



Turnitin Originality Report

Understanding Parenting Practices and Parents' Views of Parenting Programs: A Survey Among Indonesian Parents Residing in Indonesia and Australia by Agnes Maria Sumargi

From Jakad (PAK)

Similarity Index	Similarity by Source	
12%	Internet Sources:	7%
	Publications:	9%
	Student Papers:	3%

Processed on 28-Feb-2018 10:20 WIB

ID: 922653510

Word Count: 16125

sources:

- 1** 1% match (publications)
[Caroline Gilbo, Tess Knight, Andrew J. Lewis, John W. Toumbourou, Melanie D. Bertino. "A Qualitative Evaluation of an Intervention for Parents of Adolescents with Mental Disorders: The Parenting Challenging Adolescents Seminar", Journal of Child and Family Studies, 2014](#)

- 2** 1% match (publications)
[Steenweg-de Graaff, J., S. J. Roza, E. A. Steegers, A. Hofman, F. C. Verhulst, V. W. Jaddoe, and H. Tiemeier. "Maternal folate status in early pregnancy and child emotional and behavioral problems: the Generation R Study", American Journal of Clinical Nutrition, 2012.](#)

- 3** 1% match (student papers from 09-Sep-2015)
[Submitted to Universidad San Francisco de Quito on 2015-09-09](#)

- 4** < 1% match (Internet from 09-Nov-2015)
http://repub.eur.nl/pub/7352/041117_Stevens.pdf

- 5** < 1% match (publications)
[Encyclopedia of Adolescence, 2011.](#)

- 6** < 1% match (publications)
[Pickering, John A., and Matthew R. Sanders. "The protocol for a randomised controlled trial \(RCT\) of a brief intervention for parents of children experiencing sibling conflict : Sibling conflict study protocol", Clinical Psychologist, 2015.](#)

- 7** < 1% match (Internet from 03-May-2016)
<http://iacapap.org/wp-content/uploads/A.12-PARENTING-PRGS-2016.pdf>

- 8** < 1% match (Internet from 24-Jan-2014)
http://www.asianhealth.govt.nz/Publications/Asian%20Health_Conference_04_Proceedings.pdf

9 < 1% match (publications)

[Cassandra Dittman, Louise June Keown, Matthew Sanders, Dennis Rose, Susan P. Farruggia, Kate Sofronoff. "An epidemiological examination of parenting and family correlates of emotional problems in young children.", American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 2011](#)

10 < 1% match (student papers from 30-Sep-2015)

[Submitted to Laureate Higher Education Group on 2015-09-30](#)

11 < 1% match (publications)

[M. Weitzman. "Paternal Depressive Symptoms and Child Behavioral or Emotional Problems in the United States", PEDIATRICS, 11/07/2011](#)

12 < 1% match (publications)

[Boaz M. Ben-David, Vania Y.Y. Tse, Bruce A. Schneider. "Does it take older adults longer than younger adults to perceptually segregate a speech target from a background masker?", Hearing Research, 2012](#)

13 < 1% match (Internet from 07-Nov-2017)

<http://www.anzctr.org.au/trialSearch.aspx/Support/docs/Trial/Registration/Trial/Registration/TrialReview.aspx?page=336>

14 < 1% match (Internet from 07-Dec-2006)

http://mja.com.au/public/issues/177_07_071002/san10374_fm.pdf

15 < 1% match (Internet from 28-May-2016)

http://docs.di.fc.ul.pt/bitstream/10451/9803/1/ulsd067016_td_Ana_Goes.pdf

16 < 1% match (Internet from 07-Jan-2018)

[http://capa-egypt.com/pdf/Rutter's%20child%20and%20adolescent%20psychiatry-Wiley%20\(2015\).pdf](http://capa-egypt.com/pdf/Rutter's%20child%20and%20adolescent%20psychiatry-Wiley%20(2015).pdf)

17 < 1% match (student papers from 10-Apr-2014)

[Submitted to Troy University on 2014-04-10](#)

18 < 1% match (Internet from 11-Aug-2017)

<http://journal.frontiersin.org/article/10.3389/fpsyg.2014.01509/full>

19 < 1% match (Internet from 21-Jan-2016)

<http://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/4160/pdf>

20 < 1% match (publications)
[Emser, Theresa S., Trevor G. Mazzucchelli, Hanna Christiansen, and Matthew R. Sanders. "Child Adjustment and Parent Efficacy Scale-Developmental Disability \(CAPES-DD\): First psychometric evaluation of a new child and parenting assessment tool for children with a developmental disability", Research in Developmental Disabilities, 2016.](#)

21 < 1% match (publications)
[Sanders, Matthew R., and James N. Kirby. "A Public-Health Approach to Improving Parenting and Promoting Children's Well-Being", Child Development Perspectives, 2014.](#)

22 < 1% match (student papers from 08-Apr-2015)
[Submitted to University of Cumbria on 2015-04-08](#)

23 < 1% match (Internet from 22-Feb-2017)
<http://documents.mx/documents/parenting-vol-1.html>

24 < 1% match (publications)
[Pickering, John A., and Matthew R. Sanders. "Integrating Parents' Views on Sibling Relationships to Tailor an Evidence-based Parenting Intervention for Sibling Conflict", Family Process, 2015.](#)

25 < 1% match (publications)
[M. R. Sanders. "Using household survey data to inform policy decisions regarding the delivery of evidence-based parenting interventions", Child Care Health and Development, 1/15/2007](#)

26 < 1% match (student papers from 16-May-2017)
[Submitted to Ventura County Community College District on 2017-05-16](#)

27 < 1% match (publications)
[Alina Morawska. "Evaluation of a Brief Parenting Discussion Group for Parents of Young Children :", Journal of Developmental & Behavioral Pediatrics, 02/2011](#)

28 < 1% match (student papers from 16-Mar-2017)
[Submitted to Polk State College on 2017-03-16](#)

29 < 1% match (student papers from 22-Mar-2015)
[Submitted to North Harris Montgomery Community College District on 2015-03-22](#)

30 < 1% match (Internet from 31-Jul-2014)
<http://baojournal.com/IJBCT/IJBCT-VOL-2/IJBCT-2-3.pdf>

31

< 1% match (Internet from 06-Nov-2017)

<http://aquila.usm.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1578&context=dissertations>

32

< 1% match (Internet from 04-Nov-2017)

<http://scholar.uwindsor.ca/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?amp=&article=6075&context=etd>

33

< 1% match (Internet from 09-May-2010)

<http://www.pfsc.uq.edu.au/papers/calam2008.pdf>

34

< 1% match (Internet from 24-May-2016)

http://soar.wichita.edu/bitstream/handle/10057/5153/d11031_Reed.pdf?sequence=1

35

< 1% match (Internet from 28-Oct-2017)

<http://digitalcommons.usu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=7317&context=etd>

36

< 1% match (Internet from 28-Mar-2010)

<http://www.illinoischildwelfare.org/archives/spr2007/Developing%20a%20Database%20for%20Evaluating%20the%20Effectiveness.pdf>

37

< 1% match (Internet from 19-Jun-2017)

<https://bmcmmedicine.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/1741-7015-11-240>

38

< 1% match (publications)

[Matthew R. Sanders, Helen M. Stallman, Mala McHale. "Workplace Triple P: A controlled evaluation of a parenting intervention for working parents.", Journal of Family Psychology, 2011](#)

39

< 1% match (publications)

[Matthew R. Sanders. "What are the Parenting Experiences of Fathers? The Use of Household Survey Data to Inform Decisions About the Delivery of Evidence-Based Parenting Interventions to Fathers", Child Psychiatry and Human Development, 05/07/2010](#)

40

< 1% match (student papers from 22-Jul-2011)

[Submitted to The Hong Kong Polytechnic University on 2011-07-22](#)

41

< 1% match (Internet from 06-Jul-2010)

[http://www.algomafamilyservices.org/userfiles/file/News/Triple%20P%20\(May%202010\)\)/7-Sanders%202008.pdf](http://www.algomafamilyservices.org/userfiles/file/News/Triple%20P%20(May%202010))/7-Sanders%202008.pdf)

42

< 1% match (Internet from 09-Sep-2017)

http://theses.ucalgary.ca/jspui/bitstream/11023/3380/3/ucalgary_2016_smygwyat_serena.pdf

43 < 1% match (Internet from 26-Apr-2014)
http://crosscentre.tungwahcsd.org/data/publish/EPA_Full_Report.pdf

44 < 1% match (publications)
[Yulina Eva Riany, Monica Cuskelly, Pamela Meredith. "Parenting Style and Parent-Child Relationship: A Comparative Study of Indonesian Parents of Children with and without Autism Spectrum Disorder \(ASD\)", Journal of Child and Family Studies, 2017](#)

45 < 1% match (Internet from 22-Apr-2014)
http://www.prevencionbasadaenlaevidencia.net/uploads/PDF/RP_Preventing_young_people_disorders_NRCIM.pdf

46 < 1% match (Internet from 15-Mar-2010)
<http://www.pitt.edu/~momchild/publications/FINAL%20JACP%20manuscript%20on%20resilience%20april%202007.pdf>

47 < 1% match (publications)
[Ahsan, M. Tariq Sharma, Umesh Deppeler, . "Exploring pre-service teachers' perceived teaching-efficacy, attitudes and concerns about inclusive ", International Journal of Whole Schooling, Sept 2012 Issue](#)

48 < 1% match (publications)
["Handbook of Resilience in Children", Springer Nature, 2013](#)

49 < 1% match (publications)
[Anilena Mejia, Ania Filus, Rachel Calam, Alina Morawska, Matthew R. Sanders. "Validation of the Spanish version of the CAPES", International Journal of Behavioral Development, 2015](#)

50 < 1% match (Internet from 10-May-2010)
http://www98.griffith.edu.au/dspace/bitstream/10072/20750/1/52400_1.pdf

51 < 1% match (publications)
[Alina Morawska. "Is the Triple P-Positive Parenting Program Acceptable to Parents from Culturally Diverse Backgrounds?", Journal of Child and Family Studies, 11/09/2010](#)

52 < 1% match (publications)
[Tatu Vanhanen. "Evolution, IQ, and Wealth", Emerald, 2012](#)

< 1% match (Internet from 07-Nov-2015)

53

<http://www.researchgate.net/publication>[/51599828_Stepping_Stones_Triple_P_seminars_for_parents_of_a_child_with_a_disability_A_randomized_c](#)

54

< 1% match (student papers from 28-Feb-2013)

[Submitted to CSU, San Jose State University on 2013-02-28](#)

55

< 1% match (Internet from 21-Sep-2017)

<http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?amp=&article=7595&context=etd>

56

< 1% match (Internet from 24-Apr-2016)

<http://media.proquest.com/media/pg/classic/doc/2160339561/fmt/ai/rep/NPDF?s=QzmngmXsVbRX430vKqyiSWz7tu0%3D>

57

< 1% match (Internet from 25-May-2012)

<http://www.springerlink.com/content/5wx745442jwx72vj/fulltext.html>

58

< 1% match (Internet from 08-Sep-2017)

https://kuscholarworks.ku.edu/bitstream/handle/1808/6272/Counts_ku_0099D_10809_DATA_1.pdf?isAllowed=y&sequence=1

59

< 1% match (Internet from 29-May-2016)

<http://eprints.lancs.ac.uk/64809/1/S135246581300009Xa.pdf>

60

< 1% match (Internet from 14-Aug-2017)

<http://www.gjcpp.org/en/article.php?article=108&issue=19>

61

< 1% match (Internet from 20-May-2010)

<http://data.healthis.org/pv/200804/a05.pdf>

62

< 1% match (Internet from 14-Nov-2013)

<http://www.thefreelibrary.com/Korean+parents'+identification+of+emotional+and+behavioral+problems...-a0102695394>**paper text:**

44 **DOI 10.1007/s10826-** 013-9821 **-3 ORIGINAL PAPER** Understanding **Parenting**
Practices **and**

Parents' Views of Parenting Programs: A Survey Among Indonesian Parents Residing in Indonesia and Australia Agnes Sumargi • Kate Sofronoff • Alina Morawska Published online: 25 August 2013 Ó Springer Science+Business Media New York 2013 Abstract Parenting practices have been studied extensively in developed countries, but there are only limited parenting studies conducted in developing countries, such as Indonesia, the fourth most populated country in the world. Additionally, evidence-based parenting

5 **programs that aim to reduce** parenting risks **and**

2 **child emotional and behavioral problems** are not available **for**

Indonesian families.

20 **It is, therefore, important to** understand Indonesian **parents' parenting** practices **and**

needs for accessing parenting programs in order to

5 **contribute to the develop- ment of**

culturally relevant parenting programs for Indonesian families. In this study, a survey was conducted to explore different aspects of parenting practices and parents' views of parenting programs within an Indonesian population. Participants were 273 Indonesian parents residing in Indonesia and Australia

25 **who had a child aged 2–12 years**

old. Results indicate that most parents showed a high level of parental self-efficacy, parental adjustment, family relationships, and parental team work. They also reported low levels of

13 **dysfunctional parenting practices and child emotional and behavioral problems.**

No statistical differences were found in parenting practices and child emotional and behavioral problems between parents residing in Indonesia and Australia. Further investigation showed that many parents still used ineffective parenting strategies (e.g., shouting) when dealing with child misbehavior. Most parents were not familiar with existing parenting programs, but they indicated a moderate to high level of interest in participating in a parenting program, and noted several preferences for the delivery of such a A. Sumargi (&

K. Sofronoff A. Morawska

²¹**School of Psychology, The University of Queensland, St Lucia, Brisbane, QLD 4072, Australia e-mail: agnes.sumargi@uqconnect .edu.au**

program. Parents showed a preference for having

²⁴**an evi- dence-based parenting program**, particularly a

'light touch intervention' that is affordable and conducted in an accessible place. Limitations of the study are also dis- cussed, along with suggestions for future research and implications of findings. Keywords Parenting practices Parenting

⁹**risk and protective factors Child emotional** and behavioral **problems**

Parenting program Indonesian parents Introduction

²⁶**Research has indicated that the quality of parenting that children receive has an impact on overall child** develop- ment, **including social and emotional development. Par-**

enting factors that have been found to increase the

²**risk of child emotional and behavioral problems**

¹⁴**include the lack of a warm, positive relationship with parents, insecure attachment, inflexible or inconsistent discipline, inadequate supervision of and involvement with children, marital conflict and** break down, **and parental psychopathology** such as **maternal depression and parenting stress**

(Anthony

¹⁶**et al. 2005**; Miller **et al.** 1993; Patterson **et al.** 1989). **In**

contrast, protective factors that

53 **have been shown to** reduce children's **risk of developing emotional and behavioral problems**

include supportive family relationships,

41 **access to professional** supports **for** child **emotional and behavioral problems, and**

participation in an evidence-based parenting program (Armistead et al. 2002; Belsky 1984; Sanders 2003).
Parenting

48 **risk and protective factors have** been studied extensively **in**

developed countries

16 **(e.g., Nelson et al. 2007; Whittaker et al. 2011).**

However, there are only limited studies that focus on these issues in developing countries such as in Indonesia, which

44 **is the fourth most** populated **country in the world**

(United States Census Bureau 2012). The focus of parenting studies in Indonesia to date has been limited to parenting style and social adjustment in adolescents (Hanif 2005; Mahmud 2003; Rahmania and Putra 2006), and emotional and behavioral problems at school among children in kindergarten (Izzaty and Nuryoto 2006). Anthropological studies from Central Java have anecdotally shown that Indonesian parents and their children had warm relationships but parents used potentially ineffective strategies in managing child problem behavior (Geertz 1961; Koentjaraningrat 1985). For example, Indonesian-Javanese mothers used permissive approaches in disciplining their young children, including strategies such as distraction, frightening the child with threats of strangers or evil spirits, and promising children a reward if they stopped their misbehavior (Koentjaraningrat 1985). As the children grew older, parents used a threatening look and a sharp remark to shame their children in front of other people. Physical punishment was limited to tiny pinches and quick slaps (Geertz 1961). These studies have limitations as they are relatively old, they use a non-objective measure that possibly includes subjective bias in the results, and the studies were conducted only in certain areas of Indonesia. Additionally, these studies describe parenting practices of Indonesian parents without explaining the effect of parenting behavior on child emotional and behavioral problems, or

how parents need to be supported. Thus, a study exploring Indonesian parents' current parenting practices using a broader sample and objective measures is needed. As research has documented that children's social competence is positively

5 associated with parent-child relationships (Arshat **et al.**

2009) and parental self-efficacy (Jones and Prinz 2005), but negatively related with marital conflict and over reactive parenting style (O'Leary and Vidair 2005), as well as parenting stress (Anthony et al. 2005), it is necessary

35 to examine the relationships between parenting factors and child emotional and behavioral problems

within an Indonesian population. Research clearly links the impact of evidence-based parenting programs that modify risk and protective factors to decreases in child emotional and behavioral problems and dysfunctional parenting and improvements in parent-child relationships. Thomas and Zimmer-Gembeck (2007) conducted a meta-analytic review of two widely disseminated evidence-based parenting programs,

50 Parent-Child Interaction Therapy and the Positive Parenting Program (Triple P), and

found that both

36 programs were effective in reducing child behavior and parenting

problems. In addition,

32 a meta-analysis by de Graaf et al. (2008)

revealed that parents who voluntarily attend an evidence-based parenting program do increase their parenting efficacy in managing child misbehavior and reduce their use of ineffective parenting strategies. The program has also been found effective in decreasing parental stress and improving family relationships (Sanders and McFarland 2000; Wiggins et al. 2009). There is also evidence that

5 dissemination of an evidence-based parenting program **to parents**

in a developing country resulted in positive parenting skills and reduction in child

5 **behavioral problems** (Fayyad et al. 2010). Despite **the** importance of

evidence-based

33 **parenting programs in preventing and reducing child emotional and behavioral problems**, Indonesia as a

country that has a substantial number of families (i.e., 61 million; Badan Koordinasi Keluarga Berencana Nasional 2009) does not have a large-scale parenting program that specifically aims to improve parenting competence in managing children's misbehavior. Bina Keluarga Balita (BKB), a parenting program established by the Indonesian government, has a main focus on promoting the developmental milestones of children below the age of 6 (Badan Koordinasi Keluarga Berencana Nasional 2006), and does not specifically address the issue of parenting practices to reduce child emotional and behavioral problems. Other existing parenting programs in the Indonesian community, such as Sekolah Orangtua, pay attention to the parent-child relationships issue (SekolahOrangtua.com 2009), but the program has not been evaluated. Although no known published data is available on rates of child emotional and behavioral problems in Indonesia, it has been reported that 2.3 million children or 3 % of the total number of children in 2006 experienced violence (Ministry of Women Empowerment and Child Protection 2011). The National Commission for Child Protection in Indonesia (2011) has also indicated that reported child abuse rates increased from 1,998 cases in 2009 to 2,413 cases in 2010 and 2,508 cases in 2011. These data further support the need for an evidence-based parenting program in Indonesia. Meanwhile, in Australia,

40 **evidence-based parenting programs**, such as the **Triple P**, are widely available.

40 **Triple P is a behavioral** family intervention **that aims to prevent** child emotional and **behavioral**

problems by enhancing parenting competence (Sanders 2008). A large-scale population trial in Australia using the Triple P multi-level intervention system showed that the program significantly reduced levels of child

22 **emotional and behavioral problems, dysfunctional parenting practices, and parenting stress** (Sanders et al. 2008). The

efficacy of Triple P has also been shown in several countries in Asia, such as

22 **Hong Kong and Japan (Leung et al. 2003; Matsumoto et al. 2010), however,**

an evaluation for Indonesian parents either in Australia or Indonesia has not yet been conducted. The survey conducted in the present study had two aims. Firstly, it explored different aspects of parenting practices among Indonesians residing in Indonesia and Australia. This included risk and protective parenting

55 **factors, such as parental self-efficacy, dysfunctional parenting practices,**
parental **stress, family relationships, and parental**

team- work,

4 **as well as the prevalence of child emotional and behavioral problems.**

The relationships between parenting factors and

2 **child emotional and behavioral** problem were **also examined.**

It was expected that there would be significant relationships between each parenting factor

2 **and child emotional and behavioral problems**

reported by Indonesian parents. Secondly, the survey explored Indonesian parents' views about parenting programs, particularly parent familiarity with the existing parenting programs, their level of participation in these programs, and any barriers to their participation in the programs. Parents' interest in participating in a parenting program, parents' preferred delivery formats and parents' preferred features of a parenting program were also examined as these determine how such an intervention should be designed. The present study contributes to the evaluation of the existing parenting programs and to the development of new programs or trials by considering the perspective of the consumers—Indonesian parents. The targeted population in the present study was Indonesian parents residing in Indonesia and Australia. Indonesian parents in Australia were included because there is a growing number of Indonesians who stay both permanently and temporarily in Australia. The Department of Immigration and Citizenship (2012) reported that Indonesia was the 18th largest migrant community in Australia and the ninth largest provider of overseas students to Australia in 2010. To date, there is no study investigating parenting practices of Indonesian migrants in Australia, it is thus interesting to examine whether the parenting practices of Indonesians residing in Australia are similar or different from those in Indonesia. Migration is a stressful experience that can influence the mental health of parents and their children (Bhugra 2004; Masaud et al. 2010). The family may experience a loss of familiar environment and well-established relationships to the home country. Migrant parents from collectivist cultures, which emphasize obedience in parent-child

relationships, have reported difficulties in rearing their children in individualistic cultures, which place high values on egalitarian relationships (Renzaho et al. 2011; Sims and Omaji 1999). A higher level of stress experienced by migrant parents might trigger a more punitive parenting style (Su and Hynie 2011) and put children

48 **at risk** for **developing emotional and behavioral problems**

(Siantz et al. 2010). Understanding similarities and differences in parenting practices and concerns between Indonesians residing in Indonesia and Australia provides a strong basis for designing culturally-appropriate programs and services to promote the well-being of parents and children in Indonesia as well as in Australia. To date, studies on parenting practices, particularly parenting risks and protective factors within an Indonesian population, are still limited. Although there is a report on child abuse rates in Indonesia, no published data is currently available

59 **on the** rates **of child emotional and behavioral problems**. This indicates **the need for**

a study to estimate the prevalence

11 **rates of child emotional and behavioral problems and**

explore the relationships

4 **between parenting** factors **and child emotional and behavioral problems**.

Furthermore, no evidence-based parenting program is available currently for Indonesian families. There is also a lack of evaluation on the existing parenting programs from the consumers' perspective. The present study addresses these gaps in the parenting literature as it describes the current parenting practices of a sample of Indonesian parents and shows patterns of relationships between parenting factors and child

5 **emotional and behavioral problems**. The survey **conducted** included **a** broader sample **of**

Indonesian parents residing in Indonesia and Australia. It assessed the needs for parenting programs identified by parents themselves. The results of this study could contribute to the design of a parenting program that is appropriate and relevant for Indonesian families. Method Participants

18 **This study was cleared in accordance with the ethical review processes of**

the University of Queensland and the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research

guide- lines.

37 Participation in this study was voluntary and anonymous. All participants provided **consent**

after receiving information about the study. Participants both in Indonesia and Australia

10 were recruited mostly from a social networking website (i.e., Facebook), mailing lists of Indonesian **community**

orga- nizations, and e-mail. Invitation to

10 participate in the study was posted on the Facebook page of the

first author and colleagues that agreed to disseminate the survey to pro- spective parents.

10 This included a short description of the study,

10 eligibility criteria for participation (i.e., parents of children aged 2–12 years

that currently live with their child in Indonesia or Australia), and a hyperlink to the survey. A similar invitation was posted on Indonesian community mailing lists in Australia (e.g., Indonesian Islamic Society in Brisbane, Western Australia Indonesian Catholic Com- munity, University of Queensland Indonesia Student Association) and Indonesia (e.g., Sekolah Rumah, AusAid Alumni, Parenting Indonesia), after receiving consent from the moderators of the mailing lists. An e-mail about the survey was also sent to the acquaintances of the first author that met the eligibility criteria, or to those that agreed to pass the information to prospective participants. In addition to online recruitment, personal approach was used to recruit parents in Indonesia who did not have internet access. The participants were recruited using incidental sampling from three work places, one religious group, and two neighborhoods in Surabaya and Denpasar, Indonesia. Data collectors in Indonesia approached pro- spective participants who

38 met the eligibility criteria and told them about the study using the

information sheet provided. A paper version of the questionnaire was then distributed to the parents who agreed to participate. Similarly, incidental sampling method was used to recruit a few participants in Australia. The first author distributed half-page flyers consisting of information about the study and the survey link to prospective participants in Indonesian community events. Parents were also informed that a paper-based questionnaire was available if they preferred to complete this rather than the online questionnaire. Participants involved in this study were 273 Indonesian parents residing in Indonesia and Australia who had

25 at least one child aged 2–12 years

old that lived with them.

9 Parents who had more than one child in this age range were asked to

select one of their children whose behavior they perceived as being the most difficult

25 as the target child in order to complete child-related questions in the

survey. In two-parent families, only one parent completed the survey. Of the 273 participating parents, 210 resided in Indonesia (77 %) and 63 resided in Australia (23 %) at the time of this study. Of the participants who resided in Australia, 43 % had been living in Australia for 1–3 years with 27 % for less than a year, 11 % for 4–6 years, and 19 % for more than 6 years. Participants currently or previously lived in various parts of Indonesia, including Jakarta (11 %) and Surabaya (36 %), the biggest cities of Indonesia. Demographic characteristics of participating parents residing in Indonesia and Australia are summarized in Table 1. There were more mothers in Indonesia (73 %) and Australia (86 %) than fathers who participated in this study. The mean ages of mothers and fathers residing in Indonesia were 34.74 (SD = 4.75) and 38.42 (SD = 7.11) respectively, which is comparable to the mean ages of mothers and fathers residing in Australia, 34.37 (SD = 3.51) and 38.67 (SD = 4.90) respectively. Parents in Indonesia came from more diverse ethnic backgrounds and have different levels of education than parents in Australia. More than a half of parents in both samples were Javanese (59 % in Indonesia and 35 % in Australia) and Chinese descendants (20 % in Indonesia and 27 % in Australia). Approximately 70 % of parents in Indonesia and 90 % of parents in Australia had completed an undergraduate degree or postgraduate degree at university. Data revealed that the sample in the present study did not represent a typical Indonesian population in either Indonesia or Australia. For example, only 18 % of the total Indonesian population was enrolled in tertiary education (United Nations Development Programme 2010) and approximately 37 % of Indonesian residents in Australia had a higher education qualification (Department of Immigration and Citizenship 2006). Most parents in Indonesia (92 %) and in Australia (66 %) were working, with the most frequent type of work for parents in Indonesia being full-time (71 %), whereas most parents in Australia worked part-time (35 %). Most parents in Indonesia (67 %) and Australia (89 %) also reported that they were

27able to meet their essential expenses in the past 12 months

and had extra money to purchase some of the things they wanted (63 % in Indonesia and 69 % in Australia). Only 29 % of parents in Indonesia indicated financial difficulties. Employment in the sample was slightly overrepresented as the employment rate of the total Indonesian population both in Indonesia and in Australia was 62 % (Department of Immigration and Citizenship 2006; United Nations Development Programme 2010) and approximately 31 % of Indonesians in the last decades had a lower level of living standard (United Nations Development Programme 2010). With respect to the target child, the number of boys in Indonesia (51 %) and Australia (65 %) was slightly higher than girls. The child mean age in Indonesia and Australia was 5.81 (SD = 2.77) and 6.08 (SD = 2.64), respectively. Approximately 60 % of the children in Indonesia, in contrast to only 39 % of the children in Australia, had no siblings. Most children in Indonesia (72 %) and Australia (90 %) lived in nuclear families, however, there was a slightly higher number of children in Indonesia (27 %) living in extended families. The other caregivers of the children that were reported by most participants in Indonesia (n = 168) were grandparents (37 %) and housemaids (37 %), whereas parents in Australia (n = 30) nominated caregivers at child care centers (66 %). No children in this study had any physical or intellectual disability. Only a few children had health problems (6 %) or developmental disorders (2 %).

Measures The survey questions were based on four measures assessing child and parenting factors. The measures were translated into Indonesian by the first author. The translation was checked by an Indonesian bilingual postgraduate student and was pilot-tested by three Indonesian parents to ensure that the questions were understandable. Some words in the translation version were refined according to the feedback received.

Table 1 Demographic characteristics of families residing in Indonesia and Australia

Characteristics	Subgroup Indonesia	Subgroup Australia	Total n	%	n	%
Gender of parent						
Ethnic group						
Marital status						
Education level						
Employment status						
Meeting household expenses						
Left-over money						
Gender of the child						
Family structure						
Female						
Male						
Javanese						
Sundanese						
Malay						
Madurese						
Batak						
Minangkabau						
Buginese						
Indonesian						
Chinese						
Others						
Single						
Married						
Divorced or separated						
Widow or widower						

61Primary school or lower Junior high school Senior high school

Diploma Undergraduate degree Postgraduate degree

17Full-time Part-time Not working, looking for a job Home-based paid work

Not working (e.g., home parent, student) Yes No Not sure Yes, can purchase most of the things they want Yes,

17can purchase some of the things they want Not enough to purchase much of the things they want

Male Female Original family Step family Sole parent family Extended family 153 72.86 57 27.14 123 58.57 4 1.90 2 0.95 3 1.43 5 2.38 4 1.90 1 0.48 42 20.00 26 12.38 1 0.48 206 98.10 2 0.95 1 0.48 1 0.48 5 2.38 35 16.67 16 7.62 79 37.62 74 35.24 146 71.22 20 9.76 2 0.98 23 11.22 14 6.83 137 66.83 59 28.78 9 4.39 17 8.25 129 62.62 60 29.13 108 51.43 102 48.57 151 71.90 1 0.48 2 0.95 56 26.67 54 85.71 9 14.29 22 34.92 8 12.70 1 1.59 0 0.00 0 0.00 4 6.35 3 4.76 17 26.98 8 12.70 1 1.59 61 96.83 1 1.59 0 0.00 0 0.00 0 0.00 2 3.17 3 4.76 26 41.27 32 50.79 16 25.81 22 35.48 6 9.68 3 4.84 15 24.19 56 88.89 3 4.76 4 6.35 7 11.48 42 68.85 12 19.67 41 65.08 22 34.92 56 90.32 0 0.00 2 3.24 4 6.45 207 66 145 12 3 3 5 8 4 59 34 2 267 3 1 1 5 37 19 105 106 162 42 8 26 29 193 62 13 24 171 72 149 124 207 1 4 60 75.82 24.18 53.11 4.40 1.10 1.10 1.83 2.93 1.47 21.61 12.45 0.73 97.80 1.10 0.37 0.37 1.83 13.55 6.96 38.46 38.83 60.67 15.73 3.00 9.74 10.86 72.01 23.13 4.85 8.79 62.64 26.37 54.58 45.42 76.10 0.37 1.47 22.06 a n = 210, except for employment status (N = 205), meeting household needs (n = 205), and left-over money (n = 206) b n = 63, except for employment status (n = 62), left-over money (n = 61), and family structure (n = 62) The Family Background Questionnaire (FBQ; Turner et al. 2002) was used to gather information on demographic characteristics of participants and their family. This included

24 **parent and child age** and **gender, marital status**, ethnic back- ground, **education** level and **employment**, financial **status**,

family structure, child health and developmental status.

7 **The Child Adjustment and Parent Efficacy Scale (CAPES; Morawska et al.**

2012) has two scales, the Child Adjustment scale assesses

49 **children's emotional and behavioral problems** over **the**

past 4 weeks and the Parent Efficacy scale assesses parents' level of confidence in managing this problem behavior. The Child Adjustment scale consists of 30 items measuring behavior concerns (e.g., "My child yells, shouts or screams") and behavioral

6 **competencies (e.g., "My child accepts rules and limits")**, as well as **emotional**

6 **adjustment (e.g., "My child worries")**. Each item

is rated

3 **on a 4-point scale**, ranging **from not true of my child at all (0) to true of my**

child very much, or most of the time (3). The

total score (range of 0–90) was calculated to indicate

2child emotional and behavioral problems

where higher scores on this sub-scale indicate higher

7levels of child emotional and behavioral problems. The Parent Efficacy scale

consists of 20 items

28rated on a 10-point scale, ranging from certain I can't do it (1) to certain I can do it (10).

The

43items in the Parent Efficacy scale are exactly the same as the

items in the Child Adjustment scale excluding 10 items that measure behavioral competencies.

29The total score (range of 20–200) indicates parenting confidence where higher scores indicate a greater level of confidence. Morawska et al. (2012) reported that the

CAPES had satisfactory convergent and discriminant validity, as well as good

31internal consistencies ($\alpha = .90$ for the Child Adjustment scale and $\alpha = .96$ for the Parent Efficacy scale)

within an Australian population. In this present study, the internal consistencies for the Indonesian

49version of Child Adjustment and Parent Efficacy scale

were .86 and .97, respectively. The total scores

20 of the **Child Adjustment** scale and **Parent Efficacy** scale

were used for analyses, except for calculating the prevalence of

2 **child emotional and behavioral problems**. Due to **the** lack of

normative values in the Child Adjustment scale, the following method was used to estimate the rate of

2 **child emotional and behavioral problems**. The total scores of

the Child Adjustment scale were averaged and the numerical anchors of the scale used to interpret the level of emotional and behavioral problems, where the score approaching 0 indicates no problems were observed (very low), 1 the problems were observed some of the time (low), 2 the problems were observed a good part of the time (high), and 3 the problems were observed most of the time (very high).

7 **Parenting and Family Adjustment Scale (PAFAS)**; Sanders et al.

2012) assesses various aspects of parenting and family adjustment over the past 4 weeks. It is based on

34-point scale from not true of me at all (0) to true of me very much, or most of the time (3). The

instrument consists of four scales, each yielding a separate score. The Parenting Practices scale consists of 28 items indicating effective and ineffective strategies that parents commonly use with their children (e.g., "I shout or become angry with

58 my child when he/she misbehaves" and "I enjoy spending time with my child").

The total score (range of 0–84) was calculated

6 where higher scores indicate higher levels of dysfunctional parenting practices. The Parental Adjustment scale consists of

five items assessing difficulty in parental mood or

6 **adjustment (e.g., “I feel stressed or worried”)**

with the possible score ranging from 0 to 15, and a higher score indicating elevated parental stress. The Family Relationship scale (four items) assesses the quality of family support

6 **(e.g., “Our family members criticize each other”) and**

the Parental Teamwork scale (three items) assesses the quality of teamwork between parents

6 **(e.g., “I work as a team with my partner in parenting”).**

Total scores were calculated with a possible range of 0–12 for the Family Relationship scale and 0–9 for the Parental Teamwork scale. Higher scores in both scales reflect problems in the relationships or team- work. Sanders et al. (2012) reported that the PAFAS had satisfactory construct and predictive validity, as well as good

31 **internal consistencies (a = .83 for the Parenting Practice scale, a = .85 for the Parent Adjustment scale,**

a = .78

42 **for the Family Relationship scale, and a = .77 for the Parental Teamwork scale)**

within an Australian population. In this study, the internal consistencies of the scales were adequate. The Parental Teamwork scale showed the lowest consistency (a = .59) and the Parental Adjustment scale showed the highest consistency (a = .78). The internal consistencies for the Parenting Practice scale and Family Relationship scale were .67 and .75 respectively. The total scores in each scale of the PAFAS were used for the analyses. The Parenting Program Questionnaire (PPQ), modified from the International Parent Survey (Morawska et al. 2009), was used to indicate parents' views of a parenting program. It includes three items of Yes/No format about parents' familiarity with parenting programs in Indonesia and Australia (i.e., BKB, Sekolah Orangtua, and

51 **Triple P-Positive Parenting Program) and one**

item about parents' participation

51 in a parenting program over the past

12 months. A question on the

24 barriers to participating in a parenting program was

asked to parents who did not participate in any parenting program. Parents could choose more than one answer provided (e.g., “It was held at a time that was not convenient for me” and “I wasn’t aware of any programs”) and they could write other barriers in responding to the question. Parents’ interest to participate in a parenting program was asked in one item of

8a 4-point scale ranging from not at all likely (1) to extremely likely (4). The

questionnaire also contains parents’ rating on a variety of delivery formats and features of a parenting program that would influence parents’ decision to participate in a parenting program. Twelve items in

84-point scale ranging from not at all useful (1) to extremely useful (4) were used to

represent a variety of delivery formats, such as newspaper article and television program. For the features of a parenting program, nine items in 5-point scale ranging from no influence (1) to a lot of influence (5), such as convenient location and effective program, were included. Parents’ preferences of the topics of a parenting program were asked in one question. The answer choice of various program topics suggested by parents in Sanders’ and Morawska’s study (2011), such as “balancing work and family”, “how to deal with obedience”, and “coping with stress” was provided. Parents could select more than one topic listed and added other topics they would like to have. The reliabilities of the PPQ were not calculated as the questions in the measure represented different concepts and separate analyses were conducted for each part of the questionnaire. The measures used in this study were presented in the same order (i.e., FBQ, CAPES, PAFAS, and PPQ) in paper- and online-based questionnaire. For the online version, a reminder system was set up such that when a participant skipped a question they were reminded and asked if they did in fact want to complete the item. Participants could either complete the question or move to the next question. A back button was provided so participants could revisit previous answers. Procedure Most parents (68 %) in this study completed the survey via the Internet. The online data collection software, Qualtrics, was used for the survey. Participants’ data were automatically downloaded into a database for statistical analyses. A paper version of the questionnaire was made available to participants that did not have access to Internet or preferred to complete a paper-based version. Nine of 63 parents (14 %) in Australia requested a paper version of the questionnaire. The questionnaires were sent to their homes and collected by the first author. All parents that received paper-based questionnaires completed the survey. Their responses were then entered online using the same survey program as the online version. No statistical difference was found between

paper-based and on-line participants in Australia on any demographic variables. There were 87 participants (41 %) in Indonesia who completed a hardcopy version of the questionnaire. Parents received the questionnaire from data collectors at their office, at home, or during a religious event. They completed the questionnaires in their own time and returned them to data collectors who then input the questionnaire online. All parents that received the paper-based questionnaire completed the survey. The paper-based and on-line participants in Indonesia had similarities in several demographic characteristics, such as the age of participants, marital status, work status, the type of family, child gender, and the health status of the child. The differences of the participants' characteristics were found particularly in educational level and financial status. More on-line-based participants (53 %) had post-graduate degree whereas paper-based participants (39 %) had completed secondary education. The majority of on-line participants indicated that they were

27 able to meet their essential expenses in the past 12 months

(79 %) and had extra money to purchase some of the things they wanted (70 %), whereas almost a half of paper-based participants had difficulties in meeting their essential needs (49 %) and had not enough money to purchase the things they wanted (48 %). Statistical Analyses Descriptive statistics were computed for demographic characteristics of participants, parenting

45 risk and protective factors, child emotional and behavioral problems, and

parents' views about parenting programs. Frequency distributions were generated to indicate the prevalence of child emotional and behavioral problems. Four

42 categories (very low, low, high, and very high) that were based on

the numerical anchors in the Child Adjustment scale were used to represent the levels of child emotional and behavioral problems. A series of t-tests was carried out to indicate whether there were differences in child and parenting related variables between the groups of Indonesians residing in Indonesia and Australia. Pearson's correlations were used

35 to investigate the relationships between parenting practices, family adjustment, and child emotional and behavioral

problems. To further explore the nature of relationships, two groups of parent reported child emotional and behavioral problems were formed based on the median (i.e., low and

4 high levels of child emotional and behavioral problems) and a series of

t-tests was conducted for each parenting-related variable. A series of t-tests was also conducted for nine of 28 PAFAS items that indicate ineffective strategies, such as making the child apologize for his or her misbehavior and shouting at their child. The nine items were chosen to describe ineffective strategies that Indonesian parents commonly reported using.

9 **Chi square analyses** were used to explore **the association between parent residential status and**

barriers to participation in parenting program and desired topic of a parenting program. Differences in participation interest and preferred program design (i.e., delivery format, program features) between parents residing in Indonesia and Australia were tested using t-tests. Examination of the missing data found that the percentage of missing values was below 9 %, except for the Parent Efficacy scale (11 %). However,

15 **there were no differences in demographic variables between parents** that completed **the** Parent Efficacy scale **and those who did not**

complete the scale. Thus, no imputation method was carried out and the statistical analyses were performed using SPSS pairwise exclusion of missing data. Results Parenting Practices and Child Emotional and Behavioral Problems Means and standard deviations were calculated for parenting and child variables (see Table 2). Overall, parents had a high level of confidence in managing child misbehavior ($M = 163.64$, $SD = 25.47$), and showed low levels of dysfunctional parenting practice ($M = 25.46$, $SD = 6.67$), parental stress ($M = 3.34$, $SD = 2.59$), family relationship problems ($M = 2.22$, $SD = 2.07$), and parental teamwork problems ($M = 1.57$, $SD = 1.53$). Parents in the total sample also reported

46 **low levels of child emotional and behavioral problems**

($M = 26.24$, $SD = 10.50$). As shown in Table 2, t-tests revealed parents residing in Indonesia and Australia were similar in all parenting and child variables. With respect to paper-based and online participants, no statistical difference was found in parenting and child variables between the two groups for parents residing in Australia. For parents residing in Indonesia, paper-based participants displayed more dysfunctional parenting practices than online participants, $t(201) = 3.70$, $p \leq .001$. Because there was only a slight difference on parenting variables and no statistical difference was found in child emotional and behavioral problems between paper-based and online participants, no further analysis was conducted to contrast paper-based from online-based participants. Table 3 describes the percentage of parental reports of the levels of

13 **child emotional and behavioral problems.** Overall, **the** majority **of** parents

(84 %) reported low numbers of child emotional and behavioral problems. Approximately 6 % parents

reported that their children displayed emotional and behavioral problems a good part of the time over the past 4 weeks. No significant association was found between parental residential status and the levels of child emotional and behavioral problems, $\chi^2(2, n = 250) = 3.51, p = .173$. Nevertheless, 5 % ($n = 9$) of parents in Indonesia and 11 % ($n = 7$) of parents in Australia reported that their child was in the high

16 **range of emotional and behavioral problems. The relationships between parenting and**

child variables were explored using Pearson's correlations. The correlational analysis was based on the total sample as

15 **there were no significant differences in parenting and child variables between parents**

residing in Indonesia and Australia. The results showed that all parenting and child variables were significantly related (see Table 4). Positive correlations were found between

13 **dysfunctional parenting practices and child emotional and behavioral problems,**

$r(243) = .44, p < .001$; parental stress and child emotional and behavioral problems, $r(244) = .41, p < .001$; family relationship

36 **Table 2 Mean and standard deviation of reported child behavior problems and parenting**

factors Child and parenting factors Range score Indonesia Australia t p Total n M SD n M SD M SD Child emotional and behavioral problems CAPES (child adjustment-total score)^a Parental self-efficacy CAPES (parent efficacy)^a Dysfunctional parenting PAFAS (parenting practices)^b Parental stress PAFAS (parent adjustment)^b Family relationship problem PAFAS (family relationships)^b Parental teamwork problem PAFAS (parental teamwork)^b 0–90 187 20–200 181 0–84 203 0–15 204 0–12 206 0–9 203 25.96 10.12 164.39 25.59 25.49 6.73 3.22 2.39 2.28 2.04 1.60 1.56 63 27.06 63 161.51 61 25.38 62 3.74 61 2.02 61 1.48 3.16 -0.72 25.19 0.77 6.53 0.11 3.16 -1.20 2.16 0.86 1.46 0.56 .473 26.24 .441 163.64 .910 25.46 .233 3.34 .390 2.22 .576 1.57 10.50 25.47 6.67 2.59 2.07 1.53

^a CAPES: Child Adjustment and Parent Efficacy Scale. A higher score in the Child Adjustment scale (total score) indicates

23 **a higher level of child emotional and behavioral problems,**

whereas a higher score in the Parent Efficacy scale indicates a greater level of parental confidence b PAFAS: Parenting and Family Adjustment Scale. A higher score in the Parenting Practice scale, Parent Adjustment scale, Family Relationship scale, and Parental teamwork scale indicates a higher level of dysfunctional parenting practice, parenting stress, family relationship problem, and parental teamwork problem, respectively Table 3 The percentage of reported child emotional and behavior problems Scorea Categoryb Indonesiac Australiac Total n % n % n % 0 1 2 3 Very low Low High Very high Total 17 9.09 161 86.10 9 4.81 0 0.00 187 100.00 7 11.11 49 77.78 7 11.11 0 0.00 63 100.00 24 210 16 0 250 9.60 84.00 6.40 0.00 100.00 a The

34score was derived from the mean total score of parental rating

21of children's emotional and behavioral problems over the

past 4 weeks using

7Child Adjustment and Parent Efficacy Scale (CAPES), Child

Adjustment scale b The category followed the interpretation of the numerical anchors of the CAPES, Child Adjustment scale. Very low indicates that the problem behavior was not observed, low indicates that the problem behavior was observed some of the time, high indicates that the problem behavior was observed a good part of the time, and very high indicates that the problem behavior was observed most of the time c No significant association was found between parental residential status and levels of child emotional and behavioral problems, $\chi^2(2, n = 250) = 3.51, p = .173$

11problems and child emotional and behavioral problems,

$r(245) = .33, p \leq .001$; and parental team work

11problems and child emotional and behavioral problems,

$r(242) = .33, p \leq .001$, whereas a negative relationship was found between parental self-efficacy

2and child emotional and behavioral problems, $r($

235) = $-.51, p \leq .001$. To further explore the nature of relationships

4between parenting factors and child emotional and behavioral problems,

two groups of parents from the total sample that reported low and high levels

2of child emotional and behavioral problems

was formed using a median split.

33A series of t-tests was carried out to compare the

two groups of parents on parenting variables. The results revealed significant differences in parenting factors between parents that reported high (above median) and low (below median) levels of

2child emotional and behavioral problems (see Table

5). Parents who reported low levels of

2child emo- tional and behavioral problems

had greater self-efficacy ($M = 174.18$), fewer dysfunctional parenting practices ($M = 22.90$), less parental stress ($M = 2.52$), less family relationship problems ($M = 1.63$), and less parental teamwork problems ($M = 1.21$) than parents who reported high levels of child emotional and behavior problems ($M = 153.78$, $t(200) = -6.70$, $p \leq .001$; $M = 27.94$, $t(243) = 6.28$,

12 $p \leq .001$; $M = 4.18$, $t(236) = 5.24$, $p \leq .001$; $M = 2.83$, $t(240) = 4.79$, $p \leq .001$; and $M = 1.91$, $t($

$242) = 3.77$, $p \leq .001$, respectively). This further supports the suggestion that parenting practices and parent adjustment are related

2to child emotional and behavioral problems. Further analysis of the

mean rating scores of the nine selected PAFAS items from the Parenting Practice scale indicated that parents used different types of ineffective parenting strategies at varying frequencies when dealing with their child's misbehavior (see Table 6). For the total sample, the most frequent strategies were making the child apologize for his or her misbehavior ($M = 2.66$, $SD = 0.59$), giving the child a lecture about his or her

misbehavior ($M = 2.11$, $SD = 0.82$), shouting or becoming angry with their child ($M = 1.72$, $SD = 0.87$), and making the child feel bad or guilty for misbehaving ($M = 1.43$, $SD = 0.91$). Physical punishment, such as spanking, was rarely reported by parents ($M = 0.86$, $SD = 0.86$).

19 No significant differences were found in the use of each strategy between parents

in Indonesia and Australia, except for giving the child a lecture about his or her misbehavior, $t(268) = -2.12$, $p = .035$ and arguing with the child about Table 4 Correlational matrix of

13 parenting practices, parental adjustment, and child emotional and behavioral problems

Variables 1 2 3 4 5 6
 1 Child emotional and behavioral problems (CAPES-child adjustment)
 2 Parental self-efficacy (CAPES-parent efficacy)
 3 Dysfunctional parenting practices (PAFAS-parenting practices)
 4 Parental stress (PAFAS-parent adjustment)
 5 Family relationship problems (PAFAS-family relationships)
 6 Parental teamwork problems (PAFAS-parental teamwork)
 1.00 (N = 250) -.51*** (N = 237) .44*** (N = 245)
 .41*** (N = 246) .33*** (N = 247) .33*** (N = 244) 1.00 (N = 244) -.40*** 1.00 (N = 238) (N = 264) -.31***
 .50*** 1.00 (N = 240) (N = 261) (N = 266) -.34*** .37*** .44*** 1.00 (N = 241) (N = 262) (N = 265) (N = 267)
 -.29*** .25*** .43*** .45*** (N = 238) (N = 259) (N = 262) (N = 263) 1.00 (N = 264) *** $p \leq .001$
 Table 5
 Parenting factors by level of child emotional and behavioral problems
 Parenting factors Child emotional and behavioral problems (CAPES-Child Adjustment Scale)
 a t p High Low n M SD n M SD
 Parental self-efficacy CAPES (parent efficacy)
 b Dysfunctional parenting PAFAS (parenting practices)
 c Parental stress PAFAS (parent adjustment)
 c Family relationship problems PAFAS (family relationships)
 c Parental teamwork problems PAFAS (parental teamwork)
 c 118 153.78 27.77 125 27.94 6.46 125 4.18 2.74 125 2.83 2.13 125 1.91 1.54 119 174.18 18.01 -6.70 120 22.90 6.10 6.28 121 2.52 2.21 5.24 122 1.63 1.80 4.79 119 1.21 1.36 3.77
 \.001*** \.001*** \.001*** \.001*** \.001*** *** $p \leq .001$ a

2 Child emotional and behavioral problems were based on the

parental report of children's emotional and behavioral problems over the past 4 weeks, as indicated in the

7 Child Adjustment and Parent Efficacy Scale (CAPES), Child

Adjustment scale. Median split was used to form the two groups: high and low level of child emotional and behavioral problems
 b CAPES: Child Adjustment and Parent Efficacy Scale. A higher score in the Parent Efficacy scale indicates a greater level of parental confidence
 c PAFAS: Parenting and Family Adjustment Scale. A higher score in the Parenting Practice scale, Parent Adjustment scale, Family Relationship scale, and Parental teamwork scale indicates a higher level of dysfunctional parenting practice, parenting stress,

family relationship problem, and parental teamwork problem, respectively Table 6 Parents' use of ineffective strategies for dealing with children's misbehavior over the past 4 weeks by residential status Scale items of dysfunctional parenting practices (PAFAS- Indonesia Australia t p Total parenting practice)a

38n M SD n M SD N M (SD) Making the

child apologize for his/her misbehavior Giving the child a lecture for his or her misbehavior Shouting or becoming angry Making the child feel bad or guilty Arguing with the child about his or her misbehavior Giving in and doing the child's tasks Threatening but not following through Spanking Giving into the child's demands 208 2.63 208 2.06 208 1.70 207 1.41 207 1.28 208 1.29 207 1.18 206 0.85 207 0.69 0.60 63 0.82 62 0.90 63 0.89 63 0.91 63 0.90 63 0.95 63 0.87 63 0.76 63 2.75 0.57 2.31 0.78 1.79 0.77 1.52 0.98 1.65 0.90 1.24 0.76 1.29 1.05 0.89 0.83 0.71 0.75 -1.31 .191 -2.12 .035* -0.80 .426 -0.90 .370 -2.88 .004** 0.40 .687 -0.77 .445 -0.32 .751 -0.26 .795 271 270 271 270 270 271 270 269 270 2.66 (0.59) 2.11 (0.82) 1.72 (0.87) 1.43 (0.91) 1.36 (0.92) 1.28 (0.87) 1.20 (0.97) 0.86 (0.86) 0.69 (0.76) * p \ .05 ** p \ .01 a Parents rated in

3a 4-point scale, ranging from not true of me at all (0) to true of me very much or most of the time (3)

his or her misbehavior, $t(268) = -2.88$, $p = .004$ (see Table 6). Parents in Australia endorsed the lecturing strategy

47(M = 2.31, SD = 0.78) and arguing strategy (M = 1.65, SD = 0.

90) more frequently than parents in Indonesia (M = 2.06, SD = 0.82 for the lecturing strategy and M = 1.28, SD = 0.91 for the arguing strategy). As shown in Table 7, t-tests revealed significant differences in frequency for seven of the nine dysfunctional parenting practices between parents grouped by reported level of child

4emotional and behavioral problems. Parents who reported high levels of child emotional and behavioral problems

shouted or became angry (M = 1.96), made the child feel bad or guilty (M = 1.65), argued with the child about his/her misbehavior (M = 1.54), gave in and did the child's tasks (M = 1.50), threatened but did not follow through (M = 1.36), spanked the child (M = 1.06), and gave into the child's demands (M = 0.83) more often than parents who reported

46low levels of child emotional and behavioral problems

(M = 1.51, t(247) = 4.21,

12 $p = .001$; **M = 1.30**, **t(247) = 3.21**, $p = .001$; **M = 1.25**, **t(247) = 2.50**, p

= .013; M = 1.08, t(247) = 3.93, p = .001; M = 1.02, t(247) = 2.80, p = .006;

12 **M = 0.61**, **t(247) = 4.31**, $p = .001$; **M = 0.54**, **t(247) = 3.12**, $p = .001$,

respectively). The two groups of parents did not

23 **differ in how** often **they** made **the child** apologize or gave **the child**

a lecture for his or her misbehavior. Parents' Views of Parenting Programs Familiarity with Existing Parenting Programs To measure familiarity with the existing parenting programs, parents were asked if they had heard of parenting programs in Indonesia (i.e., BKB and Sekolah Orngtua), and a parenting program in Australia (i.e., Triple P). As shown in Table 8, most parents in Indonesia (62 %) and Australia (67 %) were not familiar with the BKB program, and only 22 % of parents in Indonesia and 20 % of parents in Australia recognized the program. Similarly, most parents in Indonesia (54 %) and Australia (67 %) were not familiar with the Sekolah Orngtua program, and only 27 % of parents in Indonesia and 16 % of parents in Australia were familiar with the program. For Triple P, a significant association between parents' residential status and familiarity with parenting programs was found, $\chi^2(2, n = 241) = 10.12, p = .006$. Parents in Australia were more likely to have heard about the program (26 %) and less likely to feel unsure if they were familiar with the program or not (15 %) than parents in Indonesia (10 and 21 % of parents knew about and felt unsure about the program, respectively). Nevertheless, more than half of the parents in Australia (59 %), as well as in Indonesia (69 %) had never heard of Triple P. Participation in Existing Parenting Programs The majority of parents in Indonesia (80 %) and Australia (83 %) had not participated in any parenting program in the past 12 months (see Table 8). Only small proportions of parents indicated their participation in the BKB program (2 % parents in each country), Sekolah Orngtua program (2 % parents in Indonesia only), and Triple P (1 % parents in Indonesia and 5 % parents in Australia). Approximately 11 % parents in Indonesia and 5 % parents in Australia reported that they participated in other parenting or child development program running at school or community (e.g., Posyandu or Integrated Health Service Post). A small number of parents in Indonesia (7 %) and Australia (8 %) could not recall the name of the program they had attended. Parents who had not participated in any parenting program in the past 12 months identified several barriers to participation (see Table 9). Overall, the four most frequently reported barriers were parents having no concern about their children's behavior (48 %), parents not aware of the program (44 %), the program not being held at a convenient time (32 %), and parents having competing work commitments (28 %). Chi square analyses revealed Table 7 Parents' use of ineffective strategies for dealing with children's misbehavior over the past 4 weeks by level of child emotional and behavioral problems Scale items of dysfunctional parenting practices (PAFAS-Parenting Practice)a Child emotional and behavioral problems t (CAPES-Child Adjustment Scale)b p High (n = 127) Low (n = 122)c M SD M SD Making the child apologize for his or her misbehavior Giving the child a lecture for his or her misbehavior Shouting or becoming angry

Making the child feel bad or guilty Arguing with the child about his/her misbehavior Giving in and doing the child's tasks Threatening but not following through Spanking Giving into the child's demands 2.64 0.61 2.12 0.78 1.96 0.85 1.65 0.84 1.54 0.94 1.50 0.91 1.36 0.97 1.06 0.94 0.83 0.79 2.70 0.59 2.13 0.86 1.51 0.85 1.30 0.92 1.25 0.88 1.08 0.75 1.02 0.94 0.61 0.71 0.54 0.68 -0.77 .440 -0.14 .892 4.21 \.001*** 3.21 \.001*** 2.50 .013* 3.93 \.001*** 2.80 .006** 4.31 \.001*** 3.12 \.001*** * p \ .05 ** p \ .01 *** p \ .001 a Parents rated in

3a 4-point scale, ranging from not true of me at all (0) to true of me very much or most of the time (3)

b Median score

20 of the Child Adjustment and Parent Efficacy Scale (CAPES),

Child Adjustment scale, was used to form the two groups: high and low level of child emotional and behavioral problems c n = 122, except for giving the child a lecture for his or her misbehavior (n = 121) Table 8 Percentage of parents reporting familiarity with parenting programs and participation in parenting programs Familiarity with or participation in parenting programs (Parenting Program Questionnaire) Indonesia n % Australia v2 p n % Total n % Familiarity with parenting programs BKB—Bina Keluarga Balita Yes No Not sure Sekolah Orangtua Yes No Not sure Triple P-Positive Parenting Program Yes No Not sure Participation in parenting programs in the past 12 monthsa No participation Participation in BKB—Bina Keluarga Balita Participation in Sekolah Orangtua Participation in Triple P-Positive Parenting Program Participation in other parenting programsb Participation in other parenting programs but cannot recall program name (n = 191) 41 21.47 118 61.78 32 16.75 (n = 185) 49 26.49 100 54.05 36 19.46 (n = 180) 18 10.00 124 68.89 38 21.11 (n = 208) 167 80.29 4 1.92 5 2.40 1 0.48 22 10.58 15 7.21 (n = 61) 12 19.67 41 67.21 8 13.11 (n = 63) 10 15.87 42 66.67 11 17.46 (n = 61) 16 26.23 36 59.02 9 14.75 (n = 63) 52 82.54 1 1.59 0 0.00 3 4.76 3 4.76 5 7.94 0.67 3.63 10.12 0.05 0.00 0.50 3.51 1.32 0.00 .714 .163 .006** .830 1.000 .479 .061 .251 1.000 (N = 252) 53 21.03 159 63.10 40 15.87 (N = 248) 59 23.79 142 57.26 47 18.95 (N = 241) 34 14.11 160 66.39 47 19.50 (N = 271) 219 80.82 5 1.85 5 1.85 4 1.48 25 9.23 20 ** p \ .01 a Participants could provide more than one answer b Other parenting programs parents identified were Posyandu—Pos Pelayanan Terpadu (Integrated Health Service Post; n = 4), PAUD— Program Pendidikan Anak Usia Dini (Early Childhood Education Program; n = 11), Hypnoparenting (n = 2), Smart parenting (n = 2), ESQ— Emotional Spiritual Quotient parenting class (n = 1), Program Edukasi Sehat Bagi Orangtua (Health Education Program for Parents; n = 1), Parenting Islami (Islamic Parenting; n = 1), Behaviour Tonics (n = 1), Cool Kids Program (n = 1), MOPS-Mothers of Preschoolers (n = 1), parenting seminar (n = 3), and parenting groups at schools and in the community (n = 8) parents in Indonesia and Australia reported similar frequencies of barriers to participation except in three instances: program time, program cost, and child care facilities. The proportion of parents in Indonesia reporting that a program was too expensive (24 %) and held at an inconvenient time (36 %) was significantly higher than parents in Australia (6 % and 19 % respectively), v2 (1, n = 217) = 7.37, p = .007 and v2 (1, n = 217) = 4.56, p = .033, respectively. Conversely, parents in Australia (14 %) were more likely than parents in Indonesia (3 %) to report difficulties in finding child care as a barrier to participating in a parenting program, v2 (1, n = 217) = 0.28, p = .009.

Interest in Participating in a Parenting Program Of the 269 parents that responded to this question, most

9 indicated that they were somewhat likely (49 %) or very likely (29 %) to

participate in a parenting program in the future if one were available. The mean response for parents in Indonesia and Australia were 2.49 (SD = 0.81, n = 206) and 2.62 (SD = 0.94, n = 63), respectively. Hence, there was no significant difference in the interest in participating in a parenting program between parents in Indonesia and Australia, $t(92) = -1.02$, $p = .311$. Participants in this study identified several topics of a program that were relevant to their needs (see Table 10). The most relevant topics identified by the total sample were balancing work and family (59 %), teaching children to accept failure (43 %), how to deal with disobedience (41 %), how to boost children's self-esteem (37 %), and coping with stress (31 %). Chi square analyses revealed that for each topic of a parenting program, the proportions of parents in Indonesia were not statistically different from those in Australia, except for the topic of coping with stress, $\chi^2(1, n = 81) = 6.31$, $p = .012$. Parents in Australia (44 %) were more likely than parents in Indonesia (27 %) to indicate that coping with stress was a relevant topic for a parenting program. Table 9 Percentage of parents reporting barriers to participation in parenting programs

Barriersa	Indonesia (n = 165)	Parenting Program Questionnaire	n	%	Australia (n = 52)	v2	p	Total (N = 217)	n	%	n	%	%
No concern about child's behavior	Not aware of the program	Held at a time that was not convenient	Work commitment	Too expensive	Held in a place that was hard to get to	Othersb	Not able to find a child care	Not culturally acceptable	Transport difficulties	Not feel needed because other person takes care the child	Uncomfortable accessing a program	Family members were not supportive	Not recommended by friends
75	45.45	68	41.21	60	36.36	51	30.91	40	24.24	17	10.30	13	7.88
5	3.03	6	3.64	4	2.42	6	3.64	3	1.82	3	1.82	2	1.21
29	55.77	27	51.92	10	19.23	10	19.23	3	5.77	4	7.69	6	11.54
7	13.46	0	0.00	2	3.85	0	0.00	2	3.85	1	1.92	0	0.00
1.30	.255	1.43	.231	4.56	.033*	2.12	.145	7.37	.007**	0.08	.775	6.36	.408
0.28	.009**	0.83	.340	0.00	.631	0.83	.340	0.10	.596	0.00	1.000	0.00	1.000
104	95	70	61	43	21	19	12	6	6	5	4	2	47.93
43.78	32.26	28.11	19.82	9.68	8.76	5.53	2.77	2.77	2.30	1.84	0.92	* p \ .05	** p \ .01

a Only parents that

43 did not participate in a parenting program in the last 12 months

answered the question. Parents could choose more than one barrier b Other barriers participants listed were lack of trust and lack of interest to the existing parenting programs (n = 6), and having a preference to access parenting information from books and online resources (n = 2) Preference for the Delivery Formats of a Parenting Program Most parents in Indonesia and Australia indicated that all delivery formats of a parenting program are somewhat or very useful. Overall, newspaper articles were the most preferred delivery format for a parenting program

47 (M = 2.72, SD = 0.71), followed by

individually tailored program

30(M = 2.62, SD = 0.83), and parent seminar (M = 2.61, SD = 0.

71) (Table 11). Parents in both countries reported that delivering a parenting program in religious and work places was useful

30(M = 2.68, SD = 0.80 and M = 2.61, SD = 0.77,

respectively). T-tests revealed there were no statistical differences in preferences for delivery format or point-of-access to a parenting program between parents in Indonesia and Australia, except for home visits, $t(264) = -2.00$, $p = .047$, and self-directed with telephone assistance, $t(265) = -2.27$, $p = .031$. Parents in Australia preferred home visits ($M = 2.76$, $SD = 0.86$) and self-directed with telephone assistance ($M = 2.35$, $SD = 0.72$) more than parents in Indonesia

34(M = 2.51, SD = 0.87 and M = 2.11, SD = 0.79, respectively). Preference on the

Features of a Parenting Program The feature of a parenting program that was rated most influential by parents in both countries was convenient location ($M = 3.75$, $SD = 1.00$). Overall, parents rated all nine program features as having at least some influence on their decision to participate in a parenting program with mean scores ranging from 3.03 to 3.75 on a 5-point rating scale. T-tests revealed parents in Australia provided higher ratings on all nine features of a parenting program than parents in Indonesia. However, the mean rating scores for all program features were only slightly different between groups, and this difference was significant for only four features: program effectiveness, $t(261) = -2.05$, $p = .042$; program cost, $t(263) = -2.26$, $p = .025$; tailored program, $t(263) = -2.65$, $p = .008$; and different delivery formats, $t(260) = -2.60$, $p = .010$.

60**Discussion** The first aim of this study was to describe different aspects of parenting

practices among Indonesian parents residing in Indonesia and Australia. The results of the survey showed that overall, Indonesian parents had a high level of parental self-efficacy and low levels of parental stress, dysfunctional parenting practices, family relationship and parental teamwork problems. No significant differences were found in parenting risk and protective factors and

9**child emotional and behavioral problems** between Indonesian parents

in Indonesia and Australia. The finding of no Table 10 Percentage of parents endorsing desired topics of a parenting program Program topicsa (Parenting Program Questionnaire) Indonesia (n = 205) n % Australia (n

= 61) v2 p n % Total (N = 266) n % Balancing work and family Teaching children to accept failure How to deal with disobedience How to boost children's self-esteem Coping with stress How to deal with whining Television use Encouraging children to do homework Children's fears and anxiety Tidying up Mealtime problems Sibling rivalry Taking care of yourself as a parent Assigning household chores to children Spending time as a couple Othersb Encouraging children to make friends 121 59.61 81 39.90 85 41.87 71 34.98 54 26.60 52 25.62 45 22.17 46 22.66 47 23.15 45 22.17 44 21.67 41 20.20 39 19.21 33 16.26 30 14.78 25 12.20 24 11.82 35 57.38 32 52.46 23 37.70 28 45.90 27 44.26 17 27.87 21 34.43 17 27.87 15 24.59 17 27.87 18 29.51 17 27.87 19 31.15 15 24.59 8 13.11 10 16.39 10 16.39 0.01 .935 2.71 .099 0.14 .707 2.10 .148 6.31 .012* 0.05 .822 3.28 .070 0.50 .481 0.01 .923 0.62 .431 1.23 .258 1.28 .258 3.37 .066 1.76 .185 0.01 .929 0.40 .457 0.55 .525 156 113 108 99 81 69 66 63 62 62 62 58 58 48 38 35 34 58.65 42.48 40.60 37.22 30.45 25.94 24.81 23.68 23.31 23.31 23.31 21.81 21.81 18.05 14.29 13.16 12.78 * p \ .05

a Participants could choose more than one topic b Other topics parents listed were disciplining children (n = 2), encouraging children to be independent and responsible (n = 7), maintaining effective communication with children (n = 2), developing good manner in children (morality, ethics, religious behavior) (n = 5), teaching children life skills (n = 1), preventing negative impact of video or computer games (n = 1), child development (n = 1), teaching children to choose and evaluate friends (n = 1), internet use (n = 1), household management (n = 2), how to develop teamwork in parenting (n = 1), managing emotion when dealing with children (n = 1), how to motivate children to learn (n = 4), bullying (n = 2), how to know children's talents (n = 1), and developing entrepreneurship in children (n = 1) significant differences between parent groups, particularly in parental stress, is not consistent with immigrant studies that have highlighted the stressful experiences in raising children in a new cultural environment (Renzaho et al. 2011). This is perhaps related to less adverse circumstances that most Indonesian migrants experience before, during, and after the migration process in Australia. Most Indonesians have come to Australia not for political reasons (e.g., being refugees), but for work or educational purposes (Department of Immigration and Citizenship 2012). Those who reside in Australia have completed a tertiary education (48 %), are employed (62 %), and are proficient in English (90 %) (Department of Immigration and Citizenship 2006). These circumstances may facilitate Indonesian migrants in Australia immersing into western culture and help alleviate their life stress. Research suggests that parents with lower stress and more social support, regardless of their residential and cultural differences, display less authoritarian parenting. They were more responsive to their child's needs and used less punitive discipline strategies (Su and Hynie 2011). It should be noted, however, that the sample size of parents in Indonesia (210 parents) in this present study was not equal to parents in Australia (63 parents), and this possibly influences the ability to detect reliable significant differences between parent groups. The present study provides a general description of the

4 **prevalence of child emotional and behavioral problems** among Indonesian population **in Indonesia and**

Australia. Unlike other countries in Asia Pacific, such as Singapore (Woo et al. 2007),

5 **Japan and Korea** (Matsuura et al. 1993), **and** Australia (Sanders et al.

2007), Indonesia has no published data

19 **a 5-point scale, ranging from no** influence **(1) to**

a lot of influence (5) involved more than 4,000 parents with various levels of education (Sanders et al. 2007), the Japan and Korean study (Matsuura et al. 1993) involved more than 2,000 parents, and the Singaporean study (Woo et al. 2007) involved 2,139 parents with most participants completed secondary education, whereas this study involved only a smaller number of parents with a higher level of education. The Australian survey measured the

11 **rates of child** emo- tional **and behavioral problems**

using only one question directed to parents over the telephone (Sanders et al. 2007), whereas the present survey used a multi-item scale that required parents to report their child's behavior in various contexts. Nonetheless, the prevalence rates found in this study indicate that children at-risk exist even in a very high functioning cohort. Although it was not significant, the

2 **prevalence of child emotional and behavioral problems among**

the Indonesian sample residing in Australia was double that in Indonesia. This suggests that living in a new culture with different language and expectations may be difficult for some parents and children. Migrant parents and their children often have to change their behavior patterns to be acceptable in a new setting (Berry 1997). The chil- dren may experience difficulty in the process of adjust- ment, such as having a language barrier (Mohammadi et al. 2006). A future study should investigate the possibilities that migration issues influence child emotional and behavioral problems using a larger sample. It is worthy to note that the Indonesian sample was not representative in this study and this may limit the gener- alizability of the findings. Most participating parents (70 % of parents in Indonesia and 90 % of parents in Australia) had university qualifications, in comparison to general population in Indonesia (18 %; United Nations Development Programme 2010) and Australia (37 %; Department of Immigration and Citizenship 2006). The percentage of parents participating in the work force (92 % of parents in Indonesia and 66 % of parents in Australia) are also

5 **higher than the** employment **rate of the general population in**

Indonesia and Australia (both 62 %; Department of Immigration and Citizenship 2006; United Nations Development Programme 2010).

37 **Only a small** number **of parents in this** present **study**

(24 %) reported having financial difficulties in comparison to the

52 **percentage of Indonesian people living in poverty**

(31 %; United

52 **Nations Development Programme 2010). The nature of**

the sample may be related to the recruitment method that was used. Online recruitment (i.e., social networking website, mail- ing lists, and e-mails) may not reach the whole population, particularly families with low income status. Although this study attempted to include parents that did not have access to internet (i.e., parents completing paper-based question- naire in Indonesia), and these groups of parents had relatively lower educational backgrounds and financial status than parents that were recruited online, the sample size of these parent groups (87 parents) was still considered small. Additionally, the sample was biased as the parents were recruited using incidental sampling method. It is recom- mended that future study includes heterogeneous samples of parents recruited from schools and child care centers in more diverse areas in Indonesia. Cluster or stratified ran- dom sampling method should be employed as it may reach families who live in poverty and experience a greater level of parental stress and difficulties with children's behavior. It is apparent in this study that Indonesian parents used several ineffective parenting

39 **strategies for dealing with their child's misbehavior. The**

most frequently used strat- egies were making the child apologize for his or her mis- behavior, giving the child a lecture for his or her misbehavior, and shouting. Spanking was rarely used, which supports the observation made by anthropologists that Indonesian parents used less physical punishment to discipline their children (Geertz 1961; Koentjaraningrat 1985). However, discipline strategies documented in the literature such as threatening and making the child feel guilty for misbehaving, were only sometimes used by parents in Indonesia and Australia. Compared to parents in Indonesia, parents in Australia were slightly more frequent in exhibiting two strategies: giving the child a lecture for his or her misbehavior and arguing with the child about his or her misbehavior. This may show that Indonesian parents in Australia preferred using verbal strategies to make their children understand that their misbehavior was unaccept- able. Similar to this finding, Hulei et al. (2006) found that

54 **Chinese American mothers had a higher level of verbosity than European American mothers.**

Long reprimand was used as a part of their cultural practices to teach their children about moral values, and social norms in the new cultural environment. Thus, it is possible that Indonesian parents in Australia used verbal explanation more frequently than parents in Indonesia because of the necessity to teach their children about social rules that are relevant to Indonesian and Australian cultures. The relationships between parenting

45 **risk and protective factors and** child **emotional and behavioral**

problems have been shown in many studies (Armistead et al. 2002; Kilgore

32 **et al. 2000**; Miller **et al.** 1993). **The present study** supports several **findings** from these **studies**.

All parenting and child variables were found to be significantly related. Furthermore, Indonesian parents that reported having more problems with their child behavior showed less confidence, felt more stressed, and had less family and partner support in parenting their children. They also used various ineffective strategies more frequently when dealing with children's misbehavior (e.g., shouting) than parents of children with less difficult behavior. Ineffective parenting strategies, such as shouting at a child, have been shown to be significant predictors of child difficult behavior (Sanders et al. 1999, 2007). This finding points to the need to provide parenting programs that teach Indonesian parents effective strategies in dealing with child misbehavior. Behavioral family interventions teach parents to encourage their child's appropriate behavior with praise and rewards and to reduce misbehavior by setting clear and consistent limits and implementing nonviolent punishment such as time out, loss of privileges, and logical consequences (Taylor and Biglan 1998). Further investigation on the effectiveness of this type of intervention for increasing parenting skills of Indonesian parents is necessary. The

39 **second aim of this study was to describe** parents' view **of**

parenting programs. It was found that more than 50 % of parents in Indonesia and Australia were not familiar with the existing parenting programs. Some parents (44 %) that had not participated in any parenting program over the past 12 months indicated this was one of the key reasons for not attending a program. The other reasons that were most frequently cited were parents had no concern about their child's behavior (48 %) and the program was held at inconvenient time (32 %). Previous studies showed that time and scheduling difficulties were the main barriers to participation in a parenting program and parents' perception that their child was not problematic was the next (Spoth et al. 1996). In contrast, this study found that Indonesian parents cited parent concern and program barriers more often than time-related barriers. This implies the need to advertise the existence of parenting programs to an Indonesian population. Mass media can be used to reach parents from various backgrounds, including those who have children with behavioral difficulties and those who have limited parenting support (Sanders 2003). The promotional materials should highlight the benefits of the program for preventing serious child behavior problems and use simple, straightforward, and memorable messages (Spoth et al. 1996). In other words, media campaigns can be used as a social marketing strategy to encourage parents to attend a parenting program (Sanders 2008). The delivery formats and features of parenting program should be taken into account when designing a parenting intervention. Indonesian parents in this sample indicated that various delivery formats were useful. The most preferred delivery format was newspaper article and the least preferred delivery format was self-directed with telephone assistance. The other high-rated programs types were parent

seminar and individually tailored program. It is concluded that with the exception of individually tailored programs, Indonesian parents preferred to have a light-touch parenting intervention that includes newspaper article or seminars. A light touch intervention is a brief and non-intensive program that aims to increase parent awareness of parenting issues (Sanders 2008). A few studies have documented the effectiveness of light touch interventions in reducing dysfunctional parenting practices and child

16 **behavioral problems** (Calam **et al. 2008**; Sanders **et al. 2009**),

and in raising parenting confidence and parenting support (Joachim et al. 2010; Morawska et al. 2011). It is reasonable to expect that delivering a light touch intervention in a highly populated country such as Indonesia will be efficient in terms of cost and time as its benefits will be received by a large number of parents simultaneously. The present study also found that both parents in Indonesia and Australia rated convenient location as the most preferred program features. Indonesian parents as a whole indicated personally relevant issues, effective program, professional resources, trained practitioner, and program cost as important program features that influence their decisions to participate in a parenting program.

57 **This, points to the need to have an evidence-based parenting**

program that is affordable and accessible. Having a parenting program in religious sites or workplaces would somewhat influence parents' decision to participate in a parenting program. Therefore, it may be appropriate to use these places to disseminate parenting programs. Holding a parenting program in community sites, such as in religious sites, could reach families from diverse backgrounds and increase parent participation in the programs (Harachi et al. 1997). It may also be useful to develop a parenting program in the work site as a part of an employee assistance program to help parents balance their work and family life (Sanders 2008). In this case, practical barriers to participate in a parenting program such as time constraints, program cost, and transportation difficulties can be minimized. The majority of parents in this study (78 %) showed a moderate to a high level of interest in participating in a parenting program. They identified a number of parenting issues that they would like to see included in a parenting program. Parents in both Indonesia and Australia similarly cited parent-related topics (i.e., balancing work and family) and child emotional and behavioral issues (i.e., teaching children to accept failure, dealing with child disobedience, and promoting child self-esteem) as the most preferred topics. Some parents in Australia (44 %) even indicated their greater need to have the topic of coping with stress. This implies that a parenting program should combine child management topics with parent-related topics to meet parents' needs. Taylor and Biglan (1998) suggested adding adult-oriented issues, such as dealing with stress, to child management training to increase the benefits of the intervention.

15 **There are a number of limitations in this study that should be**

considered. Selection bias might have occurred in this study as participant recruitment was mostly conducted online and used convenience or incidental sampling method. Consequently, most participating parents came from a higher education level and had better financial status than Indonesian parents in

general. This limits the generalizability of the results. A larger sample size that includes a more heterogeneous sample and the use of a random sampling method is suggested for future studies. As this study found that paper-based participants in Indonesia, characterized by a lower level of educational background and financial status, had slightly different pattern in parenting practices, it is necessary that future study continue to investigate this issue, particularly the role of demographic characteristics, such as educational level and socio-economic status, on parenting risks and protective factors. Another limitation is related to the possibility of subjective bias in the child adjustment measure. This study assessed child emotional and behavioral problems from the perspective of one parent only. In fact, most participants in this present study (76 %) were working either full-time or part-time, and 71 % participants reported that they had been supported by other child caregivers (e.g., grandparent or housemaid). Working parents might not have opportunities as much as other child caregivers or partner to observe their children's behavior at home. Future research should consider including a report from the other parent or child caregiver to obtain a more accurate picture of child emotional and behavioral problems. An objective measure, such as observation, may be used to obtain child behavior data in addition to self-report measures. It is worthy to note that parent and child behavior measures in this study were relatively new, thus there is limitation regarding the reliability of the measures and lack of normative values in determining the severity of the problem. The scores derived from the measures, including the

2prevalence of child emotional and behavioral problems,

should be interpreted cautiously. The method we used to estimate the prevalence of child

62emotional and behavioral problems that was based on the numerical anchor of the

scale requires further validation. Overall, there is a general need to validate existing measures of child adjustment and parenting in an Indonesian context. Several other methodological limitations that should be acknowledged are unequal sample size between Indonesia and Australia participants that brings a consequence of lack of power to detect significant differences, the use of a median split to differentiate the levels of child emotional and behavior problems, the use of pairwise instead of listwise deletion for missing data, and inability to assess order effects as this study did not counterbalance the sequence of survey questions. Despite these limitations, this present study provides valuable insights about the current parenting practices of Indonesian parents. Past literature has not explored parenting risk and protective factors within this population. This study inspected the relationships between parenting risk and protective factors and

11child emotional and behavioral problems using a broader sample of Indonesian parents residing in

Indonesia and Australia. It was found that parenting factors

2and child emotional and behavioral problems

were signifi- cantly related. Overall, parents with children at

23a higher level of emotional and behavioral problems

were less confident in managing child difficult behavior, displayed dysfunctional parenting practices more frequently, were more stressed, and had more relationship problems in the family. This implies the need for a parenting program that teaches parents child management strategies and parent-related issues. Unfortunately, most Indonesian parents in this present study were not familiar with the existing parenting programs and some of them perceived that their children had no problematic behavior. It is important then to use media campaign to advertise parenting program in non-stigmatized way and

19emphasize the benefits of the program for parents, children,

and the whole community (Sanders 2008). This present study is unique in that it invites parents as the consumers of par- enting programs to share their views on the most desirable design of parenting programs. The results lay foundation for developing culturally relevant parenting programs for Indo- nesian families. This present study informs policy makers and professionals working with Indonesian parents in Australia and Indonesia about the need to have an evidence-based parenting program, particularly in the format of a light touch intervention. Designing a parenting program that is affordable and accessible for all Indonesian parents is challenging, but the benefits received for the whole population may outweigh the cost involved.

References Anthony, L. G., Anthony, B. J., Glanville, D. N., Naiman, D. Q., Waanders, C., & Shaffer, S. (2005). The relationships between parenting stress, parenting behaviour and preschoolers' social competence and behaviour problems in the classroom. *Infant and Child Development*, 14, 133–154. doi:10.1002/icd.385. Armistead, L., Forehand, R., Brody, G., & Maguen, S. (2002). Parenting and child psychosocial adjustment in single-parent African American families: Is community context important? *Behavior Therapy*, 33, 361–375. doi:10.1016/s0005- 7894(02)80033-8. Arshat, Z., Baharudin, R., Juhari, R., & Talib, M. A. (2009). Relationships between family background and family strengths with children's social competence. *Pertanika Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 17, 205–214. Badan Koordinasi Keluarga Berencana Nasional. (2006). Modul Bina Keluarga Balita [Modules of Guidance for Family with Young Children]. Jakarta: Badan Koordinasi Keluarga Berencana Nasional. Badan Koordinasi Keluarga Berencana Nasional. (2009). Profil hasil pendataan keluarga tahun 2009 [Profile of family survey in 2009]. Jakarta: Badan Koordinasi Keluarga Berencana Nasion- al. Retrieved from www.bkkbn.go.id/Webs/DetailData.php?LinkID=335. Belsky, J. (1984). The determinants of parenting: A process model. *Child Development*, 55, 83–96. doi:10.2307/1129836. Berry, J. W. (1997). Immigration, acculturation, and adaptation. *Applied Psychology*, 46, 5–34. doi:10.1111/j.1464-0597.1997.tb01087.x. Bhugra, D. (2004). Migration and mental health. *Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica*, 109, 243–258. doi:10.1046/j.0001-690X.2003.00246.x. Calam, R., Sanders, M., Miller, C., Sadhnani, V., & Carmont, S.-A. (2008). Can technology and the media help reduce dysfunctional parenting and increase engagement with preventative parenting

interventions? *Child Maltreatment*, 13, 347–361. doi:10.1177/1077559508321272. de Graaf, I., Speetjens, P., Smit, F., de Wolff, M., & Tavecchio, L. (2008). Effectiveness of the Triple P Positive Parenting Program on parenting: A meta-analysis. *Family Relations*, 57, 553–566. doi:10.1177/0145445508317134. de Leon Siantz, M. L., Coronado, N., & Dovydaitis, T. (2010). Maternal predictors of behavioral problems among Mexican migrant farmworker children. *Journal of Family Nursing*, 16, 322–343. doi:10.1177/1074840710376946. Department of Immigration and Citizenship. (2006). Community information summary: Indonesia-born. Retrieved from http://www.immi.gov.au/media/publications/statistics/comm-sum/_pdf/indonesia.pdf. Department of Immigration and Citizenship. (2012). Country profile: Indonesia. Retrieved from http://www.immi.gov.au/media/statistics/country-profiles/_pdf/indonesia.pdf. Fayyad, J., Farah, L., Cassir, Y., Salamoun, M., & Karam, E. (2010). Dissemination of an evidence-based intervention to parents of children with behavioral problems in a developing country. *European Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 19, 629–636. doi:10.1007/s00787-010-0099-3. Geertz, H. (1961). *The Javanese family: A study of kinship and socialization*. New York: Free Press of Glencoe. Hanif. (2005). Perbedaan tingkat agresivitas pada siswa SMU Muhammadiyah I Yogyakarta berdasar pada pola asuh dan jenis pekerjaan orangtua [Differences in the level of aggression among students of SMU Muhammadiyah 1 Yogyakarta based on parenting style and parents' occupation]. *Jurnal Penelitian Humaniora*, 6, 144–154. Retrieved from <http://publikasiilmiah.ums.ac.id/handle/123456789/457>. Harachi, T. W., Catalano, R. F., & Hawkins, J. D. (1997). Effective recruitment for parenting programs within ethnic minority communities. *Child and Adolescent Social Work Journal*, 14, 23–39. doi:10.1023/a:1024540829739. Hulei, E., Zevenbergen, A. A., & Jacobs, S. C. (2006). Discipline behaviors of Chinese American and European American mothers. *The Journal of Psychology*, 140, 459–475. doi:10.3200/JRLP.140.5.459-475. Izzaty, R. E., & Nuryoto, S. (2006). Prediktor permasalahan perilaku anak usia TK [Predictors of behavioral problems of kindergarten children]. *Sosiosains*, 19, 321–344. Joachim, S., Sanders, M., & Turner, K. (2010). Reducing preschoolers' disruptive behavior in public with a brief parent discussion group. *Child Psychiatry and Human Development*, 41, 47–60. doi:10.1007/s10578-009-0151-z. Jones, T. L., & Prinz, R. J. (2005). Potential roles of parental self-efficacy in parent and child adjustment: A review. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 25, 341–363. doi:10.1016/j.cpr.2004.12.004. Kilgore, K., Snyder, J., & Lentz, C. (2000). The contribution of parental discipline, parental monitoring, and school risk to early-onset conduct problems in African American boys and girls. *Developmental Psychology*, 36, 835–845. doi:10.1037/0012-1649.36.6.835. Koentjaraningrat. (1985). *Javanese culture*. New York: Oxford University Press. Leung, C., Sanders, M., Leung, S., Mak, R., & Lau, J. (2003). An outcome evaluation of the implementation of the Triple P-Positive Parenting Program in Hong Kong. *Family Process*, 42, 531. doi:10.1111/j.1545-5300.2003.00531.x. Mahmud, H. R. (2003). Hubungan antara gaya pengasuhan orangtua dengan tingkah laku prososial anak [Relationships between parenting style and children's prosocial behavior]. *Jurnal Psikologi UGM*, 11, 1–10. Masaud, T., McNicholas, F., & Skokauskas, N. (2010). Overcoming the challenges of managing mental health in migrant children. *Pediatric Health*, 4, 603–611. doi:10.2217/phe.10.69. Matsumoto, Y., Sofronoff, K., & Sanders, M. (2010). Investigation of the effectiveness and social validity of the Triple P Positive Parenting Program in Japanese society. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 24, 87–91. doi:10.1037/a0018181. Matsuura, M., Okubo, Y., Kojima, T., Takahashi, R., Wang, Y. F., Shen, Y. C., et al. (1993). A cross-national prevalence study of children with emotional and behavioural problems—A WHO collaborative study in the Western Pacific region. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 34, 307–315. doi:10.1111/j.1469-7610.1993.tb00994.x. Miller, N. B., Cowan, P. A., Cowan, C. P., Hetherington, E. M., & Clingempeel, W. G. (1993). Externalizing in preschoolers and early adolescents: A cross-study replication of a family model. *Developmental Psychology*, 29, 3–18. doi:10.1037/0012-1649.29.1.3. Mohammadi, M. R., Taylor, E., & Fombonne, E. (2006). Prevalence of

psychological problems among Iranian immigrant children and adolescents in UK. *Iranian Journal of Psychiatry*, 1, 12–18.

Morawska, A., Haslam, D., Milne, D., & Sanders, M. (2011). Evaluation of a brief parenting discussion group for parents of young children. *Journal of Developmental and Behavioral Pediatric*, 32, 136–145. doi:10.1097/DBP.0b013e3181f17a28.

Morawska, A., Heinrichs, N., & Sanders, M. (2009). International parent survey. Brisbane: Parenting and Family Support Centre.

Morawska, A., Sanders, M., Haslam, D., Filus, A., & Fletcher, R. (2012). Child adjustment and parent efficacy scale (CAPES): Development and initial validation of a parent report measure. Manuscript submitted for publication. Ministry of Women Empowerment and Child Protection. (2011). Anak korban kekerasan (fisik dan mental) dan perlakuan salah (child abuse) [Child victims of violence (physical and mental) and child abuse]. 1–3. Retrieved from <http://menegpp.go.id/V2/index.php/datadanimformasi/perlindungan-anak>.

National Commission for Child Protection. (2011). Catatan akhir tahun 2011 Komisi Nasional Perlindungan Anak [2011 end of year note of the National Commission for Child Protection]. Retrieved from <http://komnspa.wordpress.com/2011/12/21/catatan-akhir-tahun-2011-komisi-nasional-perlindungan-anak/>.

Nelson, J. R., Stage, S., Duppong-Hurley, K., Synhorst, L., & Epstein, M. H. (2007). Risk factors predictive of the problem behavior of children at risk for emotional and behavioral disorders. *Exceptional Children*, 73, 367–379. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/201229979?accountid=14723>.

O’Leary, S. G., & Vidair, H. B. (2005). Marital adjustment, child-rearing disagreements, and overreactive parenting: Predicting child behavior problems. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 19, 208–216. doi:10.1037/0893-3200.19.2.208.

Patterson, G. R., DeBaryshe, B. D., & Ramsey, E. (1989). A developmental perspective on antisocial behavior. *American Psychologist*, 44, 329–335. doi:10.1037/0003-066x.44.2.329.

Rahmania, H. N., & Putra, M. G. B. A. (2006). Hubungan antara persepsi terhadap pola asuh otoriter orangtua dengan kecenderungan pemalu (shyness) pada remaja awal [Relationships between authoritative parenting style and shyness in early adolescence]. *INSAN*, 8, 211–219. Retrieved from <http://journal.unair.ac.id/media.php?med=8>.

Renzaho, A. M. N., McCabe, M., & Sainsbury, W. J. (2011). Parenting, role reversals and the preservation of cultural values among Arabic speaking migrant families in Melbourne, Australia. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 35, 416–424. doi:10.1016/j.ijintrel.2010.09.001.

Sanders, M. (2003). Triple P-Positive Parenting Program: A population approach to promoting competent parenting. *Australian e-Journal for the Advancement of Mental Health (AeJAMH)*, 2, 1–17. Retrieved from <http://search.informit.com.au/fullText;dn=697787122262352;res=IELHEA>.

Sanders, M. (2008). Triple P-Positive Parenting Program as a public health approach to strengthening parenting. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 22, 506–517. doi:10.1037/0893-3200.22.3.506.

Sanders, M., Markie-Dadds, C., Rinaldis, M., Firman, D., & Baig, N. (2007). Using household survey data to inform policy decisions regarding the delivery of evidence-based parenting interventions. *Child: Care, Health and Development*, 33, 768–783. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2214.2006.00725.x.

Sanders, M., & McFarland, M. (2000). Treatment of depressed mothers with disruptive children: A controlled evaluation of cognitive behavioral family intervention. *Behavior Therapy*, 31, 89–112. doi:10.1016/s0005-7894(00)80006-4.

Sanders, M., & Morawska, A. (2011). Using the media in delivering parenting information. Manuscript in preparation.

Sanders, M., Morawska, A., Haslam, D., Filus, A., & Fletcher, R. (2012). Parenting and Family Adjustment Scale (PAFAS): Validation of a brief parent-report measure for use in assessment of parenting skills and family relationships. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Sanders, M., Prior, J., & Ralph, A. (2009). An evaluation of a brief universal seminar series on positive parenting: A feasibility study. *Journal of Children’s Services*, 4, 4–20. doi:10.1108/17466660200900002.

Sanders, M., Ralph, A., Sofronoff, K., Gardiner, P., Thompson, R., Dwyer, S., et al. (2008). Every family: A population approach to reducing behavioral and emotional problems in children

making the transition to school. *The Journal of Primary Prevention*, 29, 197–222. doi:10.1007/s10935-008-0139-7. Sanders, M., Tully, L., Baade, P. D., Lynch, M. E., Heywood, A. H., Pollard, G. E., et al. (1999). A survey of parenting practices in Queensland: Implications for mental health promotion. *Health Promotion Journal of Australia*, 9, 105–114. SekolahOrangtua.com. (2009). Sekolah orangtua, pusat pendidikan keluarga: About us [School for parents, the centre of family education: About us]. Retrieved from <http://www.sekolahorangtua.com/tentang-kami>. Sims, M., & Omaji, A. K. (1999). Migration and parenting: A pilot study. *Journal of Family Studies*, 5, 84–96. doi:10.5172/jfs.5.1.84. Spoth, R., Redmond, C., Hockaday, C., & Shin, C. Y. (1996). Barriers to participation in family skills preventive interventions and their evaluations: A replication and extension. *Family Relations*, 45, 247–254. doi:10.2307/585496. Su, C., & Hynie, M. (2011). Effects of life stress, social support, and cultural norms on parenting styles among Mainland Chinese, European Canadian, and Chinese Canadian immigrant mothers. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 42, 944–962. doi:10.1177/0022022110381124. Taylor, T. K., & Biglan, A. (1998). Behavioral family interventions for improving child-rearing: A review of the literature for clinicians and policy makers. *Clinical Child and Family Psychology Review*, 1, 41–60. doi:10.1023/a:1021848315541. Thomas, R., & Zimmer-Gembeck, M. (2007). Behavioral outcomes of parent-child interaction therapy and Triple P-Positive Parenting Program: A review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 35, 475–495. doi:10.1007/s10802-007-9104-9. Turner, K., Markie-Dadds, C., & Sanders, M. (2002). Facilitator's manual for group Triple P. Brisbane: Triple P International Pty. Ltd. United Nations Development Programme. (2010). The real wealth of nations: Pathways to human development (Human Development Report 2010). Retrieved from http://hdr.undp.org/en/media/HDR_2010_EN_Complete_reprint.pdf. United States Census Bureau. (2012). International statistics: Population, households, population by country or area (The 2012 Statistical Abstract). U.S. Department of Commerce. Retrieved from <http://www.census.gov/compendia/statab/2012/tables/12s1332.pdf>. Whittaker, J. E. V., Harden, B. J., See, H. M., Meisch, A. D., & Westbrook, T. P. R. (2011). Family risks and protective factors: Pathways to Early Head Start toddlers' social-emotional functioning. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 26, 74–86. doi:10.1016/j.ecresq.2010.04.007. Wiggins, T. L., Sofronoff, K., & Sanders, M. (2009). Pathways Triple P-Positive Parenting Program: Effects on parent-child relationships and child behavior problems. *Family Process*, 48, 517–530. doi:10.1111/j.1545-5300.2009.01299.x. Woo, B. S. C., Ng, T. P., Fung, D. S. S., Chan, Y. H., Lee, Y. P., Koh, J. B. K., & Cai, Y. (2007). Emotional and behavioural problems in Singaporean children based on parent, teacher and child reports. *Singapore Medical Journal*, 48, 1100–1106. Retrieved from <http://smj.sma.org.sg/smjcurrent.html>.

1 **J Child Fam Stud (2015) 24:**

141–160 142

1 **J Child Fam Stud (2015) 24:**

141–160

1 **J Child Fam Stud (2015) 24:**

141-160 143 144

1J Child Fam Stud (2015) 24:

141-160

1J Child Fam Stud (2015) 24:

141-160 145 146

1J Child Fam Stud (2015) 24:

141-160

1J Child Fam Stud (2015) 24:

141-160 147 148

1J Child Fam Stud (2015) 24:

141-160

1J Child Fam Stud (2015) 24:

141-160 149 150

1J Child Fam Stud (2015) 24:

141-160

1J Child Fam Stud (2015) 24:

141-160 151 152

