Validation of the Perceived Chinese Overparenting Scale in Emerging Adults in Hong Kong

Dr. Janet T.Y. Leung is Assistant Professor at the Department of Social Sciences, The Hong Kong Polytechnic University.

Prof. Daniel T.L. Shek is Associate Vice President and Chair Professor of Applied Social Sciences, The Hong Kong Polytechnic University.

Address all correspondence to Janet T.Y. Leung, PhD, Assistant Professor, Department of Applied Social Sciences, The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Hung Hom, Hong Kong.

E-mail: janet.leung@polyu.edu.hk

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS: This research was financially supported by the Departmental General Research Fund of The Hong Kong Polytechnic University (Project Code: G-UA9S).

Conflict of Interest: The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

ABSTRACT

Overparenting is an emergent parenting style where parents are highly involved in their children's routines and they remove the perceived obstacles that may happen in their children's lives. However, validated measures that objectively assess overparenting are severely lacking in the Chinese communities. Based on a sample of 642 undergraduate students from Hong Kong, psychometric properties of the perceived Chinese Paternal Overparenting Scale (CPOS) and Chinese Maternal Overparenting Scale (CMOS) were examined in terms of internal consistency, test-retest reliability, convergent validity and factorial validity. Results indicated that both CPOS and CMOS showed good internal consistency and test-retest reliability. As predicted, the findings gave support for the convergent validity of the scales: CPOS and CMOS were significantly related to measures of paternal and maternal behavioral control, psychological control, and support; they were also negatively associated with self-efficacy but positively related to narcissistic behavior of emerging adults. Moreover, factor analyses showed that eight factors corresponding to the proposed conceptual model were abstracted from the CPOS and CMOS, respectively. The present study suggests that both CPOS and CMOS are reliable and valid assessment tools that can be used to measure parental overparenting in the Chinese context.

Keywords: overparenting, Chinese, emerging adults, scale validation, factor analysis

Introduction

Since the 2000s, generational theorists have raised their concerns about the millennial generation (Howe & Strauss, 2007) where parents are highly involved and frequently intruding into their children's lives. Parents are preoccupied with protecting and nurturing their children so that their children can succeed in the "rug rat race" (Leung & Busiol, 2016; Ramey & Ramey, 2009). "Overparenting" has become an emergent parenting style in both global and local contexts, and it has captured the attention of the mass media and the general public (e.g., Gibbs, 2009). Unfortunately, scientific research on this area is sparse, particularly in the Chinese context. Obviously, the lack of instruments validated in the Chinese communities has restricted the development of scientific studies on this area.

Overparenting is commonly defined as "developmentally inappropriate parenting that is driven by parents' overzealous desires to ensure the success and happiness of their children, typically in a way that is construed largely in the parents' terms, and to remove any perceived obstacles to those positive outcomes" (Segrin et al., 2012, p. 238). Segrin et al. (2012, 2013) identified four features of overparenting, including anticipatory problem-solving and risk aversion, excessive advice and affective involvement to children, control over children's self-direction, and provision of abundant tangible assistance. Rousseau and Scharf (2015) noted that overparenting exercises inappropriate levels of control, involvement and assistance from parents to their children, while disregards children's desire for autonomy. Previous studies showed that overparenting was negatively associated with self-efficacy of emerging adults due to the lack of opportunities for trial and error (Darlow, Norvilitis & Schuetze, 2017), but positively linked to narcissism (Sergin et al., 2012).

In the recent research, overparenting has been mixed with helicopter parenting and tiger parenting (Ashton-James, Kushlev & Dunn, 2013; Bradley-Geist & Olson-Bichanan, 2014). Helicopter parenting, which is generally referred to parents' over-involvement in their

children's lives by solving problems for them and intervening into their daily routines and decisions (LeMoyne & Buchanan, 2011; Padilla-Walker & Nelson, 2012), can be regarded as a version of overparenting (Bradley-Geist & Olson-Bichanan, 2014; Segrin et al., 2012). However, there is a need to differentiate overparenting from tiger parenting. Tiger parenting refers to strict parental control of their children to foster children's academic achievement with low affective response to the emotional needs of the children. Overparenting is different from tiger parenting as parents usually show strong affection and support to their children (Kwon, You & De Gagne, 2017).

In the conceptualization and operationalization of overparenting, two major issues should be examined. First, cultural specificity on conceptualizing overparenting should be carefully considered. As suggested by Bornstein and Cheah (2006), culture plays a primary role in shaping the ecology of parenting and childhood. While Western parenting is traditionally based on an individualistic ideology that focuses on the independence and autonomy of their children, Chinese parenting is grounded on a collective ideology that emphasizes familism and interdependence as originated in Confucian thoughts (Shek, 2006b).

There are several characteristics of Chinese parenting related to the conceptualization of overparenting. First, personal achievement is important for an individual to bring pride and honor to the family (Yeh & Yang, 1997). The Chinese saying of "*guang zong yao zu*" (bringing honor to ancestors) best describes the importance of personal achievement to the family (Leung, 2017). Hence, Chinese parents are sensitive to school performance and academic achievement of their children (Chao & Sue, 1996). Second, Chinese parents exercise behavioral and psychological control to build up their children's compliance with their rules and to monitor their children's behaviors (Shek, 2006c; Wang, Pomerantz & Chen, 2007). Behavioral control refers to the rules and regulations that parents enforce to monitor their children's behaviors (Smetana & Daddis, 2002), whereas psychological control is the

parents' attempt to control the child's activities that negatively influence his/her psychological world (Smetana & Daddis, 2002). In the Chinese culture, parents make use of different behavioral and psychological control strategies such as conformity training, modesty and self-suppression induction, shame strategy, punishment to enforce their rules and authority to their children (Yang, 1981). Third, Chinese parents are willing to sacrifice their own needs to support the educational and developmental needs of the adolescents (Leung & Shek, 2013). Last but not least, high control and intensive care for their children can be exercised at the same time by the same parent (Grolnick & Farkas, 2002; Lau & Cheung, 1987). Cheung and McBride-Chang (2008) showed that while "concern" and "restrictiveness" are two dimensions of parenting style that are theoretically independent, they are highly associated in the cases of Chinese mothers. In summary, Chinese parents exercise behavioral control and psychological control but at the same time showed their support while they socialize their children (Leung & Shek, 2013; Shek, 2006a, 2006c). Overparenting may share these features of Chinese parenting but in an excessive manner. In fact, studies showed that overparenting was associated with parental behavioral and psychological control (Darlow, Norvilitis & Schuetze, 2017; Padilla-Walker & Nelson, 2012; Rousseau & Scharf, 2015), and parental support (Schiffrin et al., 2014).

In view of the paucity of studies on the conceptualization of "overparenting" in the Chinese contexts, a qualitative study was conducted to understand the views of overparenting from four focus groups of parents and emerging adults in Hong Kong (Leung, Shek & Ng, in press). The participants were invited to share how they defined overparenting, their subjective experiences and/or observations on overparenting, as well as the parental attitudes and behaviors related to overparenting. Eight themes were identified in Chinese overparenting, including close monitoring, intrusion of child's life and direction, strong emphasis on child's academic performance, frequent comparisons on child's achievement with peers, anticipatory

problem-solving, overscheduling of child's activities, excessive care, and excessive affective involvement. Apart from the features of overparenting identified in the literature (e.g., Segrin et al., 2012), strong emphasis on child's academic performance and frequent comparisons on child's achievement with peers are unique features in Chinese overparenting. The findings echoed Chao and Sue's suggestion (1996) that personal achievements and academic performance are strongly emphasized in the Chinese socialization. Besides, Chinese parents are used to pressurize their children to excellence by comparing their children's accomplishment with others (Kwon, You & De Gagne, 2017). While there are existing Western measures of overparenting showing good psychometric properties (LeMoyne & Buchanan, 2011; Segrin et al., 2012), a new indigenous measurement to assess overparenting in Chinese contexts is essential to capture the specific cultural conceptions of overparenting.

The second issue is that some validation studies on overparenting did not address the issue of parent gender (Elgar et al., 2007; Reitman et al., 2002). In fact, as fathers and mothers assume different roles in a family, emerging adults may have different perceptions of paternal and maternal overparenting. Based on the role theory from a cultural perspective (Hosley & Montemayor, 1997), fathers are mainly responsible for the instrumental functions in the family, such as bread-winning and disciplining the children, whereas mothers are mainly responsible for the expressive functions, such as taking care of the children and managing family routines (Russell et al., 1998). With specific reference to the Chinese culture, although the "strict fathers, kind mothers" thesis (Wilson, 1974) was intrinsic to traditional Chinese families (Shek, 2002a), the thesis has been challenged recently when mothers were found to take up more roles of parental control (Shek, 2008, Leung & Shek, 2012). As such, the "strict mothers, kind fathers" or even "stricter and kinder mothers with detached fathers" phenomenon had been proposed (Shek, 2008, p. 678). Against this backdrop, paternal and maternal overparenting should be examined separately.

Based on the literature (e.g., Segrin et al., 2012), as well as the themes identified by the focus groups of Chinese parents and emerging adults in a qualitative study (Leung, Shek & Ng, in press), a 44-item Chinese Paternal/Maternal Overparenting Scale (CPOS/CMOS) was developed for this study. To ensure that an assessment tool can be adequately used in research and practice, there is a need to assess the reliability, validity, and dimensionality (i.e., factorial validity) of the measurement tool with reference to the proposed conceptual framework.

In this study, the internal consistency and temporal reliability of both CPOS and CMOS (and the related subscales) were examined. Regarding validity, convergent validity of CPOS and CMOS was examined. It was hypothesized that the scores of CPOS and CMOS would be positively associated with scores on measures of paternal and maternal behavioral control (Hypotheses 1a and 1b), psychological control (Hypotheses 1c and 1d), and support (Hypotheses 1e and 1f), respectively. Moreover, we hypothesized that the scores of CPOS and CMOS would be negatively associated with their self-efficacy (Hypotheses 1g and 1h) but positively related to narcissism (Hypotheses 1i and 1j) of the emerging adults. Furthermore, factor analyses were performed to examine whether the factor structure of CPOS and CMOS correspond to the conceptual framework. Last but not least, the responses of CPOS and CMOS among different groups based on demographic characteristics (gender, age, year of study, family intactness, duration of stay in Hong Kong, poverty status, and family household income) were analyzed. It was hypothesized that a higher level of overparenting would be found in high-income families than in low-income families (Hypothesis 2).

Method

Participants

The data were collected from Chinese undergraduate students of two government-funded universities in Hong Kong. The respondents were sampled from different classes of general education modules to facilitate recruitment of respondents from varying disciplines. Accordingly, thirteen classes participated. As general education classes in one selected university were targeted at first-year students, notably more first-year students were recruited in this study. Altogether 646 students participated, while 642 sets of questionnaires were deemed fit for statistical analyses following a screening of missing data.

Amongst the 642 respondents (i.e., Mean age = 18.34; SD = 1.22), 276 (43%) were males and 364 (56.7%) were females (two did not specify their gender). A high proportion of the respondents were first-year students (n = 542, 84.4%), whereas 67 (10.4%) were second-year students, 21 (3.3%) were third-year students and 9 (1.4%) were fourth-year students (three did not specify their years of study). The majority of the respondents were Hong Kong-born (n = 455, 70.9%), 112 (17.4%) were immigrants from mainland China, and 68 (10.6%) were non-local students who were from mainland China and Taiwan (seven did not respond). Regarding the family structure, 526 (81.9%) came from intact, first-marriage families, 34 (5.3%) were from second-marriage families, 54 (5.3%) were from divorced families, 10 (2.2%) were from separated families while 14 (2.2%) were from widowed families (three did not respond). Two hundred (31.2%) respondents claimed to be the lone children, 332 (50.2%) had one sibling and 86 (13.4%) had two siblings, and 26 (4.1%) had more than two siblings (eight did not respond). The reported family income was quite diverse in this sample, with monthly household income ranging from less than HK$20,000 (US$2,564) (n = 162, 25.2%), to HK$20,001 – HK$40,000 (US$2,565 – US$5,128) (n = 208, 32.4%), to HK$40,001 – HK$60,000 (US$5,128 – US$7,692) (n = 61, 9.5%), and to HK$60,001 (US$7,692) or above (n = 58, 9.0%). Fifty-six (8.7%) respondents came from

families who were beneficiaries of the Comprehensive Social Security Assistance (CSSA) Scheme.

Procedure

During data collection, the purpose of the research, procedures of data collection, the rights of respondents to voluntarily participate and withdraw from the study, and the use of the data were reiterated to the students. Written informed consents from the respondents were obtained. They were asked to fill out the questionnaire which featured the measures of paternal and maternal overparenting, behavioral control, psychological control, support, self-efficacy, narcissism and some demographic questions. The questionnaire was administered in Chinese and participants were allowed sufficient time to finish that. This study was approved and subject to monitoring by the Human Subjects Ethics Sub-committee of The Hong Kong Polytechnic University.

A class composed of 64 students was randomly selected to conduct the retest after two weeks to assess the temporal stability of the scales. The students were asked to fill out the questionnaire that contained an assessment of paternal and maternal overparenting once more. Sixty-two students completed both the test and retest.

Measures

The Chinese Paternal/Maternal Overparenting Scale (CPOS/CMOS). Based on the literature (e.g., Segrin et al., 2012) and the qualitative findings of focus groups with Chinese parents and adolescents, a 44-item Chinese Paternal/Maternal Overparenting Scale was developed with eight dimensions: close monitoring, intrusion of child's life and direction, strong emphasis on child's academic performance, frequent comparisons of child's achievement with peers, anticipatory problem-solving, overscheduling of child's activities,

excessive care, and excessive affective involvement. Each item is rated on a six-point Likert scale ranging from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree”. A sample item is “My development is under my father’s/mother’s meticulous plan”. Higher scores indicate a higher level of paternal/maternal overparenting. Reliability analyses showed that the CPOS and the CMOS had excellent reliability in this study (CPOS: $\alpha = 0.95$; CMOS: $\alpha = 0.96$).

The Chinese Paternal/Maternal Behavioral Control Scale (PCON/MCON). Based on the literature on parental control (e.g. Kerr & Stattin, 2000; Pettit et al., 2001), Shek (2006c) developed the Chinese Paternal/Maternal Behavioral Control Scale (Shek, 2006c; Shek & Law, 2014) that measures three aspects of parental control, namely parental knowledge, parental expectations, and parental monitoring. Each item is rated on a four-point Likert scale ranging from “1 = strongly disagree” to “4 = strongly agree”. A sample item is “My father/mother clearly knows my situation in my school”. A short form of seven items was adopted for the present study. The scales showed good internal consistency, construct validity and factorial validity in previous studies (Shek, 2006c; Shek & Law, 2014). Higher scores of the PCON/MCON indicate a higher level of paternal/maternal behavioral control. Reliability analyses showed that both the PCON and the MCON had good reliability in this study (PCON: $\alpha = 0.85$; MCON: $\alpha = 0.81$).

Chinese Paternal/Maternal Psychological Control Scale (PPSY/MPSY). Based on the literature on psychological control (Barber, 1996, 2002), a ten-item PPSY/MPSY was developed by Shek (2006a) to assess the paternal/maternal psychological control. Each item is rated on a four-point Likert scale ranging from “1 = strongly disagree” to “4 = strongly agree”. A sample item reads “When my father/mother criticizes me, he/she always mentions my mistakes in the past”. The scales were shown to possess good internal consistency, convergent validity and discriminant validity (Shek, 2006a). Higher scores of the PPSY/MPSY indicate a higher level of paternal/maternal psychological control. Reliability

analyses showed that the PPSY and the MPSY had good reliability in this study (PPSY: α = 0.89; MPSY: α = 0.89).

Chinese Paternal/Maternal Support Scale (PSUPP/MSUPP). Based on the literature of social support (Wolchik, Sandler & Braver, 1987), Shek (2002b) developed a three-item PSUPP/MSUPP to measure paternal/maternal support. Each item is rated on a four-point Likert scale ranging from "1 = strongly disagree" to "4 = strongly agree". A sample item is "When I share with my father/mother, he/she listens attentively". The measures were shown to have good internal consistency and convergent validity (Leung & Shek, 2011; Shek, 2002b). Higher scores of the PSUPP/MSUPP indicate a higher level of paternal/maternal support. Reliability analyses showed that the PSUPP and the MSUPP had good reliability in this study (PSUPP: α = 0.87; MSUPP: α = 0.84).

Self-efficacy Scale (SE). SE was modeled after the Chinese version of the Mastery Scale (Shek, 2004). A short-form of two items, "I believe things happening in my life are mostly determined by me" and "I can finish almost everything that I am determined to do", was adopted for the present study. Each item is rated on a six-point Likert scale ranging from "Strongly disagree" to "Strongly agree". The scale showed internal consistency (α = 0.64).

The Narcissism Subscale (Fung et al., 2010). Based on the Anti-Social Process Screening Device (APSD) developed by Frick and Hare (2001), Fung et al. (2010) translated the APSD into Chinese, which showed acceptable psychometric properties in a validation study with a Chinese sample (Fung et al., 2010). The seven-item Narcissism subscale was used in the study. Each question is rated on a three-point scale ranging from "Not at all true", to "Sometimes true", and to "Definitely true". A sample item reads "Do you seem to think that you are better than other people?". Higher scores on the subscale indicate a higher level of narcissism. The subscale showed internal consistency in this study (α = 0.65).

Data Analyses

We performed the exploratory factor analysis (EFA) using the principal component analysis (PCA) with varimax rotations to examine the factor structures of CPOS and CMOS respectively. The coefficients of congruence (r_c) were computed to quantify the similarity of the factor structures across CPOS and CMOS (Lorenzo-Seva & Ten Berge, 2006). Regarding reliability, the Cronbach's alpha value and test-retest correlation coefficient were used to assess the internal consistency and temporal stability of CPOS and CMOS respectively. For convergent validity, correlation analyses were performed to assess the association between CPOS and CMOS with the measures of paternal and maternal behavioral control, psychological control, parental support, self-efficacy and narcissism respectively. Finally, multivariate analyses of variances (MANOVA) were performed to assess whether there were group differences of gender, age, years of study, duration of stay in Hong Kong, family intactness (intact, remarried, divorced, and widowed), poverty status (recipients and non-recipients of the CSSA) and family household income in their responses of CPOS and CMOS.

Results

Dimensionality of the Measurement

We performed the exploratory factor analysis (EFA) due to the exploratory nature of the present study. Regarding the CPOS, eight factors were extracted from the measurement that had eigenvalue greater than unity. The solution accounted for 68.36% of the total variance. All items had loadings exceeding 0.4. Table 1 details the factor loadings of the items, eigenvalues, and variances explained by the factors, and the correlation coefficients among the factors. The eight factors included "intrusion of child's life and direction" (items 5 to 11), "anticipatory problem-solving" (items 23 to 27 and item 30), "excessive affective involvement" (items 39 to 44), "frequent comparisons of child's achievement with peers"

(items 16 to 21), “overscheduling of child’s activities” (items 28, 29, 31 to 33), “close monitoring” (items 1 to 4), “excessive care” (items 34 to 38), and “strong emphasis on child’s academic performance” (items 12 to 15).

As the CPOS showed an eight-factor structure which corresponded to the conceptual model, a factor analysis of eight-factor structure was performed in CMOS. The same number of factors in CPOS and CMOS could further facilitate the assessment of factorial congruence between the two measurements (Siegel & Pfeiffer, 1965). The solution explained 70.09% of the total variance. Although the eigenvalue of the eighth factor did not reach unity, it was approaching unity (0.98). Hence, an 8-factor solution was examined. All items, aside from items 6 and 30, had loadings which exceeded 0.40. The eight factors were “excessive affective involvement” (items 39 to 44), “intrusion of child’s life and direction” (items 5 to 11), “frequent comparisons of child’s achievement with peers” (items 17 to 21), “anticipatory problem-solving” (items 22 to 27), “overscheduling of child’s activities” (items 28, 29, 31 to 33), “close monitoring” which contained 4 items (items 1 to 4), “excessive care” (items 30, 34 to 38), and “strong emphasis on child’s academic performance” (items 12 to 16). Table 2 lists the factor loadings of the items, eigenvalues and variance explained by the factors, and the correlation coefficients among the factors. In summary, the eight-factor structures of both CPOS and CMOS generally corresponded to the proposed conceptual model.

As items 6 and 30 recorded factor loadings below 0.40 in the CMOS, and the corresponding values in the CPOS were not high (0.56 and 0.46, respectively), these two items were deleted. Most of the items, except for item 16, loaded on the same factors corresponding to the dimensions of the proposed conceptual model. Item 16 “My academic report is my father’s/mother’s performance report” fell into the same factor (strong emphasis on child’s academic performance) in the CMOS and the conceptual model, but was grouped into the factor of “frequent comparisons of child’s achievement with peers” in the CPOS. We

recommended including item 16 into the original factor on "strong emphasis on child's academic performance" because the statement represents the feature of this factor. To sum up, the final structure of CPOS/CMOS was determined with eight factors, namely close monitoring (items 1 to 4), intrusion of child's life and direction (items 5, 7 to 11); strong emphasis on child's academic performance (items 12 to 16), frequent comparisons on child's achievement with peers (items 17 to 21), anticipatory problem-solving (items 22 to 28), overscheduling of child's activities (items 28, 29, 31 to 33), excessive care (items 34 to 38), and excessive affective involvement (items 39 to 44).

Based on the final eight-factor structure of the measurement, coefficients of congruence (r_c) across CPOS and CMOS (and their subscales) were 0.99, indicating that the eight-factor components across CPOS and CMOS were almost equal (Lorenzo-Seva & Ten Berge, 2006). Furthermore, the sample was divided randomly to generate two subsamples. The values of r_c of CPOS and CMOS across two subsamples were 0.99 and 0.99 respectively, indicating good similarity of the scales across the two subsamples. The r_c of the subscales across the two random subsamples also demonstrated good similarity. Table 3 lists the coefficients of congruence across CPOS and CMOS (and the subscales), as well as the coefficient values across two random subsamples.

Reliability of the Measures

The scale and subscales showed good internal consistencies. The Cronbach's alpha value of the CPOS was 0.95 and those of the subscales ranged from 0.83 to 0.91 (Table 4). The Cronbach's alpha value of the CMOS was 0.96 and those of the subscales ranged from 0.85 to 0.93 (Table 4). Furthermore, it was found that both CPOS and CMOS showed good internal consistencies in the two random subsamples, male and female samples. Table 4 lists

the Cronbach's alpha values and inter-item correlations of the CPOS, the CMOS and their relative subscales in different subsamples.

Regarding the two-week test-retest reliability, both CPOS (i.e., $r = 0.84$, $p < .001$) and CMOS (i.e., $r = 0.89$, $p < .001$) revealed good temporal stability. Table 4 shows the Cronbach's alpha values of CPOS and CMOS (and their subscales) of the retest.

Convergent Validity

Consistent with our predictions, CPOS, CMOS and their subscales were correlated with Chinese Paternal/Maternal Behavioral Control Scale (PCON/MCON; Shek & Law, 2014), Chinese Paternal/Maternal Psychological Control Scale (PPSY/MPSY; Shek, 2006a) and Chinese Paternal/Maternal Support Scale (PSUPP/MSUPP; Shek, 2002b). In general, the CPOS had significant positive correlations with PCON, PPSY and PSUPP, with $r = 0.53$ ($p < 0.001$), 0.49 ($p < 0.001$) and 0.26 ($p < 0.001$) respectively. Hypotheses 1a, 1c and 1e were supported (see Table 5). For maternal overparenting, CMOS had significant positive correlations with MCON ($r = 0.39$, $p < 0.001$), MPSY ($r = 0.54$, $p < 0.001$) and MSUPP ($r = 0.14$, $p < 0.001$) respectively. Hence, Hypotheses 1b, 1d and 1f were supported (see Table 5).

As hypothesized, CPOS and CMOS were negatively associated with self-efficacy of the emerging adults, with $r = -0.10$ ($p < 0.05$) and -0.12 ($p < 0.01$) respectively. Hence, Hypotheses 1g and 1h were supported. Furthermore, CPOS and CMOS were positively related to narcissism of emerging adults, with $r = 0.17$ ($p < 0.001$) and 0.17 ($p < 0.001$) respectively. As such, Hypotheses 1i and 1j were supported.

Group Differences in Demographic Characteristics in Responding to CPOS and CMOS

Results of MANOVA showed that there were no significant differences of CPOS scores across groups based on the respondents' gender, age, years of study, duration of stays in Hong

Kong, family intactness (i.e., intact, divorced, and widowed families), and poverty status (i.e., recipients and non-recipients of the CSSA). Similar findings were obtained in CMOS scores. The only effect we found was that CPOS scores differed among groups with different family household income ($F(3, 480) = 5.15$, $p < 0.01$, partial eta squared = 0.031). Scheffe's comparison tests showed that the CPOS scores was significantly higher in respondents having a monthly household income of "HK$60,001 and above" than in those respondents having a monthly household income of "HK$20,000 and below" (mean difference = 0.35, $p < 0.01$), and "HK$20,001-HK$40,000" (mean difference = 0.29, $p < 0.05$) respectively.

Discussion

This study attempted to validate the perceived Chinese Paternal/Maternal Overparenting Scale (CPOS/CMOS) in a sample of emerging adults in Hong Kong. The findings suggested that CPOS and CMOS have excellent reliability status, including internal consistency and temporal stability. Besides, both measures showed convergent validity, as reflected by their significant relationships with measures of paternal/maternal behavioral control, psychological control, and support. As predicted, CPOS and CMOS also showed negative relationships with self-efficacy and positive relationships with narcissism. Finally, factor analyses showed that eight factors were extracted from each scale and both scales (CPOS and CMOS) were stable across samples. In summary, both CPOS and CMOS showed good psychometric properties that can be used in research and practice.

The results showed that the CPOS scores were significantly higher in the high-income group (HK$60,001 and above) than the low-income group (HK$20,000 and below) and middle-income group (HK$20,001-HK$40,000). Fathers of the high-income groups may easily impose their success in career and socio-economic status upon their children and accordingly, expect them to come out on top in the "rug rat race". Hence, the fathers are more

inclined to invest their resources for the nurturance of their children and place their expectations and plans in the children's life paths. As studies on overparenting and family socio-economic status are severely lacking, more studies in this area are recommended.

Another observation is that both CPOS and CMOS were positively associated with measures of parental behavioral and psychological control, but at the same time they were positively related to the measure of parental support. Echoing the suggestions that Chinese parenting is characterized by high levels of parental control with strong parental support and sacrifice (Lau & Cheung, 1987; Leung & Shek, 2013), the concepts of overparenting also demonstrate similar patterns with intensive parental control and excessive care. It is interesting to find that anticipatory problem-solving, excessive care, and excessive affective involvement were strongly associated with parental support, but at the same time, they were highly correlated with parental behavioral control. It is not surprising to understand that these three dimensions were indicators of parental support and involvement to their children. However, emerging adults also perceived this parental commitment as a kind of behavioral control which set up boundaries to their actions. From adolescence to adulthood, emerging adults seek independence, commitment, and responsibilities to demonstrate their abilities and competence in adulthood (Arnett, 2001; Nelson & Barry, 2005). Anticipatory problem-solving, excessive care, and excessive affective involvement will be viewed as parental surveillance that jeopardizes their independence and autonomy.

Furthermore, it was found that close monitoring, intrusion of child's life and direction, strong emphasis on child's academic performance, frequent comparisons of child's achievement and overscheduling of child's activities were highly correlated with parental psychological control, echoing the existing literature that parental intrusiveness, manipulation, and excessive expectations were intrinsic to psychological control (Barber & Harmon, 2002). Apart from behavioral control and substantial assistance towards their children, parents who

exercise overparenting would maneuver their children psychologically via overparenting practice.

There are several theoretical and practical implications of the present findings. First, both CPOS and CMOS showed good psychometric properties that can be used to assess the effects of overparenting on adolescent development in the Chinese contexts. As there is evidence that overparenting negatively influences adolescent psychosocial development (Reed et al., 2016; Schiffrin et al., 2014) and positively predicted adolescent narcissism (Segrin et al., 2012), it is essential to examine the influences of overparenting on adolescent psychosocial and character development in the Chinese communities. Particularly, Chinese children and adolescents are strongly influenced by their family socialization where familism and interdependence are emphasized (Fuligni & Pedersen, 2002; Lam, 1997).

Second, the present study showed that both CPOS and CMOS have congruent dimensionality. The measures can facilitate the assessment of paternal overparenting, which was neglected in the literature. Third, the study examined the responses of paternal and maternal overparenting among different groups in terms of demographic characteristics. As related studies were severely lacking in the literature, this study provided important insights for researchers and family theorists to understand more on the demographic characteristics of overparenting families.

Fourth, the inter-relationships between overparenting and parental control are novel. The present findings suggest that overparenting exhibits characteristics of behavioral control (such as monitoring) and psychological control (such as comparing one's child with others). Besides, the relationships among the overparenting components, parental support, parental behavioral and psychological control provide insightful cues on the conceptualization of overparenting in the Chinese contexts, which facilitates the development of Chinese family socialization models.

Practically, the Chinese Overparenting Scale (CPOS/CMOS) facilitates family practitioners and youth counselors to identify families that exercise overparenting, and provide timely intervention for them before family stresses and conflicts arise. The measurement also helps to advance the design and content of parent education programs and family support services to increase the sensitivity of parents on overparenting. There is a rising trend of the parents to "push" their children to excellence so as to win in "the rug rat race" (Ramey & Ramey, 2009). Feeling frightened that "doing less" will spoil the future of the children, parents tend to "do more". Echoing the dominant roles of Chinese parents in their children's lives, as reflected by the Chinese saying "*yang er yi bai sui, chang you jiu shi jiu*" (if you have a child who is a hundred years old, you have been worrying for at least 99 years; Lam, 2007, p.55), overparenting is easily "legitimized" by parents as the manifestations of love, care and parental responsibility to their children. Unfortunately, there is evidence that overparenting would hinder the adolescents from learning and experiencing, which in turn "infantilizes" them into incompetence (Gibbs, 2009; Schiffrin et al., 2014). The measures can be used in parent education programs to enhance the parents' awareness of overparenting.

Limitations

There are several limitations in the study. First, the study examined perceived overparenting from the perspective of emerging adults without addressing the perspective of parents in the study. It is justifiable as the respondents are the "receivers" of parenting (Elstad & Stefanen, 2014) and they can serve as "acute observers" of parental behaviors (Ben-Arieh, 2008; Casas, 2011). Parents who exercise overparenting may not even be fully aware of their overparenting behaviors and therefore may not accurately present their practice. However, some overparenting attributes (e.g., anticipatory problem solving) may not be easily

recognized by the emerging adults as parents might hide their behaviors. Hence, the inclusion of different informants would offer a more comprehensive understanding in relation to overparenting. Second, the data were collected from a sample of Chinese undergraduate students in Hong Kong. As overparenting may also happen in early adolescents and young working adults, it is suggested that we replicate the study with adolescents in different age groups. Moreover, whether the findings can be generalized to different Chinese communities (e.g., mainland China, Chinese-Americans) is an empirical question to be addressed. Third, as non-random sampling was employed in the study, there is a problem of generalizability of the findings. Fourth, as the eigenvalue of the eighth factor of the CMOS is less than unity, further studies are recommended to examine the factor structure of maternal overparenting. Last but not least, as this is the first scientific study that examines the factor structure of measures of overparenting in the Chinese contexts, the employment of exploratory factor analysis is justified. However, confirmatory factor analyses based on a larger sample should be conducted in the future to give support to the findings arising from this study.

Despite these limitations, the present study showed that both CPOS and CMOS possessed good psychometric properties in assessing overparenting in the Chinese contexts. In view of the rising interest in overparenting in the global and Chinese contexts, the present study provides a timely response to aid future research in this area.

Compliance with Ethical Standards:

Funding: This study was funded by the Departmental General Research Fund (Project Code: G-UA9S).

Ethical Approval: The authors declare that all procedures performed in studies involving human participants were in accordance with the ethical standards of the Human Subjects Ethics Sub-committee of The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, and with the 1964 Helsinki declaration and its later amendments or comparable ethical standards.

Informed Consent: Written informed consents from all respondents were sought.

Author Contributions:

JL: conceived of the study, designed and executed the study, performed the data analyses, and wrote the paper. DS: collaborated with the data collection and interpretation, and editing of the manuscript.

References

Arnett, J. J. (2001). Conceptions of the transition to adulthood: Perspectives from adolescence to midlife. *Journal of Adult Development, 8,* 133-143.

Ashton-James, C. E., Kushlev, K., & Dunn, E. W. (2013). Parents reap what they sow child-centrism and parental well-being. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*. DOI: 10.1177/1948550613479804.

Barber, B. K. (1996). Parental psychological control: Revisiting a neglected construct. *Child Development, 67,* 3296-3319.

Barber, B. K. (Ed.). (2002). *Intrusive parenting: How psychological control affects children and adolescents.* Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Barber, B. K., & Harmon, E. L. (2002). Violating the self: Parental psychological control of children and adolescent. In B. K. Barber (Ed.), *Intrusive parenting: How psychological control affects children and adolescents* (pp. 15–52). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Ben-Arieh, A. (2008). The child indicators movement: past, present, and future. *Child Indicators Research,1*(1), 3–16.

Bornstein, M.H., & Cheah, C.S.L. (2006). The place of "culture and parenting" in the ecological contextual perspective on developmental science.In K.H. Rubin, & O.B. Chung (eds.), *Parenting beliefs, behaviors, and parent-child relationship* (pp. 3-34). New York: Taylor & Francis Group.

Bradley-Geist, J.C., & Olson-Buchanan, J.B. (2014). Helicopter parents: an examination of the correlates of over-parenting of college students. Education & Training 56, 314–328.

Casas, F. (2011). Subjective social indicators and child and adolescent well-being. *Child Indicators Research, 4*(4), 555–575.

Chao, R.K., & Sue, S. (1996). Chinese parental influence and their children's school success:

a paradox in the literature on parenting styles. In S. Lau (Ed.), *Growing up the Chinese way - Chinese child and adolescent development* (pp. 93-120). Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press.

Cheung, C.S., & McBride-Chang, C. (2008). Relations of perceived maternal parenting style, practices, and learning motivation to academic competence in Chinese children. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 54*(1), 1-22.

Conger, R.D. & Donnellan, M.B. (2007). An interactionist perspective on the socioeconomic context of human development. *Annual Review of Psychology, 58,* 175-199.

Darlow, V., Norvilitis, J.M., & Schuetze, P. (2017). The relationship between helicopter parenting and adjustment to college. *Journal of Child and Family Studies.* DOI 10.1007/s10826-017-0751-3

Elgar, F. J., Waschbusch, D. A., Dadds, M. R., & Sigvaldason, N. (2007). Development and validation of a short form of the Alabama Parenting Questionnaire. *Journal of Child and Family Studies, 16*(2), 243-259.

Elstad, J.I., & Stefansen, K. (2014). Social variations in perceived parenting styles among Norwegian adolescents. *Child Indicators Research, 7,* 649-670.

Frick, P. J., & Hare, R. D. (2001). *Antisocial Process Screening Device (APSD): Technical manual.* Toronto, Canada: Multi-Health Systems Inc.

Fuligni, A. J., & Pedersen, S. (2002). Family obligation and the transition to young adulthood. *Developmental psychology, 38*(5), 856-868.

Fung, A. L. C., Gao, Y., & Raine, A. (2009). The utility of the child and adolescent psychopathy construct in Hong Kong, China. *Journal of Clinical Child & Adolescent Psychology, 39*(1), 134-140

Gibbs, N. (2009). The growing backlash against overparenting. *Time Magazine, 20*.

Grolnick, W. S., & Farkas, M. (2002). Parenting and the development of children's

self-regulation. In M. H. Bornstein (Ed.), *Handbook of parenting (vol.5)* (pp. 88–110). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Hosley, C.A., & Montemayor, R. (1997). Fathers and adolescents. In M.E. Lamb (Ed.), *The role of the father in child development* (pp. 162-178). New York: John Wiley.

Howe, N., & Strauss, W. (2007). *Helicopter parents in the workplace.* Syndicated Research Project, nGenera.

Kerr, M., & Stattin, H. (2000). What parents know, how they know it, and several forms of adolescent adjustment: Further support for a reinterpretation of monitoring. *Developmental Psychology, 36,* 366-380.

Kwon, K., You, G., & De Gagne, J.C. (2017). Does culture matter? A qualitative inquiry of helicopter parenting in Korean American college students. *Journal of Child and Family Studies.* DOI 10.1007/s10826-017-0694-8

Lam, C. M. (1997). A cultural perspective on the study of Chinese adolescent development. *Child and Adolescent Social Work Journal, 14*(2), 95-113.

Lam, C. M. (2007). *Not grown up forever: A Chinese conception of adolescent development.* New York, NY: Nova Sciences.

Lau, S., & Cheung, P. C. (1987). Relations between Chinese adolescents' perception of parental control and organization and their perception of parental warmth. *Developmental Psychology, 23*(5), 726-729.

LeMoyne, T., & Buchanan, T. (2011). Does “hovering” matter? helicopter parenting and its effect on well-being. *Sociological Spectrum, 31*(4), 399-418.

Leung J.T.Y. (2017). Cultural family beliefs, maternal sacrifice and adolescent psychological competence in Chinese poor single-mother families. *Social Development.* DOI:10.1111/sode.12239

Leung J.T.Y., & Busiol, D. (2016). Adolescents growing up in a “Greenhouse”: A literature

review. *International Journal of Child and Adolescent Health, 9*(4) 413-422.

Leung J.T.Y., & Shek, D.T.L. (2011). "All I can do for my child" --- Development of the Chinese Parental Sacrifice for Child's Education Scale. *International Journal of Disability and Human Development, 10*(3), 201-208.

Leung, J.T.Y., & Shek, D.T.L. (2012). Parental differences in family processes in Chinese families experiencing economic disadvantage. *Géneros. Multidisciplinary Journal of Gender Studies, 1*(3), 242-273.

Leung J.T.Y., & Shek, D.T.L. (2013). Parenting for resilience: Family processes and psychosocial competence of Chinese adolescents experiencing economic disadvantage in Hong Kong. *International Journal of Disability and Human Development, 12*(2), 127-137.

Leung, J.T.Y., Shek, D.T.L., & Ng, L.S.L. (in press). Overparenting from the perspectives of Chinese parents and youths. *International Journal of Child and Adolescent Health*.

Nelson, L. J., & Barry, C. M. (2005). Distinguishing features of emerging adulthood the role of self-classification as an adult. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 20*(2), 242-262.

Padilla-Walker, L. M., & Nelson, L. J. (2012). Black hawk down?: Establishing helicopter parenting as a distinct construct from other forms of parental control during emerging adulthood. *Journal of Adolescence, 35*(5), 1177-1190.

Pettit, G. S., Laird, R. D., Dodge, K. A., Bates, J. E., & Criss, M. M. (2001). Antecedents and behavior-problem outcomes of parental monitoring and psychological control in early adolescence. *Child Development, 72,* 583-598.

Ramey, G., & Ramey, V. A. (2009). *The rug rat race (No. w15284)*. National Bureau of Economic Research, USA.

Reed, K., Duncan, J. M., Lucier-Greer, M., Fixelle, C., & Ferraro, A. J. (2016). Helicopter Parenting and Emerging Adult Self-Efficacy: Implications for Mental and Physical Health. *Journal of Child and Family Studies,* 1-14. DOI 10.1007/s10826-016-0466-x

Reitman, D., Rhode, P. C., Hupp, S. D., & Altobello, C. (2002). Development and validation of the parental authority questionnaire–revised. *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment, 24*(2), 119-127.

Russell, A., Aloa, V., Feder, T., Glover, A., Miller, H., & Palmer, G. (1998). Sex-based differences in parenting styles in a sample with preschool children. *Australian Journal of Psychology, 50*, 89-99.

Schiffrin, H., Liss, M., Miles-McLean, H., Geary, K., Erchull, M., &Tashner, T. (2014). Helping or hovering? The effects of helicopter parenting on college students' well-being. *Journal of Child & Family Studies, 23*(3), 548-557.

Segrin, C., Woszidlo, A., Givertz, M., Bauer, A., & Taylor Murphy, M. (2012). The association between overparenting, parent-child communication, and entitlement and adaptive traits in adult children. *Family Relations, 61*(2), 237-252.

Segrin, C., Woszidlo, A., Givertz, M., & Montgomery, N. (2013). Parent and child traits associated with overparenting. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 32*(6), 569-595.

Shek, D.T.L. (2002a). Parenting characteristics and parent-adolescent conflict: A longitudinal study in the Chinese culture. *Journal of Family Issues, 23*(2), 189-208.

Shek D.T.L. (2002b). The relation of parental qualities to psychological well-being, school adjustment and problem behavior in Chinese adolescents with economic disadvantage. *American Journal of Family Therapy, 30,* 215-230.

Shek, D. T. L. (2004). Chinese cultural beliefs about adversity: Its relationship to psychological well-being, school adjustment and problem behavior in Chinese adolescents with and without economic disadvantage. *Childhood, 11,* 63-80.

Shek, D. T. L. (2006a). Assessment of perceived parental psychological control in Chinese adolescents in Hong Kong. *Research on Social Work Practice, 16,* 382-391.

Shek, D. T. L. (2006b). Chinese family research: Puzzles, progress, paradigms, and policy

implications. *Journal of Family Issues, 27*(3), 275-284.

Shek, D. T. L. (2006c). Perceived parental behavioral control and psychological control in Chinese adolescents in Hong Kong. *American Journal of Family Therapy, 34,* 163-176.

Shek, D.T. L. (2008). Perceived parental control and parent-child relational qualities in early adolescents in Hong Kong: Parent gender, child gender and grade differences. *Sex Roles, 58,* 666-681.

Shek, D.T. L., & Law, M. Y. M. (2014). Parental behavioral control, parental psychological control and parent-child relational qualities: Relationships to Chinese adolescent risk behavior. In D.T.L. Shek, R.C.F. Sun, & C.M.S. Ma (eds.), *Chinese adolescents in Hong Kong: Family life, psychological well-being and risk behavior* (pp. 51-69). Singapore: Springer.

Siegel, A. I., & Pfeiffer, M. G. (1965). Factorial congruence in criterion development. *Personnel Psychology, 18*(3), 267-279.

Smetana, J. G., & Daddis, C. (2002). Domain-specific antecedents of parental psychological control and monitoring: The role of parenting beliefs and practices. *Child Development, 73,* 563-580.

Wang, Q., Pomerantz, E. M., & Chen, H. (2007). The role of parents' control in early adolescents' psychological functioning: A longitudinal investigation in the United States and China. *Child development, 78*(5), 1592-1610.

Wilson, R. W. (1974). *The moral state: A study of the political socialization of Chinese and American children.* New York: Free Press.

Wolchik, S.A., Sandler, I.N., & Braver, S.L. (1987). Social support: Its assessment and relation to children's adjustment. In: N. Eisenberg (ed.). *Contemporary topics in developmental psychology* (pp. 319-349) New York: Wiley.

Yang, K.S. (1981). The formation and change of Chinese personality: a cultural-ecological

perspective. *Acta Psychologica Taiwanica, 23,* 39-55.

Yeh, M.H.,& Yang, K.S.(1997). Chinese familism: conceptual analysis and empirical assessment. *Bulletin of the Institute of Ethnology, Academia Sinica (Taiwan), 83,* 169-225. [in Chinese].

Table 1: Factor loadings of Chinese Paternal Overparenting Scale ($N = 642$)

		Mean	SD	Component							
				1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
CPOS1	Development under father's close monitoring	3.34	1.36	0.20	0.18	0.08	0.01	0.07	**0.71**	0.04	0.22
CPOS2	Report everything to father	2.51	1.20	0.21	0.12	0.09	0.18	0.14	**0.84**	0.04	0.06
CPOS3	Request me to consult father in every decision	2.59	1.16	0.29	0.23	0.19	0.17	0.16	**0.72**	0.01	0.07
CPOS4	Father tracks my whereabouts	2.22	1.15	0.28	0.06	0.04	0.22	0.19	**0.70**	0.11	0.04
CPOS5	Father never gives up if I do not try my best	2.12	1.09	**0.56**	-0.07	0.11	0.34	0.13	0.42	0.01	0.13
CPOS6	Father never allows me find excuse for failure	2.65	1.28	**0.56**	0.11	0.17	0.22	-0.01	0.27	-0.12	0.22
CPOS7	Father ignores me if I fail to meet his requirement	1.85	0.97	**0.58**	-0.07	0.12	0.27	0.25	0.22	0.02	0.06
CPOS8	Father intrudes my plan of future development	2.21	1.15	**0.75**	0.05	0.02	0.27	0.15	0.21	0.06	0.08
CPOS9	Develop under father's meticulous plan	1.80	0.93	**0.76**	0.11	0.05	0.16	0.30	0.17	0.03	0.10
CPOS10	Father expects me follow his direction	1.97	1.08	**0.78**	0.13	-0.02	0.22	0.22	0.16	0.04	0.11
CPOS11	Father makes decisions in my study and work	1.91	1.03	**0.69**	0.16	0.02	0.17	0.32	0.07	0.12	0.16
CPOS12	Father is anxious about my academic performance	3.01	1.39	0.25	0.10	0.14	0.37	-0.05	0.23	0.06	**0.68**
CPOS13	Father tries every effort to raise my academic result	2.26	1.19	0.35	0.19	0.15	0.27	0.20	0.14	0.10	**0.67**
CPOS14	Father frequently consults teachers on my academic progress	1.69	0.91	0.18	0.07	0.20	0.28	0.50	0.15	0.04	**0.51**
CPOS15	Father pays great attention in my examination	1.76	0.98	0.27	0.09	0.21	0.30	0.46	0.18	0.10	**0.51**
CPOS16	My academic report is father's performance report	1.70	0.99	0.24	0.02	0.11	**0.51**	0.45	0.12	0.09	0.34
CPOS17	Father frequently compares peers with me	2.11	1.28	0.19	0.06	0.01	**0.80**	0.20	0.14	0.03	0.22
CPOS18	Father's chats are around my performance in comparisons with peers	1.86	1.10	0.15	0.08	0.08	**0.76**	0.33	0.12	0.06	0.13
CPOS19	Father feels 'lose face' when I perform worse than others	1.93	1.16	0.31	0.05	0.12	**0.79**	0.16	0.10	-0.01	0.02
CPOS20	Father always expects me better than others	2.26	1.17	0.39	0.08	0.10	**0.72**	0.07	0.13	0.01	0.13
CPOS21	Father always tracks whether my performance is better than others	1.99	1.06	0.27	0.17	0.11	**0.71**	0.22	0.13	-0.01	0.13
CPOS22	Father solves problems for me when I meet challenges	3.46	1.37	0.01	**0.71**	0.16	-0.04	-0.05	0.12	0.21	0.04
CPOS23	Father intervenes when he anticipates that I will be in trouble	2.53	1.21	0.11	**0.69**	0.21	0.18	0.18	0.21	0.18	-0.00
CPOS24	Father "mows" away my developmental barriers	2.35	1.17	0.15	**0.72**	0.21	0.18	0.22	0.05	0.18	-0.00
CPOS25	Father tries hard to solve problems for me	2.83	1.36	0.00	**0.76**	0.28	0.05	0.10	0.03	0.16	0.19
CPOS26	Father steps in to reduce my barriers	2.66	1.27	0.11	**0.77**	0.31	0.07	0.13	0.07	0.11	0.10
CPOS27	Father tries every step to protect me from harm	2.85	1.36	0.08	**0.65**	0.32	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.23	-0.05
CPOS28	Father schedules my activities intensively	1.55	0.78	0.26	0.21	0.15	0.22	**0.74**	0.09	0.05	0.08
CPOS29	I live under father's schedule	1.65	0.90	0.30	0.20	0.15	0.19	**0.65**	0.23	0.01	0.02
CPOS30	Father involves much in my routine	2.40	1.21	0.05	**0.46**	0.09	-0.01	0.32	0.25	0.20	0.19
CPOS31	Father does not allow space for me to plan my own activities	1.70	0.86	0.42	0.04	0.09	0.27	**0.54**	0.33	0.03	0.00
CPOS32	Father requires me to attend tutorials or skill-learning classes	1.57	0.85	0.27	0.11	0.13	0.26	**0.70**	0.10	0.09	0.05
CPOS33	Father feels faulty if children fail to build talents	1.75	1.03	0.23	0.21	0.34	0.22	**0.51**	0.05	-0.01	0.09
CPOS34	I draw all my father's attention	2.35	1.22	0.03	0.25	0.21	0.02	0.21	0.05	**0.58**	0.24
CPOS35	Father fulfills whatever I want	3.30	1.44	-0.03	0.38	0.25	-0.08	-0.13	0.07	**0.65**	0.04
CPOS36	I am not surprised if others find that I am indulged by father	2.18	1.29	0.08	0.18	0.24	0.05	0.16	0.06	**0.74**	-0.03

Table 1: Factor loadings of Chinese Paternal Overparenting Scale ($N = 642$) (continued)

		Mean	SD	Component							
				1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
CPOS37	I am father's favorite	3.11	1.51	-0.01	0.33	0.27	-0.03	-0.14	-0.01	**0.72**	0.02
CPOS38	My desire is father's mission of work	2.37	1.21	0.06	0.25	0.45	0.16	0.14	0.03	**0.53**	0.02
CPOS39	My father could not endure when I "fall down"	1.91	0.95	0.20	0.07	**0.54**	0.24	0.28	0.14	0.33	-0.06
CPOS40	Whenever I am in trouble, father feels more stressful than do I	2.51	1.26	0.02	0.28	**0.73**	0.07	0.11	0.08	0.26	0.14
CPOS41	Whenever I fail, father feels sadder than do I	2.40	1.19	0.03	0.25	**0.80**	0.04	0.12	0.07	0.26	0.10
CPOS42	When I "fall down", father feels that he has responsibility	2.45	1.16	0.08	0.28	**0.79**	0.08	0.08	0.06	0.11	0.09
CPOS43	Father gets very upset when I am sad	2.67	1.30	0.02	0.28	**0.75**	0.03	0.05	0.10	0.19	0.10
CPOS44	Father feels guilty for not protecting me from failure	2.26	1.11	0.10	0.30	**0.74**	0.12	0.24	0.09	0.16	0.06
	Eigenvalues	3.34	1.36	15.59	5.95	2.02	1.55	1.49	1.27	1.12	1.09
	Variance explained (%)	2.51	1.20	35.44	13.52	4.60	3.51	3.38	2.88	2.56	2.48
	Total variance (%)										68.36
	Factor 1 (Intrusion of child's life and direction)	1.97	0.84								
	Factor 2 (Anticipatory problem-solving)	2.78	1.04	0.27							
	Factor 3 (Excessive affective involvement)	2.37	0.97	0.28	0.64						
	Factor 4 (Frequent comparisons of child's achievement with peers)	2.03	0.99	0.65	0.27	0.31					
	Factor 5 (Overscheduling of child's activities)	1.64	0.71	0.66	0.43	0.47	0.61				
	Factor 6 (Close monitoring)	2.66	1.02	0.59	0.36	0.34	0.45	0.51			
	Factor 7 (Excessive care)	2.66	1.03	0.16	0.63	0.66	0.16	0.29	0.22		
	Factor 8 (Strong emphasis on academic performance)	2.08	0.89	0.65	0.39	0.44	0.69	0.64	0.52	0.29	
	Overparenting (CPOS)	2.27	0.67	0.71	0.73	0.75	0.70	0.77	0.67	0.63	0.78

Note. Bold and underlined values are the highest loadings obtained by a variable among the factors.

All correlation coefficients are statistically significant ($p < .001$)

Table 2: Factor loadings of Chinese Maternal Overparenting Scale (N = 642)

		Mean	SD	Component							
				1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
CMOS1	Development under mother's close monitoring	3.88	1.23	0.07	0.15	0.21	0.12	0.10	**0.72**	0.16	0.13
CMOS2	Report everything to mother	3.47	1.26	0.18	0.21	0.16	0.15	0.12	**0.82**	-0.01	0.12
CMOS3	Request me to consult mother in every decision	3.29	1.25	0.18	0.21	0.16	0.22	0.21	**0.73**	0.01	0.16
CMOS4	Mother tracks my whereabouts	3.08	1.39	010	0.34	0.15	0.13	0.06	**0.66**	0.12	0.18
CMOS5	Mother never gives up if I do not try my best	2.42	1.23	0.06	**0.48**	0.33	0.12	0.35	0.30	0.01	0.15
CMOS6	Mother never allows me find excuse for failure	2.83	1.36	0.09	**0.37**	0.19	0.06	0.35	0.28	0.05	0.22
CMOS7	Mother ignores me if I fail to meet her requirement	2.10	1.16	0.16	**0.57**	0.29	0.05	0.36	0.15	-0.02	0.08
CMOS8	Mother intrudes my plan of future development	2.58	1.29	0.03	**0.68**	0.37	0.10	0.15	0.29	0.06	0.11
CMOS9	Develop under mother's meticulous plan	2.04	1.06	0.08	**0.76**	0.24	0.15	0.24	0.13	0.05	0.19
CMOS10	Mother expects me follow her direction	2.27	1.23	0.10	**0.77**	0.29	0.12	0.17	0.19	0.02	0.13
CMOS11	Mother makes decisions in my study and work	2.27	1.21	0.03	**0.72**	0.15	0.21	0.13	0.14	0.10	0.27
CMOS12	Mother is anxious about my academic performance	3.73	1.35	0.05	0.15	0.29	0.14	-0.03	0.30	0.16	**0.68**
CMOS13	Mother tries every effort to raise my academic result	2.96	1.34	0.08	0.23	0.21	0.24	0.20	0.23	0.14	**0.68**
CMOS14	Mother frequently consults teachers on my academic progress	2.24	1.20	0.10	0.31	0.20	0.18	0.33	0.04	0.00	**0.56**
CMOS15	Mother pays great attention in my examination	2.57	1.36	0.22	0.26	0.26	0.13	0.30	0.19	0.11	**0.63**
CMOS16	My academic report is mother's performance report	2.36	1.30	0.21	0.33	0.40	0.11	0.20	0.12	0.10	**0.52**
CMOS17	Mother frequently compares peers with me	3.05	1.51	0.08	0.15	**0.81**	0.02	0.14	0.17	0.04	0.24
CMOS18	Mother's chats are around my performance in comparisons with peers	2.82	1.47	0.08	0.14	**0.82**	0.07	0.11	0.17	0.06	0.20
CMOS19	Mother feels 'lose face' when I perform worse than others	2.42	1.30	0.09	0.30	**0.81**	0.09	0.16	0.04	0.01	0.07
CMOS20	Mother always expects me better than others	2.63	1.36	0.06	0.34	**0.74**	0.12	0.17	0.13	0.07	0.12
CMOS21	Mother always tracks whether my performance is better than others	2.60	1.34	0.13	0.28	**0.74**	0.11	0.18	0.18	0.01	0.16
CMOS22	Mother solves problems for me when I meet challenges	3.33	1.33	0.20	0.08	0.06	**0.72**	-0.01	0.17	0.21	0.09
CMOS23	Mother intervenes when she anticipates that I will be in trouble	2.82	1.37	0.33	0.18	0.15	**0.74**	0.08	0.13	0.14	0.10
CMOS24	Mother "mows" away my developmental barriers	2.76	1.16	0.22	0.26	0.12	**0.71**	0.22	0.07	0.23	0.08
CMOS25	Mother tries hard to solve problems for me	3.37	1.30	0.25	0.06	0.05	**0.74**	0.14	0.14	0.20	0.13
CMOS26	Mother steps in to reduce my barriers	3.03	1.29	0.29	0.14	0.06	**0.75**	0.14	0.06	0.19	0.17
CMOS27	Mother tries every step to protect me from harm	3.19	1.38	0.30	0.07	0.08	**0.65**	0.08	0.16	0.32	0.08
CMOS28	Mother schedules my activities intensively	1.97	1.05	0.16	0.35	0.13	0.16	**0.70**	0.07	0.04	0.23
CMOS29	I live under mother's schedule	2.27	1.24	0.10	0.47	0.14	0.21	**0.50**	0.25	0.18	0.10
CMOS30	Mother involves much in my routine	3.40	1.42	0.11	0.07	-0.03	0.36	0.26	0.33	**0.37**	0.15
CMOS31	Mother does not allow space for me to plan my own activities	2.02	1.09	0.05	0.49	0.20	0.03	**0.55**	0.26	-0.01	0.11
CMOS32	Mother requires me to attend tutorials or skill-learning classes	1.91	1.08	0.07	0.26	0.19	0.09	**0.79**	0.09	0.04	0.12
CMOS33	Mother feels faulty if children fail to build talents	2.13	1.24	0.19	0.12	0.22	0.15	**0.67**	0.10	0.12	0.08
CMOS34	I draw all my mother's attention	3.26	1.44	0.28	0.04	0.12	0.23	0.17	0.21	**0.60**	0.19
CMOS35	Mother fulfills whatever I want	3.55	1.39	0.25	-0.04	0.02	0.31	-0.05	0.04	**0.73**	0.09
CMOS36	I am not surprised if others find that I am indulged by mother	2.73	1.47	0.26	0.13	0.08	0.22	0.07	-0.01	**0.72**	-0.01

Table 2: Factor loadings of Chinese Maternal Overparenting Scale (N = 642) (Continued)

		Mean	SD	Component							
				1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
CMOS37	I am mother's favorite	3.61	1.46	0.20	0.01	-0.04	0.21	-0.04	0.08	**0.81**	0.06
CMOS38	My desire is mother's mission of work	2.61	1.33	0.42	0.09	0.09	0.13	0.22	0.00	**0.54**	0.09
CMOS39	My mother could not endure when I "fall down"	2.62	1.27	**0.67**	0.21	0.19	0.16	0.21	0.11	0.27	-0.01
CMOS40	Whenever I am in trouble, mother feels more stressful than do I	3.33	1.37	**0.77**	0.07	0.06	0.24	-0.02	0.15	0.22	0.15
CMOS41	Whenever I fail, mother feels sadder than do I	3.12	1.35	**0.84**	0.08	0.02	0.21	0.02	0.11	0.24	0.13
CMOS42	When I "fall down", mother feels that she has responsibility	3.01	1.31	**0.84**	0.03	0.08	0.25	0.14	0.08	0.11	0.06
CMOS43	Mother gets very upset when I am sad	3.36	1.37	**0.78**	0.01	0.05	0.23	0.06	0.08	0.23	0.04
CMOS44	Mother feels guilty for not protecting me from failure	2.76	1.27	**0.73**	0.08	0.13	0.33	0.20	0.08	0.18	0.06
	Eigenvalues			16.62	5.51	1.92	1.81	1.55	1.32	1.14	0.98
	Variance explained (%)			37.76	12.53	4.36	4.11	3.52	3.01	2.58	2.22
	Total variance (%)										70.09
	Factor 1 (Excessive affective involvement)	3.03	1.14								
	Factor 2 (Intrusion of child's life and direction)	2.28	0.98	0.31							
	Factor 3 (Frequent comparisons of child's achievement with peers)	2.70	1.22	0.29	0.67						
	Factor 4 (Anticipatory problem-solving)	3.08	1.09	0.64	0.42	0.31					
	Factor 5 (Overscheduling of child's activities)	2.06	0.93	0.38	0.73	0.54	0.44				
	Factor 6 (Close monitoring)	3.43	1.09	0.37	0.60	0.47	0.45	0.52			
	Factor 7 (Excessive care)	3.15	1.12	0.62	0.24	0.20	0.62	0.30	0.31		
	Factor 8 (Strong emphasis on academic performance)	2.66	1.03	0.40	0.69	0.64	0.50	0.63	0.58	0.37	
	Overparenting (CMOS)	2.80	0.79	0.71	0.78	0.70	0.77	0.75	0.71	0.64	0.81

Note. Bold and underlined values are the highest loadings obtained by a variable among the factors.
All correlation coefficients are statistically significant ($p < .001$)

Table 3: Coefficient of congruence across CPOS and CMOS, and across two subsamples

	Coefficient of congruence (r_c)		
	Between CPOS and CMOS	Between 2 random subsamples	
		CPOS	CMOS
Chinese Overparenting Scale	0.99	0.99	0.99
1. Close monitoring	0.99	0.99	0.99
2. Intrusion of child's life and direction	0.99	0.94	0.94
3. Strong emphasis on academic performance	0.99	0.99	0.96
4. Frequent comparisons of child's achievement with peers	0.99	0.99	0.98
5. Anticipatory problem-solving	0.99	0.99	0.99
6. Overscheduling of child's activities	0.99	0.99	0.99
7. Excessive care	0.99	0.98	0.99
8. Excessive affective involvement	0.99	0.99	0.99

Table 4: Internal Consistencies of CPOS and CMOS (and the subscales) of the study

	Total				Random 1				Random 2			
	CPOS		CMOS		CPOS		CMOS		CPOS		CMOS	
	α	Inter-item corr.	α	Inter-item corr.	α	Inter-item corr.	α	Inter-item corr.	α	Inter-item corr.	α	Inter-item corr.
Chinese Overparenting Scale	0.95	0.33	0.96	0.36	0.95	0.33	0.96	0.36	0.95	0.34	0.96	0.36
1. Close monitoring	0.85	0.60	0.87	0.63	0.86	0.60	0.89	0.67	0.85	0.60	0.84	0.57
2. Intrusion of child's life and direction	0.89	0.58	0.90	0.57	0.89	0.56	0.91	0.62	0.90	0.60	0.90	0.59
3. Strong emphasis on academic performance	0.86	0.58	0.86	0.56	0.86	0.57	0.88	0.60	0.87	0.59	0.84	0.51
4. Frequent comparisons of child's achievement with peers	0.91	0.67	0.92	0.70	0.91	0.66	0.93	0.72	0.91	0.68	0.91	0.67
5. Anticipatory problem-solving	0.89	0.58	0.91	0.53	0.89	0.57	0.92	0.65	0.89	0.59	0.90	0.61
6. Overscheduling of child's activities	0.86	0.57	0.87	0.58	0.87	0.58	0.98	0.60	0.86	0.56	0.86	0.56
7. Excessive care	0.83	0.49	0.85	0.53	0.82	0.48	0.84	0.52	0.83	0.50	0.86	0.54
8. Excessive affective involvement	0.91	0.63	0.93	0.69	0.91	0.62	0.92	0.70	0.91	0.63	0.96	0.71

	Male				Female				Test				Retest			
	CPOS		CMOS		CPOS		CMOS		CPOS		CMOS		CPOS		CMOS	
	α	Inter-item corr.	α	Inter-item corr.	α	Inter-item corr.	α	Inter-item corr.	α	Inter-item corr.	α	Inter-item corr.	α	Inter-item corr.	α	Inter-item corr.
Chinese Overparenting Scale	0.96	0.36	0.96	0.37	0.95	0.32	0.96	0.36	0.95	0.31	0.97	0.41	0.97	0.46	0.97	0.46
1. Close monitoring	0.85	0.59	0.86	0.61	0.86	0.61	0.87	0.64	0.89	0.68	0.89	0.67	0.84	0.59	0.88	0.65
2. Intrusion of child's life and direction	0.89	0.59	0.89	0.58	0.89	0.58	0.91	0.63	0.88	0.55	0.88	0.55	0.94	0.71	0.93	0.68
3. Strong emphasis on academic performance	0.87	0.59	0.85	0.52	0.86	0.57	0.87	0.58	0.90	0.67	0.89	0.62	0.89	0.63	0.89	0.62
4. Frequent comparisons of child's achievement with peers	0.91	0.68	0.92	0.70	0.90	0.66	0.92	0.69	0.91	0.65	0.92	0.70	0.90	0.63	0.94	0.74
5. Anticipatory problem-solving	0.88	0.57	0.92	0.66	0.89	0.59	0.90	0.61	0.89	0.58	0.93	0.69	0.90	0.60	0.93	0.70
6. Overscheduling of child's activities	0.88	0.60	0.87	0.58	0.85	0.55	0.87	0.58	0.88	0.62	0.91	0.66	0.92	0.70	0.92	0.69
7. Excessive care	0.82	0.48	0.86	0.56	0.83	0.50	0.83	0.50	0.81	0.45	0.88	0.58	0.89	0.62	0.92	0.69
8. Excessive affective involvement	0.91	0.62	0.93	0.68	0.91	0.63	0.93	0.69	0.91	0.62	0.93	0.69	0.94	0.71	0.94	0.74

Note. α = Cronbach's alpha value, inter-item corr = inter-item correlation coefficients

Table 5: Correlation coefficient between Chinese Paternal/Maternal Overparenting Scale (and the subscales) and other parenting measures.

	Paternal Behavioral Control (PCON)	Paternal Psychological Control (PPSY)	Paternal Support (PSUPP)
Paternal overparenting (CPOS)	0.53***	0.49***	0.26***
1. Close monitoring	0.43***	0.44***	0.11**
2. Intrusion of child's life and direction	0.23***	0.62***	-0.10*
3. Strong emphasis on academic performance	0.38***	0.44***	0.07
4. Frequent comparisons of child's achievement with peers	0.21***	0.53***	-0.12**
5. Anticipatory problem-solving	0.53***	0.17***	0.51***
6. Overscheduling of child's activities	0.32***	0.48***	0.04
7. Excessive care	0.40***	0.06	0.43***
8. Excessive affective involvement	0.48***	0.20***	0.39***
	Maternal Behavioral Control (MCON)	**Maternal Psychological Control (MPSY)**	**Maternal Support (MSUPP)**
Maternal overparenting (CMOS)	0.39***	0.54***	0.14***
1. Close monitoring	0.35***	0.44***	0.03
2. Intrusion of child's life and direction	0.21***	0.66***	-0.14***
3. Strong emphasis on academic performance	0.30***	0.42***	-0.00
4. Frequent comparisons of child's achievement with peers	0.16***	0.55***	-0.18***
5. Anticipatory problem-solving	0.36***	0.28***	0.36***
6. Overscheduling of child's activities	0.27***	0.55***	-0.07
7. Excessive care	0.32***	0.12**	0.38***
8. Excessive affective involvement	0.33***	0.26***	0.33***

*$p < .05$, **$p < .01$, ***$p < .001$

.