

Table S1*Exploratory Factor Analysis of Adolescent Information Management with Mothers and Fathers at Wave 1.*

	Communication with Father			Communication with Mother		
	1-factor solution	2-factor solution		1-factor solution	2-factor solution	
	Information management	Disclosure	Secrecy	Information management	Disclosure	Secrecy
Items (Do you...)						
Talk to your [parent] about how you are doing in different subjects at school?	.656*	.657*	-.001	.671*	.649*	-.015
Tell your [parent] about how your day went without being asked?	.829*	.825*	-.001	.773*	.733*	-.016
Keep quiet about what you do during the day?	-.096	.016	.630*	-.456*	-.278*	.530*
Hold back information from your [parent] about what you do on evenings and weekends?	-.201*	-.102	.626*	-.241	-.002	.614*
Tell your [parent] about what you’ve been doing with friends without being asked?	.500*	.544*	.162	.409*	.605*	.362*
Tell your [parent] what’s on your mind without being asked?	.529*	.530*	-.045	.451*	.570*	.197
Eigenvalues	2.280	1.379		2.311	1.312	
Model fit	χ^2 (9) = 79.5*	χ^2 (4) = 33.1*		χ^2 (9) = 52.75*	χ^2 (4) = 9.84*	
	CFI = .74	CFI = .89		CFI = .79	CFI = .97	
Model comparison	$\Delta \chi^2$ (5) = 46.34, $p < .001$			$\Delta \chi^2$ (5) = 42.905, $p < .001$		

Note. Oblique rotation of geomin was used. Factor loadings above .40 are bolded. * $p < .05$.

Table S2*Multiple Group Model Comparisons for Structural Invariance Across Parent and Adolescent Gender*

	χ^2	<i>df</i>	CFI	scaled $\Delta\chi^2$
Parent gender				
M0 (Freely estimated)	210.531	145	.93	
M0 vs M1 (Constraining covariate paths)	219.159	154	.93	3.044
M1 vs M2 (Constraining stability paths)	221.040	157	.93	.385
M2 vs M3 (Constraining paths predicting familism)	222.934	159	.93	.637
M3 vs M4 (Constraining paths predicting secrecy)	223.174	160	.93	.011
M4 vs M5 (Constraining paths predicting disclosure)	224.830	161	.93	1.728
Adolescent gender				
M0 (Freely estimated)	176.747	145	.96	
M0 vs M1 (Constraining covariate paths)	176.315	154	.97	3.438
M1 vs M2 (Constraining stability paths)	176.004	157	.97	.923
M2 vs M3 (Constraining paths predicting familism)	181.63	159	.97	5.785
M3 vs M4 (Constraining paths predicting secrecy)	183.099	160	.97	1.529
M4 vs M5 (Constraining paths predicting disclosure)	194.149	161	.96	156.811**

Note. Satorra-Bentler scaled chi-square difference test was used. M0 = Model 0; M1 = Model 1; M2 = Model 2; M3 = Model 3; M4 = Model 4. M5 = Model 5. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.

Table S3*Results for Longitudinal Cross-Lagged Models Using Subdimensions of Familism*

	Subdimensions of Familism		
	Obligation	Referent	Support
Structural paths			
Familism Subdimension W1 → Disclosure W2 (G)	.31*	.29*	.18
Familism Subdimension W1 → Disclosure W2 (B)	-.14	-.15	-.19
Familism Subdimension W1 → Secrecy W2	-.20*	-.18**	-.23**
Disclosure W1 → Familism Subdimension W2	.02	.05	-.01
Secrecy W1 → Familism Subdimension W2	-.03	-.01	-.01
Model fit	$\chi^2 (160) = 180.599$	$\chi^2 (160) = 176.236$	$\chi^2 (160) = 190.328$
	CFI = .97; RMSEA = .02	CFI = .98; RMSEA = .02	CFI = .96; RMSEA = .03

Note. Unstandardized estimates are shown. Estimates for the stability and the covariate paths are not reported here because they were consistent with the findings presented for the main model with overall familism scale.

G = Girl; B = Boy. W1 = Wave 1. W2 = Wave 2.

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