change substantively. When that occurs, you will need to renew your IRB application. Your study has been assigned IRB number: IRB # 161706008.

To complete your documents please add the IRB # to your study's written recruitment material and invitation to participate in the research project.

Best wishes in the completion of your research.

Sincerely,

John B. Bond, Ed.D.
SOE IRB Coordinator
Professor of Educational Leadership
Appendix C

Focus Group Consent Form

CHILDHOOD FAMILY LIFE FOCUS GROUP

PARTICIPANTS CONSENT FORM

Sharon Chiang Doctoral Candidate
Seattle Pacific University
6535 35th Ave NE.
Seattle, WA. 98115
206-302-9446

Dear Participants,

I would like to ask for your permission in recording and involving your sharing today in my research in Parental-Expectation and Parent-Child/Family Relationship via this Childhood Family Life reflection session.

There will be up to five questions asked among the group. The recording will be kept anonymously with confidentiality. Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. This project has been approved by Seattle Pacific University Guidelines for Human Subjects with the IRB # 161706006.

All information will be held as confidential as is legally possible. Only the researchers will review the interview questions and responses. The responses will be coded by the researcher as the data is entered. Please sign below as a consent of the participation in this focus group study:

My Name: ___________________________ My Signature: ___________________________

Date: ________________, 2017

You may ask to keep a copy of this letter. If you have any questions, please feel free to call Sharon (206-302-9446) or email (kidssharon@spu.edu).

Thank you for your participation!

Sincerely,

Sharon Chiang
Seattle Pacific University

DO NOT COPY OR DISTRIBUTE WITHOUT INFORMING THE RESEARCHER
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FACES IV: Questionnaire

Directions to Family Members:
1. *All family members over the age 12 can complete FACES IV.*
2. *Family members should complete the instrument independently, not consulting or discussing their responses until they have been completed.*
3. *Fill in the corresponding number in the space on the provided answer sheet.*

1. Family members are involved in each other’s lives.
2. Our family tries new ways of dealing with problems.
3. We get along better with people outside our family than inside.
4. We spend too much time together.
5. There are strict consequences for breaking the rules in our family.
6. We never seem to get organized in our family.

7. Family members feel very close to each other.
8. Parents equally share leadership in our family.
9. Family members seem to avoid contact with each other when at home.
10. Family members feel pressured to spend most free time together.
11. There are clear consequences when a family member does something wrong.
12. It is hard to know who the leader is in our family.

13. Family members are supportive of each other during difficult times.
14. Discipline is fair in our family.
15. Family members know very little about the friends of other family members.
16. Family members are too dependent on each other.
17. Our family has a rule for almost every possible situation.
18. Things do not get done in our family.

19. Family members consult other family members on important decisions.
20. My family is able to adjust to change when necessary.
21. Family members are on their own when there is a problem to be solved.
22. Family members have little need for friends outside the family.
23. Our family is highly organized.
24. It is unclear who is responsible for things (chores, activities) in our family.

25. Family members like to spend some of their free time with each other.
26. We shift household responsibilities from person to person.
27. Our family seldom does things together.
28. We feel too connected to each other.
29. Our family becomes frustrated when there is a change in our plans or routines.
30. There is no leadership in our family.

31. Although family members have individual interests, they still participant in family activities.
32. We have clear rules and roles in our family.
33. Family members seldom depend on each other.
34. We resent family members doing things outside the family.
35. It is important to follow the rules in our family.
36. Our family has a hard time keeping track of who does various household tasks.

37. Our family has a good balance of separateness and closeness.
38. When problems arise, we compromise.
39. Family members mainly operate independently.
40. Family members feel guilty if they want to spend time away from the family.
41. Once a decision is made, it is very difficult to modify that decision.
42. Our family feels hectic and disorganized.

43. Family members are satisfied with how they communicate with each other.
44. Family members are very good listeners.
45. Family members express affection to each other.
46. Family members are able to ask each other for what they want.
47. Family members can calmly discuss problems with each other.
48. Family members discuss their ideas and beliefs with each other.
49. When family members ask questions of each other, they get honest answers.
50. Family members try to understand each other’s feelings.
51. When angry, family members seldom say negative things about each other.
52. Family members express their true feelings to each other.

**How satisfied are you with:**
53. The degree of closeness between family members.
54. Your family’s ability to cope with stress.
55. Your family’s ability to be flexible.
56. Your family’s ability to share positive experiences.
57. The quality of communication between family members.
58. Your family’s ability to resolve conflicts.
59. The amount of time you spend together as a family.
60. The way problems are discussed.
61. The fairness of criticism in your family.
62. Family members concern for each other.
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FACES IV Chinese
家庭面面观问卷调查

对家庭成员的说明：
1. 所有年龄超过 12 岁的家庭成员都可以完成这份问卷调查。
2. 家庭成员应独立完成问卷，在完成前不要与其它家庭成员商量或讨论自己的回答。
3. 请在提供的答卷纸的空白处填入相应的数字。

1 2 3 4 5
强烈不同意 一般性不同意 不确定 一般性同意 强烈同意
1. 家庭成员投入彼此的生活。
2. 我们家尝试处理问题的新办法。
3. 我们与外人相处比与家里人处得更好。
4. 我们在一起花了太多的时间。
5. 在我们家中，不守家规有严重的后果。
6. 在我们家中，似乎从来没有井然有序过。
7. 家庭成员间感到彼此很亲密。
8. 父母亲在家中平等地享有领导地位。
9. 在家里，家庭成员间似乎避免相互接触。
10. 家庭成员对在一起渡过大部分的自由时间感到有压力。
11. 当家庭成员做错事时，会有清楚的后果。
12. 在这个家里，很难知道谁是领导者。
13. 家庭成员在困难时刻会相互支持。
14. 我们家的家规是公平的。
15. 家庭成员几乎不了解其它成员的朋友。
16. 家庭成员过分彼此依赖。
17. 我们家对几乎每一种可能的情况都有其相应的规矩。
18. 在我们家中，没有事情能够完成。
19. 家庭成员在重要决定上会征询家里其他人的意见。
20. 在必要时，我们家能够对变化做出相应的调整。
21. 当有问题需解决时，家庭成员孤立无援。
22. 家庭成员几乎没有在家庭以外交朋友的需要。
23. 我们家极其井然有序。
24. 在我们家，谁负责什么事（如杂事，活动）不清楚。
25. 家庭成员喜欢一起渡过一些闲暇时光。
26. 我们家轮流负责家务。
27. 我们家很少一起做事情。
28. 我们感到彼此联系太紧密了。
29. 当家庭计划或常规有变化时，家庭成员变得有挫折感。
30. 在这个家里没有领导。
31. 尽管家庭成员有各自的兴趣，大家仍一起参加家庭活动。
32. 在我们家，我们有清楚的规矩和角色。
33. 家庭成员间很少互相依赖。
34. 我们怨恨家庭成员做家外事。
35. 在我们家遵守规矩很重要。
36. 在我们家很难知道谁做了什么家务事。
37. 我们家人在自我独立和亲密关系之间取得了良好的平衡。
38. 当有问题出现时，我们每人各让一步。
39. 家庭成员主要是各管各。
40. 如果家庭成员想在家庭之外渡过他们的时光，他们会感到内疚。
41. 一旦决定做出了，很难去改变它。
42. 我们家感觉是紊乱无序的。
43. 家庭成员对彼此间的沟通方式感到满意。
44. 家庭成员是很好的倾听者。
45. 家庭成员彼此间表达关爱之情。
46. 家庭成员能够向彼此寻求他们的所需。
47. 家庭成员能彼此心平气和地讨论问题。
48. 家庭成员间彼此讨论他们的想法和信念。
49. 当家庭成员彼此间问问题时，他们会得到诚实的答案。
50. 家庭成员试着去理解彼此的感受。
51. 家庭成员在生气时很少说彼此的坏话。
52. 家庭成员间相互表达真实的感受。

1 2 3 4 5
非常不满意有点不满意一般性满意很满意极其满意
您对以下的方方面面有多满意:
53. 家庭成员之间的亲密程度。
54. 你们家应付压力的能力。
55. 你们家灵活变通的能力。
56. 你们家分享积极经验的能力。
57. 家庭成员间沟通的质量。
58. 你们家解决冲突的能力。
59. 你们家作为一个整体在一起渡过的时间的多少。
60. 讨论问题的方式。
61. 你们家批评的公正性。
62. 家庭成员间的互相关心。
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Bar Chart of Data Collection Blessing
Researcher VITA

Sharon H. C. Chiang 江秀圈 AKA: Sharon To

CONTACT INFORMATION:
kidssharon@spu.edu
Facebook: Sharon Chiang 江秀圈

EDUCATION

2017 Ph.D. in Education, Special-designed Specialization:
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2009 Certificate in Non-Profit Management
University of Washington
1997 M.ED. in Curriculum and Instruction
Seattle Pacific University
1995 BA in Self-Design Major,
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Seattle Pacific University
1988 Teaching Certificate in Early Childhood Education
Taipei Municipal Teachers College
1985 Diploma
Taipei Municipal First Girl High School

PROFESSIONAL HISTORY

2001-Present Speaker/Trainer, “Equipping For Teaching Kids”
2020-Present ED, Bethany Children’s Home, Taipei, Taiwan
2009-2020 Children & Family Ministry Minister, Evangelical Chinese Church
2000-2007 Children Ministry Director, Evangelical Chinese Church of Seattle
1999 Information Officer/Office Manager,
China National Tourist Office, New York
1997-1998 Office Manager, Overseas Radio & Television, Inc.—Seattle
1996-1997 English Administrative Assistant, Evangelical Chinese Church
1996-1996 Teacher, Calvary Temple Child Care Center
1999-1991 Teacher/Administrator, Overseas Radio & Television, Inc., Taiwan
1989 Assistant manager, Fu-Gung Cooperation
1988-1989 Teacher & Administrative Assistant, Yu-Kung Kindergarten