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Some limitations:

- Only used parent-report measures.
- Some measures had unsatisfactory psychometric properties.
- Culture and education system different from Mainland China.
Parenting programs in China

Some parenting programs are existing in China (e.g., Positive Discipline) and they are provided for Chinese parents in a commercial way.

However, little empirical research has been conducted to evaluate their effectiveness.
Triple P Variants addressing various problems

- Abdominal pain
- Developmental disabilities
- Obesity
- Persistent feeding problems
- Autism spectrum disorder
Triple P Variants addressing various problems

Academic outcomes
Parent programs for children’s academic learning

**Parent involvement programs**
- communicate with schools, attend school activities, provide enriching activities for children, talk with children about learning, and involvement in children’s homework.

**Parenting programs**
- Parenting strategies: encourage good behavior, teach child new skills and behaviors, and manage misbehavior.
Parent programs for children’s academic learning

Parent involvement programs
- Communicate with schools,
- Attend school activities,
- Provide enriching activities for children,
- Talk with children about learning,
- and involvement in children’s homework.

Parenting programs
- Parenting strategies:
  - Encourage good behavior,
  - Teach child new skills and behaviors,
  - and manage misbehavior.

About How Much

About How
Previous research

Parent involvement programs

- Some positive effects on children’s academic outcomes, many results were quite mixed (Patall et al., 2008; Pomerantz, Moorman, & Litwack, 2007).

Parenting programs

- Few studies, one rare example (Barkley et al., 2000): four groups: no treatment, parent treatment only, full-day classroom treatment with behavioral interventions, and combined parent training and classroom treatment, non-significant results.
About China

- Confucian culture and values in parenting (Chao, 1994; Chau & Landreth, 1997).

- Chinese parents emphasize their authority and children’s obedience in parenting (Leung, Sanders, Leung, Mak, & Lau, 2003).

- High expectations of children’s academic achievement (e.g., Chao, 1996; Tsui, 2005).

- Chinese parents involve more actively in children’s academic learning (e.g., Chen, 2001; Yang & Zhou, 2008).

- In Chinese parents’ perceptions, children’s learning problems is the most prevalent problem in their children (Guo et al., 2011; Liu, Li, & Wang, 2004).
Summary: literature limitations

There is lack of empirical research on the effectiveness of parenting programs with Chinese parents in Mainland China.

The effects of parenting programs on parent’s academic behaviors and children’s learning outcomes have not been evaluated.
Participant flow

Screened = 174

Eligible n = 94

Randomised n = 86

Randomised to Intervention n = 43, Pre-test n=38(p), 39(c)

Randomised to Waitlist n = 43, Pre-test N=41(p), 39(c)

Post-test n =35(p), 36(c)

Follow-up test n =32(p), 32(c)

Not eligible = 80

2 withdrew before start, 1 dropped out

p=parent
c=child
Demographics

- **Age:**
  - 86 Parents: $M=38.79$ (SD=3.32), ranged from 32-49
  - 86 Children $M=9.07$ (SD=1.14), ranged from 9-14
  - 5 data missing

- **Gender:**
  - Parents: 13 fathers, 68 mothers
  - Children: 41 boys, 40 girls
Criteria to involve participants

- Parents were concerned about children’s academic learning;
- Children were in grade 1-3 at primary schools;
- Children didn’t have any diagnostic problems (e.g., intellectual impairment.);
- Parents and children were not involved in any other similar programs in the meantime.
### Parent measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire</th>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Child Adjustment and Parent Efficacy Scale (CAPES)</strong> <em>(Morawska &amp; Sanders, 2010)</em></td>
<td>Emotional Problems</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Behavioral Problems</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parent Efficacy</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parenting and Family Adjustment Scale (PAFES)</strong> <em>(Sanders &amp; Morawska, 2010)</em></td>
<td>Parenting Practices</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parental Adjustment</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family Relationships</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parental Teamwork</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Parenting Practices Questionnaire (adapted from PAFAS)</strong></td>
<td>Academic Parenting Practices</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Misbehavior Questionnaire</strong></td>
<td>Academic Misbehaviors</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Achievement Perception</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Achievement Satisfaction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Child measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaires</th>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Self-regulation Questionnaire</strong> (Deci &amp; Ryan, 1989; Tang, 2002)</td>
<td>Intrinsic motivation</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identified regulation</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Introjected regulation</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>External regulation</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Short-term effects

### Parenting practices (parent report)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Intervention (I)</th>
<th>Waitlist (W)</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
<th>p-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DysParenting</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>0.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DysAparenting</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.008*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parefficacy</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>0.001*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ F(3,64) = 12.45, \quad p < 0.001^* \]

\[ d = 1.20 \]

\[ d = 0.52 \]

\[ d = 1.16 \]

\[ p = 0.008^* \]

\[ I = \text{Intervention} \]
\[ W = \text{Waitlist} \]
Child behavioral and emotional problems (parent report)

F(3, 67) = 8.26, \( p < 0.001^* \)

- \( p = 0.001^* \)
  - \( d = 0.61 \)

- \( p = 0.316 \)
  - \( d = 0.18 \)

\( p < 0.001^* \)

\( d = 0.67 \)
Parental perception and satisfaction of children's academic achievement

Academic achievement perception (I)
F(1,70) = 2.66
p = 0.107
d = 0.33

Academic achievement perception (W)
F(1,69) = 9.76
p = 0.003*
d = 0.68

Academic achievement satisfaction (I)

Academic achievement satisfaction (W)

I = Intervention
W = Waitlist
**Academic self-regulation (child-report)**

- **Intrinsic (I)**
  - Pretest: 2.5
  - Posttest: 2.5

- **Intrinsic (W)**
  - Pretest: 2.5
  - Posttest: 2.5

- **Identified (I)**
  - Pretest: 3.5
  - Posttest: 3.5

- **Identified (W)**
  - Pretest: 3.5
  - Posttest: 3.5

- **Introjected (I)**
  - Pretest: 4
  - Posttest: 4

- **Introjected (W)**
  - Pretest: 4
  - Posttest: 4

- **External (I)**
  - Pretest: 1.5
  - Posttest: 1.5

- **External (W)**
  - Pretest: 1.5
  - Posttest: 1.5

---

**Statistics**

- **$F(4, 68) = 3.38, p = 0.014^*$**

- **$P = 0.520, d = 0.10$**

- **$P = 0.053, d = 0.56$**

- **$P = 0.014, d = 0.70$**

- **$P = 0.001^*, d = -0.75$**

---

*I = Intervention  
W = Waitlist*
Long-term effects

- Short-term effects maintained except External regulation ($p=0.155$, $d=0.22$)
- Client satisfaction
  - 91.7% of parents rated the program’s quality as good to excellent.
  - 97.2% of parents indicated that they received the help they wanted from the program.
  - 94.4% of parents were satisfied with the program.
Thank you!