



Parenting Style and Bullying and Victimization: Comparing Foreign-Born Asian, U.S.-Born Asian, and White American Adolescents

Jun Sung Hong¹ · Dong Ha Kim² · Ellen W. deLara³ · Hsi-Sheng Wei⁴ · Anh Prisner¹ · Nicholas Benjamin Alexander¹

Published online: 1 July 2020

© Springer Science+Business Media, LLC, part of Springer Nature 2020

Abstract

The purpose of the study is to explore whether the association between types of parenting styles and bullying and victimization are similar across White American, U.S.-born Asian, and foreign-born Asian adolescents. Authoritative parenting, which is characterized as being supportive and showing acceptance, is positively related to psychological well-being among White American youth. However, due to different cultural norms in parenting style, Asian parents whose parenting style appears to be controlling and lacking in warmth might differentially affect their children's behavior and socialization in school. Sample was drawn from the 2009–2010 Health Behavior in School-Aged Children (HBSC) U.S. study. The most recent data were collected in the United States from 2009 to 2010. HBSC consisted of adolescents, aged 11, 13, and 15 years. The sample for the present study includes 1438 adolescents who identified as White American, U.S.-born Asian, or foreign-born Asian. Univariate analyses, bivariate analyses, and multiple linear regression analyses were conducted. The regression analysis was conducted separately for bullying victimization and perpetration across foreign-born Asians, U.S.-born Asians, and White Americans. Among foreign-born Asians, mother's non-involvement was positively associated with bullying victimization. Among U.S.-born Asians, father's non-involvement was found to be positively associated with bullying victimization, and authoritarian parenting was positively associated with perpetration. Among White Americans, both authoritative parenting and mother's non-involvement were positively related to bullying perpetration. This study highlights the importance of understanding the association between types of parenting styles and adolescent bullying and victimization.

Keywords Bullying · Parenting style · Race/ethnicity · Victimization · Youth violence

Bullying remains a serious social concern. According to the U.S. Department of Justice, in 2017, about 20% of U.S. students (ages 12–18) reported being bullied at school (Musu

et al. 2019). Of these students, 23% of White Americans and 7% of Asians were victimized in their school (Musu et al. 2019). Although it appears that Asian students have a lower

Jun Sung Hong and Dong Ha Kim contributed equally and are both co-first authors. The authors wish to express their deepest gratitude to the three anonymous reviewers for their extremely helpful suggestions, which significantly enhanced the quality of this article.

✉ Jun Sung Hong
fl4684@wayne.edu

✉ Dong Ha Kim
dhkim@chungwoon.ac.kr

Ellen W. deLara
edelara@syr.edu

Hsi-Sheng Wei
hswei@mail.ntpu.edu.tw

Anh Prisner
anh.nguyen3@wayne.edu

Nicholas Benjamin Alexander
fv5403@wayne.edu

- ¹ School of Social Work, Wayne State University, 5447 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, MI 48202, USA
- ² Department of Social Welfare, Chungwoon University, Hongseong, Chungnam 32244, South Korea
- ³ Falk College, School of Social Work, Syracuse University, 440 White Hall, Syracuse, NY 13244, USA
- ⁴ Department of Social Work, National Taipei University, 151 University Rd., San Shia District, New Taipei City 237, Taiwan

likelihood of being bullied, research suggests that Asians, particularly Asian immigrants, are vulnerable to bullying in their school due to minority status, “Model Minority” stereotypes (e.g., being perceived as smart, industrious, docile, and conformist), language barriers, physical appearance, and racism (Cooc and Gee 2014; Koo et al. 2012; Qin et al. 2008; Schumann et al. 2013). Research has also shown that White American youth are significantly at risk of experiencing bullying (Fisher et al. 2015; Connell et al. 2015; Schumann et al. 2013).

Scholars have explored several antecedents of bullying and victimization (e.g., Bowes et al. 2009; Mishna et al. 2012). However, antecedents, processes, and outcomes for perpetrators differ from victims due to divergent developmental pathways. Aspects of dissimilarity in development include factors related to the individual, parenting/caregiving, family structure, peer interactions, and environment (Arseneault et al. 2010; Rodkin et al. 2015). Family characteristics, such as parenting, appear to be influential in children’s bullying involvement. Parenting style can play a critical role in shaping children’s behavior, as the mode of communication and discipline, and the extent to which the child is permitted to negotiate within the boundaries of parent-child relations considerably influence a child’s development and behavior (Kokkinos et al. 2016; Wilmshurst 2008). Parents also play a pivotal role in the development of their children’s peer relations and socialization through both direct (e.g., assisting children to develop socialization skills) and indirect (e.g., parenting behaviors and modeling) pathways (Holt et al. 2009). It is therefore likely that parenting style has particular relevance to children’s bullying involvement (Holt et al. 2009; Kokkinos 2013), as research has repeatedly found that children’s bullying behavior is related to parenting practices. Bullies are likely to come from distant and disengaged parents who use harsh parenting techniques. As a result, bullies tend to develop negative relationships with parents and siblings and emulate parental aggression (Smith and Myron-Wilson 1998). Further studies find that bullies may display moral competence and lack moral engagement and moral compassion that could direct appropriate behavior (Gini et al. 2011; Perren et al. 2012). From an ethological perspective, bullying is adaptive for the perpetrator and supports specific dominance goals (Volk et al. 2012). On the other hand, victims show a more placid temperament than bullies along with experiencing overprotectiveness and enmeshment by family (Smith and Myron-Wilson 1998). Hostility by a parent may result in victimization as children become habituated to it, expect it, and this leads to internalizing behavior. Victims display higher levels of insecure attachment compared to bullies (Koiv 2012) and also lack emotion regulation skills and interactional problem-solving strategies (Mahady Wilton et al. 2000).

Numerous theories support the association between parenting and adolescents’ bullying behavior and experiences in bullying victimization among adolescents of varying ages. For instance, attachment theory places importance on the emotional bond between the child and the caregiver (Bowlby 1969). Attachment theorists might argue that adolescents, particularly middle school students whose parents were uninvolved or emotionally distant can contribute to bullying and victimization, as they might have difficulty in relating to others in school (Eliot and Cornell 2009). Family systems theory, on the other hand, might perceive adolescents’ bullying perpetration and victimization as by-products of dysfunction in the family. At age fifteen, adolescents start to seek a balance between autonomy and connectedness to their families. Both cohesion (supportive family interactions) and enmeshment (controlling patterns that derail another family member’s autonomy) are important elements of family systems theory (Barber and Buehler 1996). Adolescents in enmeshed relationships where their parent inhibits their sense of autonomy are at an increased risk for social anxiety and difficulty in socialization (Barber and Buehler 1996), and consequently, they might get involved in bullying.

However, children’s behaviors have shown to vary depending on the parenting style of their caregivers (Chao 1994) and on the cultural and social contexts in which it occurs (Chao 2000; Mandara and Murray 2002). It is also uncertain whether the association between parenting and bullying might be similar across different racial and ethnic groups. According to Sorkhabi and Mandara (2013), it is unclear whether the typology of parenting styles accurately describe non-White American styles of parenting practices (Sorkhabi and Mandara 2013). The present study aims to compare the difference in the relevance of parenting style in bullying involvement of White American, foreign-born Asian, and U.S.-born Asian adolescents.

Although Asian Americans are one of the fastest-growing ethnic groups in the United States and primarily consist of foreign-born immigrants, intra-ethnic group (e.g., foreign-born and U.S.-born Asians) differences in parenting style are vast (Mau 1997). A growing body of research has examined the association between parenting style and adolescent bullying involvement as well as bullying and victimization of Asian American adolescents. However, the relationship between parenting styles and adolescent development of U.S.-born Asian Americans may be distinct from that of foreign-born adolescents in that the former represents a distinct bicultural group (Kim et al. 2014). Also, because U.S.-born Asian American adolescents did not experience the immigration process, they have not gone through the post-migratory acculturation process as their foreign-born peers had (Kim et al. 2014) and often experience intergenerational cultural dissonance. Intergenerational cultural dissonance (i.e., a conflict between parents and children over cultural differences) is a serious

issue among Asian American adolescents, particularly U.S.-born Asians. Research documents that intergenerational cultural dissonance is correlated with behavioral problems in Asian American adolescents (Choi et al. 2008). However, U.S.-born adolescents from immigrant families may not be as familiar with the parenting style of their immigrant parents and are desirous of the mainstream U.S. norms of emotional expressiveness and open style of communication (Pyke 2000). As a result, unlike foreign-born Asians, U.S.-born Asians who perceive their immigrant parents as authoritarian (e.g., being emotionally distant) might develop behavioral problems, such as bullying due to intergenerational cultural dissonance.

For foreign-born Asians who tend to be more familiar with the cultural values of their country-of-origin, the parenting style of their parents, which is guided by their cultural value orientation and socialization goals (Darling and Steinberg 1993), may produce different outcomes. Chinese parenting, for example, is characterized by the Chinese cultural value of *guan* (“training”), which involves a high degree of guidance and monitoring of children’s behaviors (Chao 1994, 2000). *Guan* goes hand-in-hand with some aspects of authoritarianism, such as obedience, directiveness, and a standard of conduct (Chao 1994, 2000). Moreover, adherence to collectivism, conformity to norms, emotional self-control, and humility are reportedly linked to higher use of authoritarian parenting among Asian mothers (Xu et al. 2005).

Despite the distinctions among the racial and ethnic groups, research, to our knowledge, has not considered possible intra-ethnic group differences in the parenting style of Asian parents and how they might be linked to children’s bullying and victimization. Therefore, we compare the association between types of parenting styles and bullying perpetration and victimization among White American, foreign-born Asian, and U.S.-born Asian adolescents.

Typology of Parenting Style and Child Bullying and Victimization

According to Diana Baumrind’s earlier observations, children display different types of behaviors based on their caregivers’ parenting style, which was categorized as authoritarian, authoritative, uninvolved or neglectful, and permissive (Baumrind 1991).

Authoritarian Parenting

The research literature also shows a connection between how caregivers parent their children and whether children become victims and perpetrators of bullying. *Authoritarian* parents have high expectations and standards, but are likely to employ strict disciplinary techniques and are not responsive to their children’s needs (Chao 1994). A large body of research has

documented a positive association between the authoritarian style of parenting and bullying by children (Baldry and Farrington 2000; Georgiou et al. 2013; Gomez-Ortiz et al. 2016; Martinez et al. 2019). Findings from Gomez-Ortiz et al.’s (2016) study showed, for example, that among Spanish high school students, a non-democratic parenting style, characterized as physically punitive (authoritarian) was related to an increased risk of bullying involvement. Results from Gomez-Ortiz et al.’s (2016) study also confirmed that the authoritarian style of parenting which is characterized by parental psychological aggression and physical punishment was correlated with adolescents’ bullying and victimization. Interestingly, Baldry and Farrington (2000) found from a sample of Italian middle school students that youth identified as bullies had authoritarian parenting whereas those who were victims tended to have uninvolved parents.

Authoritative Parenting

Baumrind theorized that parents who are characterized as *authoritative* have high expectations for their children, but, at the same time, are also understanding and responsive to their needs (Darling and Steinberg 1993). The authoritative style of parenting has been documented as being negatively associated with bullying and victimization (Baldry and Farrington 2005; Georgiou 2008; Lee and Wong 2009; Wang et al. 2009). From a sample of 337 Greek Cypriot children, Georgiou (2008) reported that maternal responsiveness predicted a lower score on bullying behavior whereas children with permissive mothers had the highest mean score in victimization. Another study in Hong Kong highlighted that authoritarian parenting was positively associated with child bullying behavior among students in Hong Kong whereas authoritative parenting, which was defined as enhancing communication, had negative effects on bullying (Lee and Wong 2009). Also, a meta-analytic review of research concluded that authoritative parenting characterized as having communication between parent and child, warmth, and affection, parental involvement and support, and parental supervision were protective against bullying victimization (Lereya et al. 2013).

Permissive Parenting

Permissive parents tend to have very few rules and boundaries and are less likely to discipline children for behavioral infractions although they display warmth (Darling and Steinberg 1993). Some authors postulate that children whose parents are characterized as being permissive are at an elevated risk of bullying and victimization (Dehue et al. 2012; Georgiou 2008; Luk et al. 2016). For instance, Dehue et al.’s (2012) findings from a sample of elementary and middle school students in the Netherlands indicated that adolescents with permissive parents reported having engaged in bullying more

frequently than those with authoritarian and authoritative parents. Similarly, Luk et al.'s (2016) study, which explored the association between bullying and substance use in a 646 U.S. university student sample (58.2% White American and 11.1% Asian), found that having a permissive mother was positively linked to bullying, which was also linked to increased alcohol use. Other researchers also showed that permissive parental behavior is predictive of child bullying victimization whereas authoritarian parenting is correlated with bullying perpetration (Baldry and Farrington 2000; Kaufmann et al. 2000). Scholars propose that parents of bullies rarely monitor or supervise their child very closely or set limits concerning their child's bullying involvement (Batsche and Knoff 1994).

Uninvolved or Neglectful Parenting

Uninvolved or neglectful parents have no real set of boundaries or standards. They tend to be unresponsive to their children's needs and are not involved in their children's lives (Darling and Steinberg 1993). Parental non-involvement can significantly impact child bullying behavior, as indicated in several studies, which comprised a White-majority sample (Christie-Mizell et al. 2011; Flouri and Buchanan 2003). According to one study, which comprised 10 to 14-year-old White American, African American, and Hispanic samples, when adolescents perceive that their fathers do not spend enough time with them, their bullying behavior increased (Christie-Mizell et al. 2011). Concerning bullying victimization, research findings appear to be inconsistent. In a nationally representative sample of White American, African American, and Hispanic 6th–10th grade students, Nansel et al. (2001) reported that parents of victims of bullying tend to be overly involved in their child's school. While parental involvement reflects concerns parents have about their children's socialization, it may also reflect that parental overinvolvement can result in children becoming less independent, potentially leaving them more vulnerable to becoming a target of bullies (Nansel et al. 2001). Jeynes' (2008) study, on the other hand, which included White American, Asian American, African American, and Hispanic college students and 7th–12th grade students, found that parental involvement in children's schooling is related to a lower incidence of bullying victimization.

Parenting Styles of White and Asian Caregivers in the United States

Cultural values can shape parenting styles and practices, which in turn influence child outcomes (Chao and Tseng 2002; Kim and Wong 2002). Cultural variations in parenting have been documented extensively in research studies (Chao 2000; Cheah and Rubin 2003; Chen et al. 2001). Research

shows that for White Americans, a parenting style that is most related to adolescent psychological well-being is authoritative parenting, which consists of support (e.g., praising) and moderate control (setting clear expectations). In general, adolescents with authoritative parents reportedly engage in fewer problematic behaviors, are less likely to turn to risky behavior, and show a higher level of social competence (e.g., Bahr and Hoffmann 2010; Pezzella et al. 2016).

The parenting style of Asian Americans is typically characterized as authoritarian in which parents exert strict control and are often less expressive in showing affection (Huntsinger et al. 2001). In the United States, authoritarian style parenting practice is negatively perceived as it is reported to contribute to child psychosocial problems, especially among White Americans (e.g., Deater-Deckard et al. 2005; Hovee et al. 2009; Thompson et al. 2003). However, findings on the association between authoritarian parenting style and child outcomes among Asians appear to be inconsistent. Authoritarian parenting predicted satisfaction with the parent-child relationship in native Chinese children in one study (Quoss and Zhao 1995) and adolescents' health and life satisfaction among ethnic Chinese young adults in another study (Stewart et al. 1998). It was also negatively related to child aggression in Ho et al.' (2008) findings. Ho et al. (2008) showed a negative relationship between harsh parenting and child aggression in South Asian Canadian households whereas for White Canadian households, there was a positive relationship. On the other hand, research documented that authoritarian parenting is predictive of depression, low self-esteem, aggressive behavior, and diminished academic performances of Asian adolescents, including native Chinese (Chang et al. 2003), U.S.-born Chinese American (Kim et al. 2013) and foreign-born Vietnamese adolescents (Nguyen 2008).

The Present Study

The present study aims to compare the relationship between four types of parenting styles (authoritarian, permissive, uninvolved, and authoritative) and bullying perpetration and victimization of foreign-born Asians, U.S.-born Asians, and White Americans. It is hypothesized that (a) authoritarian style of parenting will be positively associated with bullying and victimization among White Americans; (b) On the contrary, authoritarian parenting style will be negatively associated with bullying and victimization among foreign-born Asians; (c) both permissive and uninvolved parenting styles will be positively associated with both bullying and victimization among White Americans; (d) Authoritative parenting will be negatively associated with bullying and victimization for U.S.-born Asians and White Americans.

Method

Sample and Data

Data for the present study were derived from the 2009–2010 Health Behavior in School-Aged Children (HBSC) U.S. study. The most recent data in the United States were collected from 2009 to 2010. HBSC is a standardized, international World Health Organization study, which comprises repeated cross-sectional surveys in the 43 participating countries through school-based surveys using random sampling to select a proportion of adolescents, aged 11, 13, and 15 years (Currie et al., 2012). Sample for the present study consists of 1438 adolescents (40.9% male; 49.1% female) who responded “Asian” and “White” to the question in the survey, “What do you consider your race to be?” Two categories, “foreign-born Asian” and “U.S.-born Asian” were also created. “Foreign-born Asian” were youth who respond “no” to the question, “Were you born in the United States?” whereas “U.S.-born Asian” were those who responded “yes” to the question. The school-based survey includes a self-reported questionnaire, which was completed by students in the classroom in public school districts and comprises a range of health indicators and health-related behaviors, in addition to the life circumstances of the students (Roberts et al., 2009). Questions include socio-demographics, social background, social context, health outcomes, health behaviors, and risk behaviors (Roberts et al., 2009).

Measures

Bullying victimization was measured with four items, which included, “How often have you been bullied at school in the past couple of months?”; “How often have you been bullied at school in the past couple of months in the ways listed below? (a) I was called mean names, was made fun of, or teased in a hurtful way; (b) Other students left me out of things on purpose, excluded me from their group of friends, or completely ignored me; and (c) I was hit, kicked, pushed, shoved around, or locked indoors.” Response options for the first item are 0 = I haven’t been bullied at school the past couple of months, 1 = It has only happened once or twice, 2 = 2 or 3 times a month, 3 = About once a week, and 4 = Several times a week. For the remaining items, the response options are 0 = I have not been bullied in this way in the past couple of months, 1 = Only once or twice, 2 = 2 or 3 times a month, 3 = About once a week, and 4 = Several times a week. The Cronbach’s alpha was .80.

Bullying perpetration was measured with four items, which included, “How often have you taken part in bullying another student(s) at school in the past couple of months?”; “How often have you bullied another student(s) at school in the past couple of months in the ways listed below? (a) I called another student(s) mean names, and made fun of, or teased him or her

in a hurtful way; (b) I kept another student(s) out of things on purpose, excluded him or her from my group of friends, or completely ignored him or her; and (c) I hit, kicked, pushed, shoved around, or locked another student(s) indoors”. Response options for the first item are 0 = I haven’t bullied another student(s) at school in the past couple of months, 1 = It has only happened once or twice, 2 = 2 or 3 times a month, and 3 = About once a week, and 4 = Several times a week. For the remaining items, the response options are 0 = I have not bullied another student in this way in the past couple of months, 1 = Only once or twice, 2 = 2 or 3 times a month, 3 = About once a week, and 4 = Several times a week. The Cronbach’s alpha was .81.

Authoritarian parenting was measured with one item from the Parental Bonding Inventory-Brief Current form (PBI-BC)(Klimidis et al. 1992): “My parent/guardian...“Tries to control everything I do.” Response options range from 0 = Don’t have or don’t see parent/guardian, 1 = Almost never, 2 = Sometimes, and 3 = Almost always.

Permissive parenting was measured with two items from the PBI-BC(Klimidis et al. 1992): “My parent/guardian... (a) lets me do the things I like to do and (b) likes me to make my own decision.” Response options range from 0 = Don’t have or don’t see parent/guardian, 1 = Almost never, 2 = Sometimes, and 3 = Almost always. The Cronbach’s alpha was .66.

Mother’s non-involvement was measured with five items, which were derived from the instruments designed by Brown et al. (1993): “How much does your mother (or female guardian) really know about....? (a) Who your friends are, (b) How you spend money, (c) Where you are after school, (d) Where you go at night, and (e) What you do with free time.” Response options range from 0 = Don’t have/see mother/guardian, 1 = She doesn’t know anything, 2 = She knows a little, and 3 = She knows a lot. The Cronbach’s alpha was .79.

Father’s non-involvement was measured with five items, which were also derived from the instruments designed by Brown et al. (1993): “How much does your father (or male guardian) really know about....? (a) Who your friends are, (b) How you spend money, (c) Where you are after school, (d) Where you go at night, and (e) What you do with free time.” Response options range from 0 = Don’t have/see father/guardian, 1 = He doesn’t know anything, 2 = He knows a little, and 3 = He knows a lot. The Cronbach’s alpha was .86.

Authoritative parenting was measured with three items from the PBI-BC(Klimidis et al. 1992): “My parent/guardian: (a) helps me as much as I need, (b) understands my problems and worries, and (c) makes me feel better when upset.” Response options range from 0 = Don’t have or don’t see parent/guardian, 1 = Almost never, 2 = Sometimes, and 3 = Almost always. The Cronbach’s alpha was .80.

Covariates for the study included *biological sex* (“Are you a boy or a girl?; 1 = boy, 0 = girl), *grade* (“What grade are you

in?"; 5 = grade 5 to 10 = grade 10) and *family socioeconomic status (SES)*; "How well off do you think your family is?"; 0 = Not well off, 1 = well off).

Analytic Techniques

Univariate analyses were conducted to describe the overall sample. Next, bivariate analyses were computed to examine the relationships among all study variables. Finally, to examine the relationship between parenting styles and bullying, multiple linear regression analyses were conducted separately for bullying victimization and bullying perpetration across foreign-born Asians ($n = 165$), U.S.-born Asians ($n = 497$), and White Americans ($n = 776$).

All of the variables had less than 10% of missing data, except for permissive parenting and authoritative parenting variables, which showed approximately 35%. Expectation-Maximization algorithm and Little's (1988) equation were considered to determine the patterns of missingness. There were no patterns in missingness that were considered to be missing completely at random. We used full information maximum likelihood procedures (FIML) to handle missing data. FIML has been evaluated as being the most efficient and least biased method even when data are not missing at random or completely at random (Little and Rubin 2014). Because the data also contain nonnormally distributed variables such as bullying perpetration (skewness = 2.86, kurtosis = 9.474), we also used the robust maximum likelihood estimator, which does not require the assumption of normality and provides mean- and variance-adjusted chi-square test statistics and corrected standard errors (Muthén & Muthén, 2012).

Table 1 Descriptive statistics of the sample ($N = 1438$)

Variable	$N(\%)$	$M(SD)$
Grade (range 5–10)		7.42(1.61)
Sex		
Boy	8039(50.9)	
Girl	7758(49.1)	
Family SES (poor)	172(12.3)	
Bullying victimization (range 0–16)		1.92(3.17)
Bullying perpetration (range 0–16)		1.26(2.51)
Authoritarian parenting (range 0–2)		0.83(0.80)
Permissive parenting (range 0–4)		2.45(1.22)
Mother's non-involvement (range 0–10)		1.97(2.22)
Father's non-involvement (range 0–10)		3.21(2.97)
Authoritative parenting (range 0–6)		3.74(1.89)

Results

The socio-demographic characteristics of the study participants are shown in Table 1. Of the 1438 adolescents, 40.9% were male and 49.1% were female, and the mean grade was 7.42 ($SD = 1.61$, range 5–10). Approximately 12% self-reported that their family is not well off.

The mean for the bullying victimization was 1.92 ($SD = 3.17$, range 0–16) and the bullying perpetration was 1.26 ($SD = 2.51$, range 0–16). The participants reported mean scores of 0.83 ($SD = 0.80$, range 0–2) for authoritarian parenting, 2.45 ($SD = 1.22$, range 0–4) for permissive parenting, 1.97 ($SD = 2.22$, range 0–10) for mother's non-involvement, 3.21 ($SD = 2.97$, range 0–10) for father's non-involvement, and 3.74 ($SD = 1.89$, range 0–6) for authoritative parenting.

Correlation analyses among the study variables are displayed in Table 2, which indicated that most of them were significantly related to one another as anticipated. We also calculated the tolerance and VIF for each independent variable in the model. All variables indicated a value of less than 10, implying little concern over multicollinearity.

Multiple Regression Models for Bullying Victimization and Perpetration

Table 3 displays results from the multiple regression analyses, which were utilized to identify the effect of parenting styles on bullying victimization and perpetration across foreign-born Asians, U.S.-born Asians, and White Americans.

Regarding victimization, we found that mother's non-involvement was positively associated with bullying victimization for foreign-born Asians ($B = .299$, $p = .042$), and father's non-involvement was positively associated with bullying victimization for U.S.-born Asians ($B = .164$, $p = .048$) after controlling for sex, grade, and family SES. Contrary to our third hypothesis, none of these variables were significant for White Americans.

Regarding perpetration, authoritarian parenting was positively associated with bullying perpetration for U.S.-born Asians ($B = .239$, $p = .036$) after controlling for all covariates. This finding was inconsistent with the first hypothesis. Mother's non-involvement ($B = .515$, $p = .000$) and authoritative parenting ($B = .144$, $p = .038$) were positively associated with bullying perpetration for White Americans, contrary to the third and fourth hypotheses.

Discussion

The present study aimed to examine the association between four types of parenting styles (authoritarian, permissive, uninvolved, and authoritative) and bullying perpetration and victimization of foreign-born Asians, U.S.-

Table 2 Bivariate correlations of the study variables by group ($N = 1438$)

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Foreign-born Asian ($n = 165$)							
1. Bullying victimization	1						
2. Bullying perpetration	.424***	1					
3. Authoritarian parenting	.060	-.049	1				
4. Permissive parenting	-.059	.014	-.467***	1			
5. Mother’s non-involvement	.152*	.065	.319**	-.179	1		
6. Father’s non-involvement	-.009	.079	.259**	-.264**	.559***	1	
7. Authoritative parenting	-.129	-.032	-.265**	.576***	-.392	-.451***	1
U.S.-born Asian ($n = 497$)							
1. Bullying victimization	1						
2. Bullying perpetration	.207***	1					
3. Authoritarian parenting	.051	.145*	1				
4. Permissive parenting	-.048	-.059	-.455***	1			
5. Mother’s non-involvement	.087	.059	.164***	-.269***	1		
6. Father’s non-involvement	.114*	.089	.154**	-.222**	.501***	1	
7. Authoritative parenting	-.176	-.095	-.286***	.541***	-.465	-.387***	1
White American ($n = 776$)							
1. Bullying victimization	1						
2. Bullying perpetration	.279***	1					
3. Authoritarian parenting	.138*	.073	1				
4. Permissive parenting	-.054	-.060	-.415***	1			
5. Mother’s non-involvement	.099	.284**	.221***	-.317***	1		
6. Father’s non-involvement	.072	.028	.158**	-.186**	.472***	1	
7. Authoritative parenting	-.138	-.106**	-.257***	.542***	-.524	-.361***	1

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

born Asians, and White Americans. Bullying is commonly linked to maladaptive or inadequate parenting—a notion supported by several research and theories, such as social learning theory, attachment theory, and family

systems theory. However, the association between the types of parenting styles and bullying and victimization are complex and may be influenced by socio-cultural contexts.

Table 3 Multiple regression models for bullying victimization and perpetration

Variable	Victimization						Perpetration					
	Foreign-born Asian ($n = 165$)		U.S.-born Asian ($n = 497$)		White American ($n = 776$)		Foreign-born Asian ($n = 165$)		U.S.-born Asian ($n = 497$)		White American ($n = 776$)	
	<i>B</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>p</i>
Authoritarian parenting	.014	.877	-.008	.914	.059	.310	-.067	.294	.239	.036*	.015	.756
Permissive parenting	.078	.559	.010	.909	-.051	.578	.065	.558	.102	.203	-.006	.930
Mother’s non-involvement	.299	.042*	-.064	.443	.068	.690	.026	.831	.115	.521	.515	.000***
Father’s non-involvement	-.098	.394	.164	.048*	.034	.665	.079	.379	.025	.801	-.084	.143
Authoritative parenting	-.029	.814	-.036	.716	-.141	.100	.024	.795	-.022	.755	.144	.038*

Controlled for sex, grade, and family SES

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .00$

In terms of the association of parenting styles with bullying victimization, we found that the mother's non-involvement was positively associated with bullying victimization among foreign-born Asians. Also, the father's non-involvement was related to bullying victimization among U.S.-born Asians, but not among foreign-born Asians and White Americans. These findings appear to be somewhat inconsistent with the research hypothesis and Nansel et al.'s (2001) study, which found that youth who were victimized had parents who were overly involved. But they were consistent with Jeynes' (2008) findings, which suggest that parental involvement can decrease youths' risk of bullying victimization. In this study, parental involvement was measured by whether mothers or fathers know their adolescent child's activities and socialization. For both foreign-born and U.S.-born Asians, parental involvement appears to be very significant. Less parental involvement during adolescence is believed to be normative and is a prerequisite for healthy autonomous functioning in the United States (see McElhaney et al. 2009). For both foreign-born and U.S.-born Asians in the study sample, however, parental involvement of both fathers and mothers appears to be very important during adolescence, as Asian families have long placed a strong emphasis on family interdependence (Chao and Tseng 2002; Kim and Wong 2002). Further, Asians whose parents are uninvolved are likely to be deprived of socialization in the home, resulting in a lack of social skills. Due to a lack of parental social support and social skills, Asian adolescents may struggle with forming relationships and socializing with others, which likely increases their vulnerability to victimization. To our surprise, parental non-involvement was not significantly associated with bullying perpetration among both Asian groups, which is inconsistent with past research (Flouri and Buchanan 2003). However, this lack of significant findings can be due to the importance placed on non-assertiveness and self-restraint in Asian cultures (Kim and Wong 2002). Consequently, these adolescents are less likely to display "acting out" behaviors (e.g., bullying).

Our results also revealed a positive association between the authoritarian style of parenting and bullying perpetration for U.S.-born Asians but not for foreign-born Asians and White Americans. These results were inconsistent with the hypothesis but consistent with other research findings (Chang et al. 2003). U.S.-born Asians whose parents are authoritarian and controlling might be at a higher risk of bullying relative to foreign-born Asians and White Americans perhaps due to incongruous cultural values between the country-of-origin and the host (U.S.) culture, which might result in intergenerational cultural dissonance.

Authoritative parenting was significantly and positively related to bullying perpetration in the White American sample, which was contrary to the hypothesis and previous findings. Several research findings indicated an inverse association between authoritative parenting and bullying (Baldry and

Farrington 2005; Georgiou 2008; Lee and Wong 2009; Wang et al. 2009). Some studies also reported positive outcomes of White Americans (e.g., Pinquart & Kauser, 2018) and Asian (e.g., Chao 2000) adolescents whose parents employ an authoritative style of parenting practice. However, some scholars also questioned whether authoritative parenting indeed results in a better psychosocial adjustment in adolescents (e.g., Eamon, 2002). In certain situations, establishing a high level of parental control by demanding obedience and granting less autonomy might better protect adolescents from engaging in misbehaviors than an authoritative style of parenting. One study (Eamon, 2002) found that when risks in the neighborhood are high, authoritarian, rather than authoritative parenting strategies, resulted in a lower level of antisocial behavior in adolescents. Based on the present study finding, exploring under what context authoritative parenting strategies might result in bullying is warranted.

A positive association between mother's non-involvement and bullying perpetration was also found among White Americans, which was in line with the proposed hypothesis and extant research (Christie-Mizell et al. 2011; Flouri and Buchanan 2003). Adolescence is a period in which friends and peer groups are an important source of support (Bollmer et al. 2005). However, scholars have also recognized the critical roles that parents, especially mothers, continue to play in an adolescent's behavior and socialization (e.g., Laird et al. 2008; Miller-Slough and Dunsmore 2016). For White Americans in the study, having a mother who is unaware of their socialization and activities outside the home can increase their likelihood of bullying others, which is not surprising as mothers typically assume a caregiving role in the family and spend more time with their children than do fathers.

Limitations and Implications for Future Research

The present study is among the initial efforts to explore the potential differences in the effect of parenting style on children's bullying involvement among foreign-born Asian, U.S.-born Asian, and White American adolescents in the United States, and the findings contribute to the knowledge building on this important issue. However, several methodological limitations need to be noted. First, the analysis was based on cross-sectional secondary data, and it was impossible to determine the causal relationships among the research variables. Future investigations are advised to employ a longitudinal design to better assess the effect of parenting received in childhood on one's later bullying involvement at school. Second, "Asian" is a broad category with significant in-group heterogeneity. A particular style of parenting may have different effects on children from different Asian heritages as well as families with varying degrees of acculturation (Park et al. 2010). However, Asian American ethnic subgroups share many beliefs, values (e.g., collectivism), lifestyles,

traditions, and customs, which reflects the similarities in Asian cultures that are rooted in religion, philosophy, history, economy, and social-political structure (Leung 1988). That said, this study only identified the respondents' race and immigrant status as proximities to their family culture, although it would be more accurate to directly measure their adherence to those cultural beliefs in future research.

Similarly, the measures of the four parenting styles (authoritarian, permissive, non-involvement, authoritative) were drawn from existing items of the HBSC survey, and they were not designed specifically for the constructs. It is a common limitation of secondary analysis, and researchers are encouraged to use established scales with satisfactory psychometric properties in their investigation to verify the results of the present study. Also, the suppressor variables possibly influenced the results of this study. For instance, the zero-order correlation between authoritative parenting and bullying perpetration for White American adolescents was negative, but it was positive in our regression model. In the multiple regression equations, suppressor variables increase the magnitude of regression coefficients associated with other independent variables or sets of variables (Conger 1974). Bivariate results, such as zero-order correlation coefficients, provide only partial information about the relationship between a predictor and an outcome variable (Pandey and Elliott 2010). Thus, it has been suggested that the results of the multiple regression are more accurate than the correlations because the relationship between predictors is also considered (Pandey and Elliott 2010). In particular, in most social science research, explanatory variables are intercorrelated, therefore, the regression coefficients should be calculated after adjusting for all the bivariate correlations between independent variables. Moreover, the items for permissive parenting variables are in question as there was a notable absence of permissive rule-setting and discipline (e.g., there are no rules concerning watching television). As a result, these items might potentially measure an authoritative parenting style. Further, the reliability coefficient for the permissive parenting measure was .66. Although a Cronbach's alpha of .70 or higher is regarded as satisfactory, some scholars have argued that a value of .50 or higher is considered to be acceptable in cases where the measure contains fewer than 20 items (see Dall'Oglio et al. 2010).

In addition to the above research implications, it is important to mention that the association between parenting and bullying may be contingent on many other factors. For example, both authoritative parenting and mother's non-involvement were surprisingly positively associated with bullying perpetration among White Americans. However, these findings may reflect the complexity of how parenting style might be related to children's behavioral outcomes. While authoritative parenting, characterized as emotional warmth and responsiveness, might appear to lower the odds of child behavioral problems, it can also possibly reinforce behavioral

problems in some adolescents. Authoritative parenting style, which is high in both responsiveness and demandingness, is perceived to be the ideal parenting style (Baumrind 2005). However, over-parenting is also assumed to be an extension of authoritative parenting, which is described as a parent emphasizing their child's specialness, resulting in parents putting effort into ensuring that their child receives what they desire at all times (Twenge and Campbell 2009). Over-parented children from dominant social/cultural groups may feel privileged and entitled to do what they want (Segrin et al. 2012), which can reinforce aggressive behavior and a lack of empathy (Campbell et al. 2004).

The authoritarian parenting style may elicit different psychological and behavioral outcomes from children in families with different cultural norms. Compared with their European American peers, the emphasis on mother-child interdependence in many Asian societies makes parental pressure more tolerable and even a source of motivation for Asian American students (Fu and Markus 2014). More contextual variables should be considered in future research to better assess the dynamic process within the family. Also, even though the family may be influential in shaping children's personality and behavior, how these individual attributes affect their peer relations depends on school contextual factors such as the class norm. Aggression and withdrawal were found to be more acceptable in classrooms where those behaviors were more prevalent (Stormshak et al. 1999). Students who develop aggressiveness in the family are therefore at a lower risk to be rejected and victimized in some but not other school conditions. Further research is encouraged to adopt a hierarchical design to integrate multi-level contexts into one model and examine the developmental trajectory of bullying/victimization through different layers of ecosystems. Lastly, given the high levels of missing data for authoritative and permissive parenting, we urge a degree of caution in over-interpreting the effects observed in our study.

Implications for Practice

Our study findings reveal that the relationship between parenting practices and adolescent bullying and victimization is complex. This finding is not surprising considering that parents often struggle with the complex issues associated with raising adolescents and, in particular, they are likely to be perplexed about bullying issues. In the United States, education for parents on bullying is not standard, although professionals argue that such education is necessary. Educating parents about the importance of being involved when their child is bullied might be important for parents of foreign-born and U.S.-born Asian adolescents.

Interestingly, our analyses also found that authoritative parenting was positively related to bullying perpetration among White Americans. This might indicate the need for White

American parents, who choose an authoritative parenting style, to clarify their expectations regarding bullying behavior. Although authoritative parenting was related to bullying in White Americans only, practitioners working with adolescents and parents of any racial groups need to consider an intervention or a treatment plan that is a good fit among adolescents, parents, and cultural values. It may call for working with authoritative parents in learning to be more aware of the kinds of behaviors they observe in their children at home, in their neighborhoods, and among their friends. Even though it is normative in the United States to allow greater distance from parents for adolescents, closer parental supervision is still necessary for healthy outcomes related to bullying. Mothers, in particular, play a critical role in children's socialization through adolescence (Miller-Slough and Dunsmore 2016). Consequently, mothers can be encouraged to continue investment, supervision, and support throughout this important stage of development to decrease the likelihood of bullying victimization. In general, parents can be encouraged to ask adolescents questions about bullying. It is often the case that parents are not cognizant of bullying at school (Bywater et al. 2015) and that adolescents do not inform their parents (Bjereld et al. 2017). Once apprised, parents' conversations with adolescents can lead to a greater understanding of their children's experience and how it may correlate with parenting efforts. And finally, a positive association between authoritarian parenting and bullying perpetration among U.S.-born Asians possibly due to cultural dissonance calls for an intervention that focuses on adolescents' perceptions of an intergenerational cultural gap, family conflict management, and improved bonding with parents (Choi et al. 2008).

Conclusion

This study highlights the importance of enhancing our understanding of how parenting styles are relevant to adolescent bullying and victimization. Scholars have argued that assessing parenting and family level factors is critical to success in bullying prevention and intervention efforts (Lester et al. 2017; Ttofi and Farrington 2009). Our findings suggest that some types of parenting styles might foster or inhibit bullying and victimization risks among foreign-born Asian, U.S.-born Asian, and White American adolescents. To better inform school-based practice, however, there is a need for research using a longitudinal research design with more validated measures of parenting styles. A longitudinal research design would contribute to our understanding of the early developmental process such as relations with parents during childhood which may contribute to bullying and victimization. More importantly, future research will need to consider cultural differences among Asian and White American parents, which can contribute to more effective and culturally relevant anti-bullying programs.

Compliance with Ethical Standards

Conflict of Interest The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest and ensured that all ethical standards were met; thus, there are no ethical issues with regard to human participants or animals. Informed consent was obtained in the study.

References

- Arseneault, L., Bowes, L., & Shakoor, S. (2010). Bullying victimization in youths and mental health problems: 'much ado about nothing'? *Psychological Medicine*, *40*, 717–729. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0033291709991383>.
- Bahr, S. J., & Hoffmann, J. P. (2010). Parenting style, religiosity, peers, and adolescent heavy drinking. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol and Drugs*, *71*, 539–543. <https://doi.org/10.15288/jsad.2010.71.539>.
- Baldry, A. C., & Farrington, D. P. (2000). Bullies and delinquents: personal characteristics and parental styles. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, *10*, 17–31. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1099-1298\(200001/02\)10:1<17::AID-CASP526>3.0.CO;2-M](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1099-1298(200001/02)10:1<17::AID-CASP526>3.0.CO;2-M).
- Baldry, A. C., & Farrington, D. P. (2005). Protective factors as moderators of risk factors in adolescent bullying. *Social Psychology of Education*, *8*, 263–284. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11218-005-5866-5>.
- Barber, B. K., & Buehler, C. (1996). Family cohesion and enmeshment: different constructs, different effects. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *58*, 433–441.
- Batsche, G. M., & Knoff, H. M. (1994). Bullies and their victims: understanding a pervasive problem in the schools. *School Psychology Review*, *23*, 165–174.
- Baumrind, D. (1991). The influence of parenting style on adolescents' competence and substance use. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, *11*, 56–95. <https://doi.org/10.1177/02724316911111004>.
- Baumrind, D. (2005). Patterns of parental authority and adolescent autonomy. *New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development*, *108*, 61–69. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cd.128>.
- Bjereld, Y., Daneback, K., & Petzold, M. (2017). Do bullied children have poor relationships with their parents and teachers? A cross-sectional study of Swedish children. *Children and Youth Services Review*, *73*, 347–351. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2017.01.012>.
- Bollmer, J. M., Milich, R., Harris, M. J., & Maras, M. A. (2005). A friend in need: the role of friendship quality as a protective factor in peer victimization and bullying. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *20*, 701–712. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260504272897>.
- Bowes, L., Arseneault, L., Maughan, B., Taylor, A., Caspi, A., & Moffitt, T. E. (2009). School, neighborhood, and family factors are associated with children's bullying involvement: a nationally representative longitudinal study. *Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*, *48*, 545–553. <https://doi.org/10.1097/CHI.0b013e31819cb017>.
- Bowlby, J. (1969). *Attachment and loss*. London: Random House.
- Brown, B. B., Mounts, N., Lamborn, S. D., & Steinberg, L. (1993). Parenting practices and peer group affiliation in adolescence. *Child Development*, *64*, 467–482. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.1993.tb02922.x>.
- Bywater, T., Axford, N., Farrington, D. P., Clarkson, S., Bjornstad, G. J., Wrigley, Z., & Hutchings, J. (2015). Involving parents in school-based programmes to prevent and reduce bullying: what effect does it have? *Journal of Children's Services*, *10*, 242–251. <https://doi.org/10.1108/jcs-05-2015-0019>.

- Campbell, W. K., Bonacci, A. M., Shelton, J., Exline, J. J., & Bushman, B. J. (2004). Psychological entitlement: interpersonal consequences and validation of self-report measure. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 8, 29–45. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa8301_4.
- Chang, L., Schwartz, D., Dodge, K. A., & McBride-Chang, C. (2003). Harsh parenting in relation to child emotion regulation and aggression. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 17, 598–606. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0893-3200.17.4.598>.
- Chao, R. (1994). Beyond parenting control and authoritarian parenting style: understanding Chinese parenting through the cultural notion of training. *Child Development*, 65, 1111–1119. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.1994.tb00806.x>.
- Chao, R. K. (2000). Parenting differences among immigrant Chinese fathers and mothers in the United States. *Hong Kong Psychological Society*, 1, 71–91.
- Chao, R. K., & Tseng, V. (2002). Parenting of Asians. In M. H. Bornstein (Ed.), *Handbook of parenting* (Vol. 4, pp. 59–93). Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Cheah, C. S. L., & Rubin, K. H. (2003). European American and mainland Chinese mothers' socialization beliefs regarding preschoolers' social skills. *Parenting: Science and Practice*, 3, 1–21. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327922PAR0301_01.
- Chen, X., Wu, H., Chen, H., Wang, L., & Cen, G. (2001). Parenting practices and aggressive behavior in Chinese children. *Parenting: Science and Practice*, 1, 159–184. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327922PAR0103_01.
- Choi, Y., He, M., & Harachi, T. W. (2008). Intergenerational cultural dissonance, parent-child conflict and bonding, and youth problem behaviors among Vietnamese and Cambodian immigrant families. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 37, 85–96. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-007-9217-z>.
- Christie-Mizell, C. A., Keil, J. M., Laske, M. T., & Stewart, J. (2011). Bullying behavior, parents' work hours and early adolescents' perceptions of time spent with parents. *Youth & Society*, 43, 1570–1595. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0044118X10388261>.
- Conger, A. J. (1974). A revised definition for suppressor variables: a guide to their identification and interpretation. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 34, 35–46. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001316447403400105>.
- Connell, N. M., El Sayed, S., Gonzalez, J. M., & Schell-Busey, N. M. (2015). The intersection of perceptions and experiences of bullying by race and ethnicity among middle school students in the United States. *Deviant Behavior*, 36, 807–822. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01639625.2014.977159>.
- Cooc, N., & Gee, K. A. (2014). National trends in school victimization among Asian American adolescents. *Journal of Adolescence*, 37, 839–849. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2014.05.002>.
- Currie, C., Zanotti, C., Morgan, A., Currie, D., de Looze, M., Roberts, C., ... Barnekow, V. (2012). *Health behaviour in school-aged children (HBSC) study: International report from the 2009/2010 survey* (Health Policy for Children and Adolescents, No. 6). Copenhagen: WHO Regional Office for Europe.
- Dall'Oglio, A. M., Rossiello, B., Coletti, M. F., Caselli, M. C., Ravà, L., Di Ciommo, V., et al. (2010). Developmental evaluation at age 4: validity of an Italian parental questionnaire. *Journal of Paediatrics and Child Health*, 46, 419–426. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1440-1754.2010.01748.x>.
- Darling, N., & Steinberg, L. (1993). Parenting style as context: An integrative model. *Psychological Bulletin*, 113, 487–496.
- Deater-Deckard, K., Dodge, K. A., & Sorbring, E. (2005). Cultural differences in the effects of physical punishment. In M. Rutter (Ed.), *Ethnicity and causal mechanisms* (pp. 204–226). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dehue, F., Bolman, C., Vollink, T., & Pouwelse, M. (2012). Cyberbullying and traditional bullying in relation to adolescents' perception of parenting. *Journal of CyberTherapy & Rehabilitation*, 5, 25–34.
- Eamon, M. K. (2001). Poverty, parenting, peer and neighborhood influences on young adolescent antisocial behavior. *Journal of Social Service Research*, 28, 1–23. https://doi.org/10.1300/J079v28n01_01.
- Eliot, M., & Cornell, D. G. (2009). Bullying in middle school as a function of insecure attachment and aggressive attitudes. *School Psychology International*, 30, 201–214. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0143034309104148>.
- Fisher, S., Middleton, K., Ricks, E., Malone, C., Briggs, C., & Barnes, J. (2015). Not just black and white: peer victimization and intersectionality of school diversity and race. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 44, 1241–1250. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-014-0243-3>.
- Flouri, E., & Buchanan, A. (2003). The role of mother involvement and father involvement in adolescent bullying behavior. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 18, 534–644. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260503251129>.
- Fu, A. S., & Markus, H. R. (2014). My mother and me: why tiger mothers motivate Asian Americans but not European Americans. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 40, 739–749. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167214524992>.
- Georgiou, S. N. (2008). Parental style and child bullying and victimization experiences at school. *Social Psychology of Education*, 11, 213–227. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11218-007-9048-5>.
- Georgiou, S. N., Fousiani, K., Michaelides, M., & Stavrinides, P. (2013). Cultural value orientation and authoritarian parenting as parameters of bullying and victimization at school. *International Journal of Psychology*, 48, 69–78. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00207594.2012.754104>.
- Gini, G., Pozzoli, T., & Hauser, M. (2011). Bullies have enhanced moral competence to judge relative to victims, but lack moral compassion. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 50, 603–608. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2010.12.002>.
- Gomez-Ortiz, O., Romera, E. M., & Ortega-Ruiz, R. (2016). Parenting styles and bullying: the mediating role of parental psychological aggression and physical punishment. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 51, 132–143. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2015.10.025>.
- Ho, C., Bluestein, D. N., & Jenkins, J. M. (2008). Cultural differences in the relationship between parenting and children's behavior. *Developmental Psychology*, 44, 507–522. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.44.2.507>.
- Hoeve, M., Dubas, J. S., Eichelsheim, V. I., van der Laan, P. H., Smeenk, W., & Gerris, J. R. M. (2009). The relationship between parenting and delinquency: a meta-analysis. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 37, 749–775. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10802-009-9310-8>.
- Holt, M. K., Kantor, G. K., & Finkelhor, D. (2009). Parent/child concordance about bullying involvement and family characteristics related to bullying and peer victimization. *Journal of School Violence*, 8, 42–63. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15388220802067813>.
- Huntsinger, C. S., Jose, P. E., Rudden, D., Luo, Z., & Krieg, D. B. (2001). Cultural differences in interactions around mathematics tasks in Chinese American and European American families. In C. C. Park, A. L. Goodwin, & S. J. Lee (Eds.), *Research on the education of Asian and Pacific Americans* (pp. 75–104). Greenwich: Information Age Publishing.
- Jeynes, W. H. (2008). Effects of parental involvement on experiences of discrimination and bullying. *Marriage & Family Review*, 43, 255–268. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01494920802072470>.
- Kaufmann, D., Gesten, E., Santa Lucia, R. C., Salsedo, O., Gobioff, G. R., & Gadd, R. (2000). The relationship between parenting style and children's adjustment: the parents' perspective. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 9, 231–245. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1009475122883>.

- Kim, S. Y., & Wong, V. Y. (2002). Assessing Asian and Asian American parenting: A review of the literature. In K. Kurasaki, S. Okazaki, & S. Sue (Eds.), *Asian American mental health: Assessment methods and theories* (pp. 185–219). Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Kim, S. Y., Wang, Y., Orozco-Lapray, D., Shen, Y., & Murtuza, M. (2013). Does “tiger parenting” exist? Parenting profiles of Chinese Americans and adolescent developmental outcomes. *Asian American Journal of Psychology, 4*, 7–18. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0030612>.
- Kim, L., Knudson-Martin, C., & Tuttle, A. (2014). Toward relationship-directed parenting: an example of north American born second-generation Korean-American mothers and their partners. *Family Process, 53*, 55–66. <https://doi.org/10.1111/famp.12052>.
- Klimidis, S., Minas, I. H., & Ata, A. W. (1992). The PBI-BC: a brief current form of the parental bonding instrument for adolescent research. *Comprehensive Psychiatry, 33*, 374–377. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-440X\(92\)90058-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-440X(92)90058-X).
- Koiv, K. (2012). Attachment styles among bullies, victims and uninvolved adolescents. *Psychology Research, 2*, 160–165.
- Kokkinos, C. M. (2013). Bullying and victimization in early adolescence: associations with attachment style and perceived parenting. *Journal of School Violence, 12*, 174–192. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15388220.2013.766134>.
- Kokkinos, C. M., Antoniadou, N., Asdre, A., & Voulgaridou, K. (2016). Parenting and internet behavior predictors of cyber-bullying and cyber-victimization among preadolescents. *Deviant Behavior, 37*, 439–455. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01639625.2015.1060087>.
- Koo, D. J., Peguero, A. A., & Shekarkhar, Z. (2012). The “model minority” victim: immigration, gender, and Asian American vulnerabilities to violence in school. *Journal of Ethnicity in Criminal Justice, 10*, 129–147. <https://doi.org/10.1080/153779382011.609405>.
- Laird, R. D., Criss, M. M., Pettit, G. S., Dodge, K. A., & Bates, J. E. (2008). Parents’ monitoring knowledge attenuates the link between antisocial friends and adolescent delinquent behavior. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 36*, 299–310. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10802-007-9178-4>.
- Lee, S. S. T., & Wong, D. S. W. (2009). School, parents, and peer factors in relation to Hong Kong students’ bullying. *International Journal of Adolescence and Youth, 15*, 217–233. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02673843.2009.9748030>.
- Lereya, S., Samara, M., & Wolke, D. (2013). Parenting behavior and the risk of becoming a victim and a bully/victim: a meta-analysis study. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 37*, 1091–1108. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2013.03.001>.
- Lester, L., Pearce, N., Waters, S., Barnes, A., Beatty, S., & Cross, D. (2017). Family involvement in a whole-school bullying intervention: mothers’ and fathers’ communication and influence with children. *Journal of Child and Family Studies, 26*, 2716–2727. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-017-0793-6>.
- Leung, E. K. (1988). *Cultural and acculturational commonalities and diversities among Asian Americans: Identification and programming considerations*. Paper presented at the ethnic and multicultural Symposia, Dallas TX (ERIC document reproduction service no. ED 298 708).
- Little, R. J. (1988). A test of missing completely at random for multivariate data with missing values. *Journal of the American Statistical Association, 83*, 1198–1202. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/01621459.1988.10478722>.
- Little, R. J., & Rubin, D. B. (2014). *Statistical analysis with missing data*. Hoboken: Wiley.
- Luk, J. W., Patock-Peckham, J. A., Medina, M., Terrell, N., Belton, D., & King, K. M. (2016). Bullying perpetration and victimization as externalizing and internalizing pathways: a retrospective study linking parenting styles and self-esteem to depression, alcohol use, and alcohol-related problems. *Substance Use & Misuse, 51*, 113–125. <https://doi.org/10.3109/10826084.2015.1090453>.
- Mahady Wilton, M. M., Craig, W. M., & Pepler, D. J. (2000). Emotional regulation and display in classroom victims of bullying: characteristic expressions of affect, coping styles and relevant contextual factors. *Social Development, 9*, 226–245. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9507.00121>.
- Mandara, J., & Murray, C. B. (2002). Development of an empirical typology of African American family functioning. *Journal of Family Psychology, 16*, 318–337. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0893-3200.16.3.318>.
- Martinez, I., Murgui, S., Garcia, O. F., & Garcia, F. (2019). Parenting in the digital era: protective and risk parenting styles for traditional bullying and cyberbullying victimization. *Computers in Human Behavior, 90*, 84–92. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2018.08.036>.
- Mau, W. (1997). Parental influences on the high school students’ academic achievement: a comparison of Asian immigrants, Asian Americans, and White Americans. *Psychology in the Schools, 34*, 267–277. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1520-6807\(199707\)34:3<267::AID-PITS9>3.0.CO;2-L](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1520-6807(199707)34:3<267::AID-PITS9>3.0.CO;2-L).
- McElhaney, K. B., Allen, J. P., Stephenson, J. C., & Hare, A. L. (2009). Attachment and autonomy during adolescence. In R. M. Lerner & L. Steinberg (Eds.), *Handbook of adolescent psychology* (Vol. 1, 3rd ed., pp. 358–403). Hoboken: John Wiley.
- Miller-Slough, R. L., & Dunsmore, J. C. (2016). Parents and friend emotional socialization in adolescence: associations with psychological adjustment. *Adolescent Research Review, 1*, 287–305. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40894-016-0026-z>.
- Mishna, F., Khoury-Kassabri, M., Gadalla, T., & Daciuk, J. (2012). Risk factors for involvement in cyberbullying: victims, bullies and bully-victims. *Children and Youth Services Review, 34*, 63–70. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2011.08.032>.
- Musu, L., Zhang, A., Wang, K., Zhang, J., & Oudekerk, B. A. (2019). *Indicators of school crime and safety: 2018 (NCES 2019-047/NCJ 252571)*. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education, and Bureau of Justice Statistics, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice.
- Muthén, L. K., & Muthén, B. O. (2012). *Mplus version 7 user’s guide*. Los Angeles, CA: Muthén & Muthén.
- Nansel, T. R., Overpeck, M., Pilla, R. S., Ruan, W. J., Simons-Morton, B., & Scheidt, P. (2001). Bullying behaviors among US youth: prevalence and association with psychosocial adjustment. *JAMA, 285*, 2094–2100. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.285.16.2094>.
- Nguyen, P. V. (2008). Perceptions of Vietnamese fathers’ acculturation, parenting styles, and mental health outcomes in Vietnamese American adolescent immigrants. *Social Work, 53*, 337–346. <https://doi.org/10.1093/sw/53.4.337>.
- Pandey, S., & Elliott, W. (2010). Suppressor variables in social work research: ways to identify in multiple regression models. *Journal of the Society for Social Work and Research, 1*, 28–40. <https://doi.org/10.5243/jsswr.2010.2>.
- Park, Y. S., Kim, B. S., Chiang, J., & Ju, C. M. (2010). Acculturation, enculturation, parental adherence to Asian cultural values, parenting styles, and family conflict among Asian American college students. *Asian American Journal of Psychology, 1*, 67–79. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0018961>.
- Perren, S., Gutzwiller-Helfenfinger, E., Malti, T., & Hymel, S. (2012). Moral reasoning and emotion attributions of adolescent bullies, victims, and bully-victims. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology, 30*, 511–530. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-835X.2011.02059.x>.
- Pezzella, F. S., Thornberry, T. P., & Smith, C. A. (2016). Race socialization and parenting styles: links to delinquency for African American and white adolescents. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice, 14*, 448–467. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1541204015581390>.
- Pinquart, M., & Kausar, R. (2018). Do the associations of parenting styles with behavior problems and academic achievement vary by culture? Results from a meta-analysis. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic*

- Minority Psychology*, 24, 75–100. <https://doi.org/10.1037/cdp0000149>.
- Pyke, K. (2000). “The normal American family” as an interpretive structure of family life among growing children of Korean and Vietnamese immigrants. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 62, 240–255. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2000.00240.x>.
- Qin, D. B., Way, N., & Rana, M. (2008). The “model minority” and their discontent: examining peer discrimination and harassment of Chinese American immigrant youth. *New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development*, 2008, 27–42. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cd.221>.
- Quoss, B., & Zhao, W. (1995). Parenting styles and children’s satisfaction with parenting in China and the United States. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 26, 265–280.
- Roberts, C., Freeman, J., Schnohr, C. W., Looze, M. E., Nic Gabhainn, S., Rasmussen, M., & the International HBSC Study Group. (2009). The health behaviour in school-aged children (HBSC) study: Methodological developments and current tensions. *International Journal of Public Health*, 54, 140–150. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00038-009-5405-9>.
- Rodkin, P. C., Espelage, D. L., & Hanish, L. D. (2015). A relational framework for understanding bullying: developmental antecedents and outcomes. *American Psychologist*, 70, 311–321. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0038658>.
- Schumann, L., Craig, W., & Rosu, A. (2013). Minority in the majority: community ethnicity as a context for racial bullying and victimization. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 41, 959–972. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jcop.21585>.
- Segrin, C., Woszildo, A., Givertz, M., Bauer, A., & Murphy, M. T. (2012). The association between overparenting, parent-child communication, and entitlement and adaptive traits in adult children. *Family Relations*, 61, 237–252. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3729.2011.00689.x>.
- Smith, P. K., & Myron-Wilson, R. (1998). Parenting and school bullying. *Clinical Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 3, 405–417. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1359104598033006>.
- Sorkhabi, N., & Mandara, J. (2013). Are the effects of Baumrind’s parenting styles culturally specific or culturally equivalent? In R. E. Larzelere, A. S. Morris, & A. W. Harrist (Eds.), *Authoritative parenting: Synthesizing nurturance and discipline for optimal child development* (pp. 113–135). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Stewart, S. M., Rao, N., Bond, M. H., McBride-Chang, C., Fielding, R., & Kennard, B. D. (1998). Chinese dimensions of parenting: broadening Western predictors and outcomes. *International Journal of Psychology*, 33, 345–358. <https://doi.org/10.1080/002075998400231>.
- Stormshak, E. A., Bierman, K. L., Bruschi, C., Dodge, K. A., & Coie, J. D. (1999). The relation between behavior problems and peer preference in different classroom contexts. *Child Development*, 70, 169–182. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8624.00013>.
- Thompson, A., Hollis, C., & Richards, D. (2003). Authoritarian parenting attitudes as a risk for conduct problems. *European Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*, 12, 84–91. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00787-003-0324-4>.
- Ttofi, M., & Farrington, D. (2009). What works in preventing bullying: effective elements of anti-bullying programmes. *Journal of Aggression, Conflict and Peace Research*, 1, 13–24. <https://doi.org/10.1108/17596599200900003>.
- Twenge, J. M., & Campbell, W. K. (2009). *The narcissism epidemic: Living in the age of entitlement*. New York: Free Press.
- Volk, A. A., Camilleri, J. A., Dane, A. V., & Marini, Z. A. (2012). Is adolescent bullying an evolutionary adaptation? *Aggressive Behavior*, 38, 222–238. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ab.21418>.
- Wang, J., Iannotti, R. J., & Nansel, T. R. (2009). School bullying among adolescents in the United States: physical, verbal, relational, and cyber. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 45, 368–375. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2009.03.021>.
- Wilmshurst, L. (2008). *Abnormal child psychology: A developmental perspective*. New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group.
- Xu, Y., Farver, J. A. M., Zhang, Z., Zeng, Q., Yu, L., & Cai, B. (2005). Mainland Chinese parenting styles and parent-child interaction. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 29, 524–531. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01650250500147121>.

Publisher’s Note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.