

EXAMINING THE LINK BETWEEN PARENTING
DISCIPLINE STRATEGIES AND CHILD PROBLEM
BEHAVIORS IN A HISPANIC POPULATION

By

SASHA D. JAQUEZ

Bachelor of Arts in Psychology

New Mexico State University

Las Cruces, New Mexico

2007

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate College of the
Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for
the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
May, 2009

EXAMINING THE LINK BETWEEN PARENTING
DISCIPLINE STRATEGIES AND CHILD PROBLEM
BEHAVIORS IN A HISPANIC POPULATION

Thesis Approved:

Dr. Maureen A. Sullivan

Thesis Adviser

Dr. John M. Chaney

Dr. Larry L. Mullins

Dr. A. Gordon Emslie

Dean of the Graduate College

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I offer my sincerest gratitude to my mentor Dr. Maureen A. Sullivan, who has supported me throughout this endeavor. Her knowledge, motivation, and encouragement, together with her patience, kindness, and willingness to share her expertise have made this project possible. I would also like to thank my committee members Dr. John Chaney and Dr. Larry Mullins for their time, advice, and support throughout this project.

I cannot forget to thank the principals and teachers who so kindly allowed me into their schools and classrooms to gather the data for this project. It would truly not have been a reality without their faith and interest in this thesis. I am especially excited that some of my own favorite teachers from my elementary years were able to help me in the data collection.

I am truly grateful for, and would like to thank my parents, Joe and Nicky, along with my brother, Tyson, for their unending support and patience thus far in graduate school. Their constant encouragement and love have helped me to get to where I am today. They have believed in me and encouraged me to do my best in all aspects of life. Additionally, I would like to thank the rest of my family and friends who have also been there for me whether in person or on the phone. Finally, I would like to thank God, whose daily sustaining love gives me strength to persevere in all aspects of life. Through him, all things truly are possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	3
Problem Child Behaviors.....	3
Parenting Styles	8
Parenting Strategies	12
Link between Parenting and Problem Behaviors.....	13
Popular Measures.....	16
Hispanics.....	20
Current Investigation	24
III. METHODOLOGY	26
Participants.....	26
Measures	27
Procedure	3
IV. RESULTS.....	33
Parenting Characteristics	33
Parenting Strategies and Child Problem Behaviors	34
Other Factors of Parenting.....	37
V. DISCUSSION.....	41
Hispanic Family Characteristics	41
Comparison of Standardization Measures to Normative Data	43
Links between Parenting Strategies and Child Problem Behaviors.....	44
Other Possible Factors of Parenting.....	45
Clinical Implications.....	46
Limitations and Strengths	47
Areas for Future Research	49
REFERENCES	52
APPENDICES	62

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Summary of Demographic Information.....	72
2. One-sample z -test for ECBI and PS.....	73
3. Pearson Product-Moment Correlations between PS and ECBI.....	73
4. Pearson Product-Moment Correlations between SCSORFQ, ECBI, and PS	74
5. Pearson Product-Moment Correlations between BAS, ECBI, and PS	74
6. Summary of Stepwise Regression for Variables Predicting Intensity Score	75
7. Summary of Stepwise Regression for Variables Predicting Problem Score	75

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A parent-child relationship is a unique human tie. While it encompasses many features seen in other relationships, such as companionship, affection, interdependence of action sequencing, some degree of meshing of goals and the potential for conflict, there are some characteristics that distinguish this unique relationship from others (Maccoby & Martin, 1983). The degree of obligation of the parent to the child is immense. Over time, change is inevitable in the relationship between parents and children, but still the relationship continues and adapts. The interaction between the parent and child is a popular topic of research. More specifically, this paper focuses on the interaction between parenting and problem child behaviors.

In the past, various studies have been conducted to examine the role between parenting strategies, and behavior problems in children. While there are many different dimensions involved in this research, the key assumption has been that parenting strategies affect children's adjustment and behavior problems (Aunola & Nurmi, 2005). However, there is research that suggests children and their adjustment may also influence their parents' childrearing patterns (Bell, 1968; Harris, 1995; Hart, Newell, & Olsen, 2003). Therefore, extant research suggests a cyclical association between parenting discipline strategies and child problem behaviors.

While the importance of studying the link between problem child behaviors and parenting styles is obvious, it is of great concern that there is a lack of research studying this cyclical association within ethnic minority groups. One such group that has less than ample parenting and child behavior research is the Hispanic ethnic group. By the year 2050, it is projected that nearly one quarter of the population in the U.S. will consist of individuals identifying themselves as Hispanics (US Census, 2000).

The current document focuses on 3 major areas. First the extant literature of problem child behaviors, parenting styles, and parenting strategies will be discussed. This will be followed by a thorough discussion of the interactions between these variables, including what links are documented in the current literature. Lastly, the importance of research with minority populations will be discussed, more specifically, research including Hispanic ethnicity groups.

The next major focus of the paper is the presentation of an empirical study to examine parenting strategies and child behavior within a Hispanic sample. The goals of this project are: 1) gather descriptive information about traditional family values among Hispanic families; 2) examine the association between parenting strategies and child problem behaviors in a sample of Hispanic families; 3) compare the data with norms from popular measures to determine if there are significant differences; and 4) examine links between family values, religiosity, child problem behaviors, and parenting discipline strategies.

Lastly, the implications of the study will be presented. Implications for current work with Hispanic families will be addressed, as well as directions for future research.

CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Problem Child Behaviors

While it is understandable that there is a cyclical relationship between parenting styles and child problem behaviors, it is imperative to review existing research in each of the individual areas to attain a complete understanding of the task at hand.

Problem behaviors in children and adolescents are prevalent universally, especially in the United States. The Institute of Medicine estimates that between 12% and 30% of school-aged children in the U.S. experience moderate to severe social, emotional, and behavioral problems that can interfere with their functioning not only in, but also out of school (1994).

Research has found that the period from infancy to preschool age is one of the most critical in development, and during these years, many developmental trajectories leading to adaptive or maladaptive outcomes begin (Campbell, 1995). Behavior problems can escalate to more severe forms, and even at early ages can be costly to society because of property damages and the disruption in normal living patterns (Shaw, Gilliom, Ingoldsby, & Nagin, 2003). Furthermore, research on treatment of these behavioral problems has shown that intervention prior to school age has a higher probability of success (Dishion & Patterson, 1992).

The difficulties that are noted in childhood have also been found to have negative effects later in life. For example, behavior difficulties that emerge in adolescence such as drug use and abuse, delinquency, teen pregnancy, and failure to complete high school were subsequent to early academic problems, declining academic performance, and poor motivation (Cairns, Cairns, & Neckerman, 1989). Here it can be seen that behavior problems have the potential to generate difficulties in numerous aspects of an individual's life.

The characteristics of problem behaviors are well documented, and there is evidence that they are the result of both biological and environmental factors that interact with complexity (Martin, Linfoot, & Stephenson, 2005). There are other identified risk factors within families among parenting who demonstrate inconsistent parenting strategies, or high levels of parental stress. These factors include difficult temperament, dysfunctional families, economic hardships, exposure to violence, poor relationships and attachment, depression and child abuse (Martin et al., 2005). Numerous researchers have suggested that some parents may be unprepared or unable to cope with their role as a parent, and therefore, respond inconsistently and aversively to their children's behavior. This situation may be worsened when the child or the parents are affected by developmental disabilities or other health concerns.

Problem behaviors in children can be typified as either externalizing or internalizing behaviors (Aunola & Nurmi, 2005). Externalizing behaviors include negative emotions which are directed towards others or have impact on the child's environment (Campbell, 2002), and can be displayed as anger, aggression, frustration (Roeser, Eccles, & Strobel, 1998), destructive behavior, over-activity, fighting and

tantrums (Campbell, 2002). Children with externalizing problem behaviors often have underdeveloped self-regulation skills as well as under-controlled behaviors (Cole, Zahn-Waxler, Fox, Usher, & Welsh, 1996).

In addition, externalizing problem behaviors are evident in disorders such as attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD), oppositional defiant disorder (ODD), and conduct disorder (CD). Among these disorders, externalizing problem behaviors can lead to impairments in academic and psychosocial functioning, substance use disorder, antisocial personality disorder, and delinquency when children begin to get older (Zwirs, Burger, Buitelaar, Schulp, 2006).

Externalizing behavior problems can be difficult to tease apart between the different disorders mentioned. One successful method that has been used in several studies is the Eyberg Child Behavior Inventory (ECBI; Eyberg & Ross, 1978) which has been shown to be a concise measure of childhood problem behaviors. Burns and Patterson (1990) randomly selected 300 children on the basis of gender and ethnicity to complete the ECBI, many with no history of learning disabilities or behavioral problems. The Intensity and Problem score scales were able to discriminate children with no history of either learning disabilities or behavioral problems from those who were receiving treatment. Another advantage of the ECBI is its brevity as a measure for externalizing problems.

In contrast to externalizing behaviors, internalizing behaviors have quite different characteristics, including social withdrawal, fearfulness, inhibition, anxiety, and unhappiness (Eisenberg, et al., 2001; Roeser et al., 1998; Campbell, 2002). These particular types of behaviors are focused more on individuals than others, and include

disorders such as anxiety and depression (Martin et al., 2005). While there is less research on internalizing behaviors in children, there is evidence of continuity between these problems in early childhood and later on in life (Keenen, Shaw, Delliquadri, Giovanelli, & Walsh, 1998).

Research has shown that both internalizing as well as externalizing problem behaviors appear to remain stable from early school years to later in life (Denham, et al., 2000). Moreover, both types of problem behaviors lead to problems in various areas of life, including school, peer relationships, and mental health (Roeser et al., 1998).

In a study conducted by Eisenberg et al. (2001), researchers observed the differences between children with internalizing and externalizing problem behaviors, and problem behaviors that are comorbid of the two. Of the pool of 315 children who were recruited primarily through local pre-schools and elementary schools, all children with *T* scores of 60 or above ($N = 214$) on the Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL; Achenbach, 1982) were selected to participate in the study. Of the sample, 74% were Caucasian, 13% Hispanic, 5% Native American, 3% African American, less than 1% Asian, and 4% were of other origin.

The results of this study supported the conclusion that internalizing and externalizing problem behaviors (although they can co-occur), are two distinct types of behavioral problems and that they differ in regard in types of emotion exhibited and regulation. Generally speaking, children who were classified as externalizing were relatively under-controlled, scored high on anger, and were only somewhat prone to sadness. Thus, children who tend to act out more may do so because of unregulated anger and frustration. Children who had internalizing problem behaviors were more

prone to sadness and scored low on both effortful regulation and impulsivity. However, it is noted that anger might be difficult to predict in children who are internalizing since they may keep everything inside of them causing adults to underestimate the amount of anger that is actually present. As can be seen from the results of this study, it is evident that there are numerous different types of behavioral problems. This is important to keep in mind when trying to establish links to problem child behaviors.

These findings are consistent with previous research such Huey and Weisz (1997), where as predicted, ego control was associated with both dimensions (internalizing and externalizing) of behavioral problems, but in different directions. Likewise, ego under control was linked positively to externalizing problems in children, and was negatively associated with internalizing problems. Within the sample of 116 mental health clinic referred children, ego control was the strongest predictor of externalizing behaviors in children, whereas internalizing behaviors were explained by both ego under control and resiliency. Implications for these findings are that under control of impulse is expressed through various externalizing or acting out behaviors, and an over control of impulse tends to result in internalizing behaviors like depression or anxiety. Findings from this study were consistent with Wolfson, Fields, and Ross (1987), in that the highest levels of psychopathology were found in children described as ‘brittle undercontrollers’ and ‘brittle overcontrollers,’ supporting the differentiation of internalizing and externalizing behaviors in children.

With a basic understanding of problem child behaviors, focus will now turn to understanding the different ways in which parents choose to raise their children in a discussion of parenting styles.

Parenting Styles

In current parenting research, there are three dimensions of parenting styles that have become the primary focus; *affection*, which refers to the parents' connectedness to the child; *behavioral control*, referring to the regulation of child misbehaviors through consistent and firm disciplinary actions; and *psychological control*, referring to the control parents have on a child's emotions and behavior through psychological means (Barber, 1996; Galambos, Barker, & Almeida, 2003). These three parenting style dimensions have each been shown to have some association with child behavioral problems. For instance, a high level of behavioral control is related to low levels of externalizing problems such as conduct disorder and antisocial disorder in elementary school children (Barber, 1996). In addition, it has been found that affection from parents can assist in children's adjustment difficulties (Gray & Steinberg, 1999). However, not all findings on parental affection are consistent. Various studies found that maternal warmth had a negative relationship with externalizing problems among preschoolers (Miller, Cowan, Cowan, Hetherington, & Clingempeel, 1993; Dodge, Pettit, & Bates, 1994). Furthermore, the warmer a mother was towards her children, the less likely they were to exhibit externalizing problem behaviors. However, in adolescents, parental support was not related to behavioral problems (Galambos et al., 2003).

Therefore, researchers suggest that perhaps it is certain combinations of parenting style variables, rather than their unique impacts that contribute to adjustment in children as well as adolescents (Baumrind, 1989, 1991; Darling & Steinberg, 1993; Steinberg, 2001). Parenting style as defined by Coplan, Hastings, Lagacé-Séguin, & Moulton (2002) characterizes a collection of parenting behaviors, which creates a constant

interactional environment over a broad range of contexts and situations. Parenting styles can be conceptualized as general patterns of childrearing that characterize typical techniques and responses used by parents.

For the last 40 years, a model developed by Diana Baumrind has dominated research in the realm of parenting styles. In a well-known study, Baumrind systematically observed childrearing practices associated with competence in young children (Baumrind, 1968). Subjects for this study were 32 three- and four-year-olds who were chosen from 110 children enrolled at the Child Study Center (Baumrind, 1968). All 110 children were assessed on five dimensions: self-control, approach-avoidance tendency, self-reliance, subjective mood, and peer affiliation. Using home visits, structured observations and interviews, parent behaviors were studied on parental control, parental maturity demands, parent-child communication, and parental nurturance.

The results of this study found that parents of the most mature boys and girls (Pattern I children) were firm, loving, demanding, and understanding. Parents of the dysphoric and disaffiliative children (Pattern II) were firm, punitive, and unaffectionate. Parents of the dependent, immature children (Pattern III) lacked control and were only moderately loving toward their children. The naturalness, warmth, and enthusiasm of Pattern I children were not affected by high parental control.

While Baumrind's research has identified around seven different parenting styles, the three most commonly known and used are; permissive, authoritarian, and authoritative. A permissive parent acts in an accepting and confirmatory manner toward a child's impulses, desires, and actions (Baumrind, 1966; 1989; 1991). The parent will confer with the child about policies and decisions, and will give explanations for family

rules. He/she will not enforce household responsibility or orderly behavior in the child. This type of parent also avoids the use of control for a child, and does not encourage the child to obey rules; but rather attempts to use reason and manipulation to accomplish what they need from the child (Baumrind, 1966; 1989; 1991).

Another well-known parenting style is the authoritarian style. Here, a parent attempts to shape, control, and evaluate a child's behavior in accordance to an absolute standard, usually formulated by a higher authority. This type of parent values obedience and will use forceful measures to get a child's behavior to be in line with the expectations previously mentioned. An authoritarian parent believes that a child should be kept in place and restricts his/her autonomy. This parent assigns household responsibilities to instill respect for work. He/she does not allow bargaining, and believes a child should accept what is said for what is right (Baumrind, 1966; 1989; 1991).

Lastly, the authoritative parent is viewed as more of a combination of permissive and authoritarian parenting styles. An authoritative parent attempts to direct the child's activities and behaviors in a rational manner. Verbal feedback is encouraged and at times this parent will share reasoning with the child and will listen to objections if the child refuses to conform. Self-will and disciplined conformity are valued, but control is used if there is a disagreement between the child and the parent. This type of parent will enforce his/her own perspective but will also be open to the perspectives and interests of the child. An authoritative parent uses reason, power, and shaping to achieve their goals with their children, but does not base decisions on group consensus or on what the child desires or wants (Baumrind, 1966; 1989; 1991).

Since the establishment of parenting styles by Baumrind, other researchers have further expanded this area. Maccoby and Martin (1983) identified a fourth type of parenting style described as indifferent-uninvolved. This type of parent is motivated to do whatever might be necessary to minimize time and effort for an interaction with the child. This parenting style frequently leads to neglectful care of the child. Martin (1981) performed a micro-analytic study of parent-child involvement at 10-months of age, and followed up at 22 and 42 months old. It was found that involved mothers tended to have children who were high in compliance at both 22 and 42 months, and were more willing to let their mother leave the room for a brief period of time at 42 months. In addition, it was found that maternal involvement was associated with a decrease in child demandingness and coerciveness from 10 to 42 months. Furthermore, parents with low parental involvement will orient their behavior toward the avoidance of interactions with the child, therefore responding to immediate demands from the child in hopes to end them instantly (Maccoby & Martin, 1983).

Many studies have found that the authoritative parenting style is most conducive with lack of behavioral problems and positive development outcomes in a child. There is also growing evidence that the authoritative parenting style is associated with children who perform well in school, exhibit few internalizing or externalizing behaviors and are prosocial (Weiss & Schwarz, 1996). For example, an authoritative parenting style, characterized by a high level of parental affection and behavioral control, has been shown to be positively associated with the adjustment of children at various ages (Baumrind, 1966; 1989; 1991). In contrast, authoritarian parenting styles, as well as a permissive parenting style have been found to be related to various kinds of maladjustment,

including withdrawn behavior, low peer relationships, and conduct disorders (Baumrind, 1989; Heller, Baker, Henker, & Hinshaw, 1996). In addition, Maccoby & Martin (1983) found that children who were raised in authoritative homes scored higher on measures assessing competence, achievement, social development, self esteem and mental health, than peers who were raised in permissive or authoritarian homes.

While the focus is on parenting styles, it is also important to gain an understanding of the various strategies parents often use in disciplining their children.

Parenting Strategies

As mentioned earlier, there is a cyclical association between child behavior and parenting strategies. This phenomenon can be viewed in an experiment done by Johnson & Lobitz (1974). In this study, twelve families were recruited and asked to modify the behavior of their children. The participants were given three days in which they were to portray their child as “good” and on the alternating days, they were told to portray their child as “bad.” It was found that on bad days, the child’s deviant behavior score was higher than on good days. Likewise the number of parental commands was significantly higher on bad days, as was the proportion of negative responses. The results of this study can clearly show how parents can manipulate the level of deviant behavior in their children by increasing their rate of negative responding and commands. Through this study, it is exhibited how parenting strategies are in fact able to influence the behavior of children. According to Maccoby and Martin (1983), these techniques of discipline can be classified under one of two headings; power assertion and love withdrawal.

Power Assertion

Power assertive techniques in parenting are those that use physical punishment, forceful and unexplained commands (Kuczynski, 1984; Maccoby & Martin, 1983), yelling and threats (Campbell, 1995; Maccoby & Martin, 1983). This technique used in combination with other parenting techniques is most often used in dealing with aggressive children (Milton, Kagan, & Levine, 1971). On the contrary, some studies have found that power assertive techniques may actually result in higher level of non-compliance (Kochanska & Aksan, 1995; Lytton, 1977). Lytton and Zwirner (1975) found that in children 25 to 35 months old, the use of physical control and negativity from the parent actually increased non-compliance in the present as well as the likelihood for further parent-child conflict in the future.

Love Withdrawal

Love withdrawal is characterized by withholding of love, affection, praise and reasoning, as well as showing disappointment and isolation (Chapman & Zahn-Waxler, 1982). Time out, sending a child to his/her room, or merely ignoring a child are techniques that fall into the category of love withdrawal. In one study, conducted by Holden (1983), attempting to ignore a misbehaving child in the supermarket was found to be highly ineffective in influencing the child's misbehavior. However, it is theorized that in the long term, high frequencies of love withdrawal can result in lowered self-esteem in children as well as avoidance (Maccoby & Martin, 1983). Along similar lines, Chapman and Zahn-Waxler (1982) found that the most effective technique for maintaining child misbehaviors was combining love withdrawal with other parenting techniques such as reasoning or punishment.

Link between Parenting and Problem Behaviors

From previous research, support for the link between parenting strategies and child problem behavior begins to emerge. Through deductive reasoning, the family factors that Stormont (1998) mentions as affecting problem behaviors (such as marital conflict and parenting stress), it can be seen how these factors could also affect the behavior of children. Should a child feel stressed over marital discord between his/her parents, the child may begin to exhibit more problem behaviors as a plea for attention. A child such as this has a lack of social support, which has been documented to be a buffer for families and children (Webster-Stratton, 1997). In addition, research has found that parental aggression toward children at home contributes to predictive power of children's aggression at school (Stormont, 2002).

In contrast, it is also worth noting that children who are found to have more pervasive behavior problems appear to put more stress on families that can lead to differential parenting strategies. Some researchers have found that children with the greatest risk of behavioral problems are those who do not have internal resources or external support systems to help them overcome early difficulties with self-regulation and behavior control (Campbell, Pierce, March, Ewing, & Szumowski, 1994).

One study maintaining that there is a link between parenting strategies and child problem behaviors is Gardner (1987). This study investigated the interactions that took place between a group of mothers and their preschoolers with conduct problems. It was documented that 20% of the time during Gardner's observations was spent in negative interactions between the preschoolers with conduct problems and their mothers. This was found to be almost 10 times that of mothers and children without conduct problems.

Moreover, children with conduct problems spent more time doing nothing or watching TV, while children without conduct problems spent more time playing alone and spent twice as much time engaging in positive interactions with their mothers. In a later study, Gardner (1989) investigated the interaction styles of mothers and their children with conduct problems, documenting those mothers and children with conduct problems who spent more time engaging in angry conflicts. Additionally, mothers who had children with conduct problems were not consistent after issuing a command. Sixty-seven percent of the time, mothers gave a command that was not followed through, and did not obtain compliance from their child. This is consistent with the permissive parenting style (Baumrind, 1966).

An additional study offering further support for the link between these two factors is by Martin et al., (2005). In this study, 77 responses to the questionnaires were received from parents of children age 3 to 5 who had been referred for serious concerns about the behavior of the young children. The surveys completed included the Child Behavior Checklist (Achenbach, 1982), questions about risk factors relating to parents and families, questions about the younger behavior of the target child, parental confidence, perceived support, and current stressors in the lives of the respondents. It was found that parenting characteristics were one of the most consistent predictors of Achenbach subscale scores. The guilt and anxiety subscale scores predicted both the aggressive and delinquent Achenbach subscales. The authors concluded that this parental view of their behavior towards their children presents a high risk for the emergence of serious behavior disorders. This is consistent with previous literature about the surfacing of behavior

problems in children who are involved in a cycle of negative and hostile interactions (Hemphill, 1996; Patterson, Reid, & Dishion, 1992).

Given the considerable amount of previous research examining parenting strategies and problem child behaviors, it is key to address some of the more popular measures used in this realm of research. Furthermore, research on these measures brought to light a common limitation; the lacks of cross cultural validation, especially with a Hispanic population. Specific measures will be discussed along with their psychometric properties and limitations.

Popular Measures

While there is a breadth of research that has been conducted on the link between parenting styles and child problem behaviors, many of the measures used in this realm of research have not been validated cross-culturally. Furthermore, many measures currently being used in research have not been scrutinized or studied for the Hispanic population. An example of this is The Parenting Scale (Arnold, O' Leary, Wolff, & Acker, 1993) that did not include ethnicity diversity in the standardization sample. The subjects included in the sample were 168 mothers of children ages 18 to 48 months. Sixty-five of these mothers had reported to a clinic because of difficulties in handling their children. The remaining mothers had children who attended the university preschool or who had volunteered to participate in studies of parenting. While the Parenting Scale was found to have good reliability and validity, the standardization sample was exclusively Caucasian (Arnold et al., 1993).

Additional research using The Parenting Scale has since been conducted using differing ethnic samples, but still, the Hispanic population has not been included in these

studies. Reitman, Currier, Hupp, Rhode, Murphy, and O' Callaghan (2001) investigated the psychometric characteristics of the Parenting Scale in a Head Start Population. This study included 187 mothers and their children ages 3.5 to 4.5 years old recruited from regular enrollment of a rural Head Start Program. This study was comprised of 84% African American participants and only 16% Caucasian. Other studies such as the one conducted by Steele, Nesbitt-Daly, Daniel, & Forehand (2005) examined some ethnic minorities such as African Americans, but research failed to turn up studies including a significant amount of Hispanic participants.

The Eyberg Child Behavior Inventory (ECBI; Eyberg & Ross, 1978) is one of the most widely used parent-rating scales of conduct problem behaviors (Burns & Patterson, 1990). It was designed as a homogenous measure of conduct problem behaviors for use with children ages 2 to 16 years. The ECBI is a brief screening measure to differentiate normal behavior from conduct problem behaviors in children and adolescence. Although this popular measure is used widely in problem behavior research, there has been minimal ethnic diversity among population samples. Normative data for the ECBI comes from two different studies (Robinson, Eyberg, & Ross, 1980; Eyberg & Robinson). In Robinson et al., the sample included 512 children between the ages of 2 and 12 years old who had been brought by their parents to an outpatient pediatric clinic. The second study (Eyberg & Robinson, 1983) involved 102 adolescents between 13 and 16 years who also had been brought by their parents to an outpatient pediatric clinic. Both of these studies were unique in that they included children with chronic illnesses, developmental delays, and behavioral problems, and on both studies, no breakdown of ethnicity was provided.

A follow-up study using new standardization data for the ECBI reported using a population sample that included Asians, African Americans, Caucasians, and those of mixed ethnicity (Burns & Patterson, 1990). This study included 6% Asian participants, 32% African American, and 61% Caucasian. Once again, no Hispanics were included in the sample and the majority of subjects were of Caucasian decent.

More recently, in 1999, the ECBI was re-evaluated and re-standardized with a sample ($N = 798$) comprised of 74% Caucasian, 19% African American, 3% Hispanic, 1% Asian, 1% Native American, and 2% other or mixed race (Colvin, Eyberg, & Adams 1999). While this study did include Hispanics, this sample was too small to analyze differences by ethnicity (Gross, Fogg, Young, Ridge, Cowell, Sivan, & Richardson, 2007).

On the other hand, the most recent study did concentrate on the reliability and validity of the ECBI in African Americans and Hispanics (Gross, et al., 2007). A sample of 682 parents and legal guardians of 2-year-old ($n = 227$), 3-year-old ($n = 218$) and 4-year-old ($n = 237$) children were recruited from the Chicago metropolitan area. Of the participants, this study included 29% African-Americans and 47% Hispanics. The results of this study do offer support for use of the ECBI with African-American, Hispanic, and Caucasian parents of preschool children from low and middle/upper income groups. All groups had consistently high reliabilities for the ECBI Intensity and Problem scales (alphas ranged from .86 to .95). While the ECBI Intensity Scale showed internal consistency in the study, differences in Intensity scale means and proportions of children exceeding Problem Scale cutoff points were found pointing to the need for additional

research to further explore the construct validity of the ECBI among African-American and Latino parents of preschool children (Gross et al., 2007).

Studies have shown compatibility between the ECBI and another popular measure of child behavior, the Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL; Boggs, Eyberg, & Reynolds, 1990). The CBCL is a comprehensive measure designed to assess a wide variety of specific behaviors in children between ages four and sixteen. It is a more lengthy measure that consists of 118 behavior-problem items rated by the parent on a 3-point scale; *not true (0), somewhat or sometimes true (1), very true or often true (2)* (Achenbach & Edelbrock, 1983). The behavior scale was created to assess a broad range of problems relevant to children's mental health referrals that can be reported by parents. In addition, it includes 20 social competence items to assess children's participation in sports, hobbies, games, activities, how well the child gets along with others and plays or works by themselves, and school functioning (Achenbach & Edelbrock, 1983). To obtain normative data, interviewers were sent to interview randomly selected homes in Washington D.C., Maryland, and Northern Virginia. The racial distribution was 80.5% Caucasian, 18.2% African American, and 1.3% other. As with many other measures, the CBCL did not include the Hispanic population in their normative data. The authors found no other studies of the CBCL with Hispanic families.

However, not all measures have a deficit of research on Hispanic populations. The Behavior Assessment System for Children (BASC; Sandoval & Echandia, 1994) is an integrated set of measures that include self-report, a teacher rating scale, a parent rating scale, and a developmental history all designed to assess children for the differential diagnosis and educational treatment of emotional and behavior disorders.

The original standardization sample included 2,084 children age six to eleven. According to McCloskey, Hess, and D'Amato (2003) there was an under representation of Hispanic children (5% of total sample) that was weighted proportionate to the 1985 census data. Yet a Spanish Version of the BASC (*el Sistema Multidimensional de Evaluación de la Conducta de los Niños*) has been created and is currently being used with non-English speaking parents and children. Using a total of 55 children and their primary caregivers who met criteria (bilingual or non-English speaking parents and children), McCloskey, Hess, and D'Amato (2003) compared the two different BASCs. The results from the Hispanic group closely resembled correlation data reported in the BASC manual, with the exception of three scales. The Attention Problems, Withdrawal, and Adaptability scales did not have adequate reliability. While the BASC is one example of a measure that has included research for different ethnicities, there is still a great amount of research that needs to be conducted before researchers can be confident measures are similar across different ethnicities.

In today's society, it is important to conduct research that includes ethnic minorities; one goal of the current project was to include Hispanics in the research.

Hispanics

This information shows how critical it is to evaluate the validity of scales for individuals from different ethnic and economic backgrounds. With the lack of psychometrically sound measures that have been standardized on Hispanic populations, there are many concerns for the validity of future psychological research. As of July 2006, Hispanics comprised 14.8% of the total population in the United States (U.S. Census Bureau). It is projected that by 2050, Hispanics will comprise 24.4% of the

population (102.6 million). With the Hispanic population growing at an astronomical rate each year; it is no surprise that Hispanics currently inhabit all of the fifty states in the US. Currently, the top five states by Hispanic population are: California, Texas, Florida, New York, and Illinois. Additionally, the five states that currently have the largest growth rate of Hispanics are: Arkansas, Georgia, South Carolina, Tennessee, and North Carolina. Presently, the western and southern regions of the United States have the highest Hispanic populations, with the midwestern region having the lowest population of Hispanics.

A popular question asked by many is, “what exactly constitutes a Hispanic?” According to Merriam-Webster’s definition, a Hispanic is “of or relating to the people, speech, or culture of Spain or of Spain and Portugal” or the second definition stating “of, relating to, or being a person of Latin American descent living in the United States; *especially* one of Cuban, Mexican or Puerto Rican origin” (2008). However, the use of this explanation to define the term *Hispanic* can be somewhat limiting. The federal government defines Hispanic or Latino as a person of Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, South or Central American, or other Spanish culture or origin regardless of race (Ramirez, 2004). Thus, Hispanics may be of any race. To gather this information, for the 2000 Census, Hispanics were asked to mark one of the four categories: Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, or other Spanish/Hispanic/Latino. This last category had a write-in option where people could specify an origin group such as Dominican or Spaniard. There are many characteristics that people believe to identify Hispanics, but according to information from the U.S. Census, these characteristics cannot always be used. For example, over 75% of Hispanics speak a language other than English in their homes

(Ramirez, 2004), however not all Hispanics can understand another language. Likewise, it is thought that Hispanics have extended family members living in the same household, but according to the Census, 81% of Hispanic households are family households. Family households consist of a householder and one or more people living together under the same roof who are related by birth, marriage, or adoption. In addition, in 2000, about 7 out of every 10 Hispanics residing in the U.S. were either native or naturalized citizens.

While the Hispanic population is made up of many different groups or people, the largest group is Mexican (59.3%) followed by other Hispanics (15.7%). The smallest group is Spaniard (0.3%) followed by Dominican (2.3%) (Ramirez, 2004). In 2000, over half of the Hispanic population (52.4%), age 25 and over, had at least a high school diploma and 10% earned a bachelor's or higher degree. These numbers are particularly low compared to the national averages (80.4% and 24.4 % respectively) for educational attainment similar to the number of research projects that have included Hispanics in the population samples. However, with the growing population and changing demographics, it is hoped that the numbers of degrees granted to Hispanics will increase, as will the numbers of Hispanics included in current research.

While the Hispanic population is growing rapidly, not all Hispanics acculturate to the main culture at the same rate. Some Hispanics will hold tightly to their traditional values, while others will adopt the values of the mainstream culture. Acculturation is a multidimensional concept that involves the interaction between two differing cultures and the process of change that occurs as a result of the interaction. This process of acculturation varies with each individual, and includes the individual integrating some of his/her beliefs and values of their original culture into their new culture. When

measuring acculturation, many believe that the best factors to look at are language and length of residency. While these are of great importance to acculturation, there are other factors that are considered as well including: family relationships, and spirituality (Siatkowski, 2007).

More specifically, the traditional Hispanic family provides security and identity for its members. Family relationships are extremely close and oftentimes, advice and help with child rearing are found in members of the extended family. In addition, it is not peculiar for extended family members to live in the same house as the nuclear family (Altarriba & Bauer, 1998). Furthermore, religion is also an important part of life for traditional Hispanics, and is also viewed as a way of maintaining their cultural identity. The majority of Hispanics are Catholic, but there are also a significant amount of Protestant groups in the Hispanic community. To Hispanics, religion is viewed as a more personal practice than institutional practice, and many religious practices take place out of the structure of the church.

As seen from previous literature, there is a need for the Hispanic population to be included in further research in the field of psychology. While many measures are being used with individuals of various ethnicities, little research has actually examined the reliabilities and validity of these scales for these select populations. Therefore, the purpose of the current study is to include Hispanic families and children in the research investigating the association between parenting discipline strategies and child behavior problems. With the shift of demographics that is predicted to happen in the coming years, it is a necessity to have reliable and psychometrically sound measures to assess Hispanic families and children.

Current Investigation

Parenting styles and strategies have been found to contribute to child problem behaviors; however, these domains have not been examined in the Hispanic population. The present study employed accepted and standardized measures to collect normative data on parenting strategies of Hispanic families. This study also included a measure of religiosity to examine any differences in parenting styles and strategies with possible links to religious beliefs. With a wide selection of measures being readily available, it is important to employ measures that are time and cost effective. Although observational studies can be quite useful in obtaining valuable information, this study used survey measures, which were less costly and time consuming.

First, this study provided information about parenting strategies and rates of child problem behavior in a Hispanic sample in which acculturation and basic demographic information will be evaluated.

Next, the data gathered on the Eyberg Child Behavior Inventory (ECBI) and the Parenting Scale (PS) was examined and compared to normative data. The following research question was posed: Is there a significant difference between the normative data and data from a Hispanic sample on the sub-scale scores and total scores on the Parenting Scale and the Eyberg Child Behavior Inventory? If the two samples were significantly different, the results provided support for the need to develop a separate set of norms for Hispanic populations. If the two samples did not differ significantly, the results provided evidence that these measures can be used with Hispanic populations.

Third, the association between parenting strategies was examined in relation to intensity and problem level of child misbehavior. Previous research has consistently

shown that parents with aggressive children are more likely to engage in irritable and ineffective discipline (Patterson, 1982; Patterson, Reid, & Dishion, 1992). It was therefore hypothesized that in a Hispanic sample, less effective parenting strategies will result in higher frequencies of problem behaviors in the children.

Lastly, a multiple regression was conducted to examine the association of parenting strategies, acculturation, and religion on child problem behaviors.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Participants

Five hundred packets were distributed in a Northwestern New Mexico school district. One hundred and fifty one packets were returned, indicating a 30% return rate. Of the packets returned, 42% of the participants were Caucasian, 40% Hispanic, 15% American Indian, and 2% biracial. To be included in the study, parents had to report they were the primary caregiver for a child between the ages of 4 to 13 years old and report their race/ethnicity as Hispanic on the demographic questionnaire used in this study.

Sixty-one parents participated in the current study. Two participants were excluded for not completing the necessary measures, and three participants were excluded for not having a child within the specified age range. Therefore, only 56 Hispanic parents with children between the ages of 4 to 13 years were included in the final analyses.

Fifty participating caregivers were biological parents while 6 participants reported “other,” more specifically, grandparents. The majority of those who participated were females. Most of the parents were married or living with a partner, and the majority were between the ages of 25 – 40. The average education level was some college for both the participants and the education level of their partners. Family income ranged from less

than \$10,000 to over \$100,000, with the majority falling between \$10,000 and \$40,000. All participant recruitment and data collection was completed in Northwestern New Mexico. This area was targeted due to a substantial number of Hispanics living in the area.

Participating caregivers were asked to complete study questionnaires in regards to a child between the ages of four and thirteen. If caregivers had more than one child in the specified age range, they were asked to choose the child who brought the packet home from school and to keep that child in mind throughout the study. The children of the participating caregivers had a mean age of 8.47 (range 4-13) years. There were more female children than male children included in the study. The majority of the caregivers identified their child's ethnic background as Hispanic. Refer to Table 1 for a detailed participant demographic summary.

Measures

Demographic Questionnaire

Parents completed a demographic questionnaire for descriptive purposes (Appendix A). The questionnaire assessed parents' income, occupation, age, ethnic background, level of education, and gender. In addition, it also assessed the age, grade level, gender, and ethnic background of the target child for the measures.

The Parenting Survey

The Parenting Survey (Appendix B) is a brief 6-item scale assessing aspects of parenting such responsibility in the child rearing, confidence in parenting practices, discipline strategies, teaching values to the child, and importance of education. Some items are scored on a 10 point likert scale ranging from 1 being *not important* or *never* to

10 being *very important* or *always*. Other items require the participant to check what applies to them most. This measure was included for descriptive data for responsibility, parenting practices, discipline, values, and importance of education.

Parenting Scale (PS)

The Parenting Scale (Arnold, et al., 1993; Harvey, Danforth, Ulaszek, & Eberhardt, 2001) is a brief and psychometrically sound measure of dysfunctional discipline. It was designed for early identification of at-risk parents and for detection of dysfunctional discipline strategies before severe child behavior problems develop. The PS is a 30-item scale (using seven-point ratings) that consists of three factors: *Laxness*, shown with characteristics of overly permissive and inconsistent discipline; *Overreactivity*, associated with authoritarian parenting styles as well as modeling aggression, anger, or physical punishment; and *Verbosity*, associated with overly long reprimands rather than taking direct action (Arnold et al., 1993; Irvine, Biglan, Smolkowski, & Ary, 1999), furthermore, these three factors are combined for a total score. Scores on the PS can range from 30 to 210 with higher scores be more indicative of dysfunctional parenting strategies. Internal consistency of the Parenting Scale was reported as .83 for Laxness, .82 for Overreactivity, .63 for Verbosity, and .84 for the Total. Test-retest correlations were .83 for Laxness, .82 for Overreactivity, .79 for Verbosity, and .84 for the total (Arnold et al., 1993).

Although the PS was developed for parents with children between 18 months and 4 years old, research suggests that the item-content and subscale scores are suitable for use with parents of older children as well (Irvine et al., 1999; Harvey et al., 2001). Research has shown instability in the Verbosity scale; therefore, in older children the

Verbosity scale is typically not used. High correlations with the Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL; Achenbach, Edelbrock, & Howell, 1987) and the short form of the Locke-Wallace Marital Adjustment Test (SMAT; Locke & Wallace, 1959) show convergent validity for the PS with other validated measures. This measure was included to determine the discipline strategies of participants in the study.

Eyberg Child Behavior Inventory (ECBI)

The Eyberg Child Behavior Inventory (Eyberg & Ross, 1978) is a psychometrically sound measure that was designed to assess the parental report of behavioral problems in children between ages 2 and 16 years. It is a 36-item inventory that is easily administered, scored, and is quantifiably objective. Each of the 36 items is assessed on two dimensions: the frequency of the occurrence and its identification as a problem. The frequency ranges from 1 (never occurs) to 7 (always occurs), and the scores are then summed to yield an intensity score of overall problem behavior. Scores on the ECBI can range from 1 to 252 with higher scores showing evidence of more child problem behaviors. For identification as a problem, the parent of the child is asked to circle “yes” or “no” when asked, “Is this behavior a problem for you?” The problem score is calculated by summing the total number of items that were indicated as being a problem. The ECBI has high internal consistency for the Intensity (Cronbach’s alpha = .95) and Problem (Cronbach’s alpha = .93) scales (Colvin, Eyberg, & Adams, 1999), good test-retest reliability ($r = .86$) and shows validity in differentiating problem children from non-problem children (Robinson, Eyberg, & Ross, 1980). All scores (Intensity, Problem, and Total) were used as a comprehensive measure of child behaviors and the

tolerance of parents. The measure was included in the study as an index of perceived child problem behaviors from the parents.

Santa Clara Strength of Religious Faith Questionnaire (SCSORF)

The Santa Clara Strength of Religious Faith Questionnaire (Plante & Boccaccini, 1997) is a brief 10-item scale assessing the strength of religious faith. It is easy to administer and score. Items are scored on a 4-point scale and questions were designed to measure the strength of religious faith regardless of denomination. Scores range from 10 to 40 with higher scores indicating higher levels of religiosity. Findings suggest that the SCSORF has high internal reliability (Chronbach's $\alpha = .95$) and split-half reliability ($r = .92$) (Plante & Boccaccini, 1997). This measure was included to examine any religious variable that may play a part in parenting strategies or child problem behaviors.

Bidimensional Acculturation Scale for Hispanics (BAS)

The Bidimensional Acculturation Scale for Hispanics (Marin & Gamba, 1996) assesses Hispanics on two major cultural dimensions; Hispanic and Non-Hispanic. The BAS is a 24-item measure that evaluates three language-related areas. Items are rated on a 4-point Likert scale from (4) *almost always*; (3) *often*; (2) *sometimes*; (1) *almost never* and (4) *very well*; (3) *well*; (2) *poorly*; (1) *very poorly* on the Hispanic and non-Hispanic scales. In general, the subscales showed high internal consistency. The lowest alpha coefficients were for the Celebrations subscales ($\alpha = .65$ – non-Hispanic and $\alpha = .60$ for the Hispanic domain). For the language-related subscales, the lowest consistency was found for the Electronic Media subscale ($\alpha = .80$ for non-Hispanic and $\alpha = .81$ for Hispanic domain). Furthermore, when combined, the four subscales showed high internal consistency; Hispanic domain ($\alpha = .87$) and non-Hispanic domain ($\alpha =$

.94). The combination of the three language related subscales was ($\alpha = .90$ Hispanic and $\alpha = .96$ non-Hispanic domain). This measure was included to assess the level of acculturation of the participant to his/her native culture.

The combined scores and the subscale scores were validated by evaluating the correlations between the respondents scores and seven criteria (a) generation status; (b) length of residence in the US; (c) amount of formal education; (d) age at arrival in the US; (e) proportion of resident's life lived in US; (f) ethnic self-identification; and (g) correlation with acculturation score and score on the Short Acculturation Scale for Hispanics (SASH; Marín, Sabogal, Marín, Otero-Sabogal, & Pérez-Stable, 1987). Most of the language-based subscales showed high correlations with the various validating correlates. The exception was low correlations in the Electronic Media subscale, particularly in the correlation with length of residence in the US. Combining the three language-based subscales, the correlations found were higher than those of Language Use and Electronic Media subscales, but lower than those found in the Linguistic Proficiency subscale. This measure was included to assess the level of acculturation for participants identifying themselves as Hispanic.

Procedure

Prior to collecting any data for this study, clearance was received from the Farmington Municipal Schools Superintendent to contact the principals of the selected schools. The principals were provided with packets for additional clearance and final approval. Recruitment of participants was completed by distributing packets to students to take home to parents and returned within one week. Each packet included a letter to the potential participants from the investigators, two consent forms, the demographic

questionnaire, Parenting Survey, Parenting Scale, Eyberg Child Behavior Inventory, Santa Clara Strength of Religious Faith Questionnaire, and the Bidimensional Acculturation Scale for Hispanics. Participants completed packets and returned the packets via postage-paid envelopes. Caregivers were entered into a drawing for gift certificates and an ipod.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Initial data analysis focused on descriptive information regarding the background of the participating families. Descriptive statistics were used to summarize data collected on parenting strategies, child misbehavior, acculturation and religiosity.

Parenting Characteristics

The Parenting Survey (Appendix B) was designed to gather descriptive data of 3 primary areas related to parenting: 1) use of extended kinship ties, 2) aspects of discipline and parenting competence, and 3) education and goals. Please see Table 3 for detailed results of the Parenting Survey questionnaire.

Upon review of the use of extended kinship ties, Parenting Survey responses indicated that for all of the families, one or both parents were primarily responsible for childrearing. However, 35.8% of the participants indicated that childrearing was also shared with extended family members. These family members included grandparents, great grandparents, aunts, uncles, cousins, and stepparents.

The next areas assessed by the Parenting Survey were aspects of discipline and parenting competence. The majority of the participants (96.5%) reported an overall high competence of parenting. In regard to discipline, most participants (78.6%) reporting that

they were responsible for disciplining their children. Furthermore, 83.9% of the participants reported being consistent in the disciplining of their children. Results indicated that 82.2% that girls should receive the same type of discipline as boys. Additionally, most caregivers (92.9%) reported they were the person their child would go to for teaching and guidance.

The third section of the Parenting Survey focuses on the participants goals of education for the children. Almost all participants (98.2%) reported it was important for their child to receive a good formal education. Similarly, 98.2% felt that completing middle school was very important, as was getting a high school diploma. Finally, 94.7% felt it was important for their child to attend some college, 87.5% felt it was important for their child to get a college degree, and 73.2% felt it was important to attain a graduate degree.

Parenting Strategies and Child Problem Behaviors

The Parenting Scale (PS; Arnold, et al., 1993) is a brief and psychometrically sound measure of dysfunctional discipline. A total score and three factor scores (Laxness, Overreactivity, and Verbosity) were calculated from this measure. Research has shown Verbosity to be a less stable factor score (Harvey et al., 2001); therefore, the Verbosity score was not included in the analyses for this project. Scores for the current sample and standardization sample are presented in Table 2. Scores from the current Hispanic sample were compared to scores in the standardization sample in order to determine whether there were significant differences. A one-sample z -test was conducted. Results indicated that there was no significant difference between this Hispanic sample and the normative sample for the Laxness score ($z = -.88, p > .05$), the

Overreactivity score ($z = -.33, p > .05$), and the Total score ($z = -.20, p > .05$). This indicates the scores for this Hispanic sample are comparable to those in the standardization sample. Next, the Cronbach's alpha coefficients of PS scale scores were calculated in order to determine the internal consistency. Cronbach's alpha coefficients were .80 for Laxness, .77 for Overreactivity, and .77 for the Total score. The alpha coefficients for the standardization were very similar for all of the scales: (.85 for Laxness, .84 for Overreactivity, and .87 for the Total score). Thus, while there is no statistical test to compare the scores, there is high similarity in the internal consistency for both samples the 3 scales on this measure.

The Eyberg Child Behavior Inventory (ECBI) is a psychometrically sound measure of problematic child behaviors. Two scale scores were calculated from this measure: an Intensity score reflecting the frequency of the occurrence of problem behaviors and a Problem score reflecting if the behavior is perceived as problematic by the parents. Scores for the current sample and standardization sample are presented in Table 2. One child (1.8% of sample), scored above the clinical cutoff for the ECBI Intensity score (Intensity Score ≥ 132), while 5 children (9% of sample) scored above the ECBI Problem score clinical cutoff (Problem Score ≥ 15). Using the mean scores on both the Intensity and Problem scores, a one-sample z -test was conducted to determine if the scores differed significantly from the normative data for this measure. Results indicated that there were no significant differences between this sample and the normative sample for the mean Intensity score ($z = -.74, p > .05$) and the mean Problem score ($z = -.32, p > .05$). This indicates that the current sample scores are comparable to the standardization sample scores. Cronbach's alpha for the current study is .94 for the

Intensity score and .93 for the Problem score. The alpha coefficients for the standardization were very similar for both scores derived on the ECBI (.95 Intensity scale and .93 for Problem scale).

Next, parenting strategies were correlated with child problem behaviors in order to explore the association between these variables in a Hispanic population. In order to control for the number of analyses, a modified Bonferroni correction was used. This yielded an alpha level of .0167. It was hypothesized that less effective parenting strategies would be associated with higher frequencies of problem behaviors in the children. Scale scores from the PS (Laxness, Overreactivity, and Total score) were correlated with the Intensity score of the ECBI using Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients. Less effective parenting, as indicated by higher scores on the PS Total score, was related to a higher frequency of child misbehavior ($r = .386, p = .005$). Additionally, Overreactivity (emotional harshness, excessive displaying of anger, meanness, and irritability), as measured by higher values on the Overreactivity score, was related to higher frequencies of problematic child behaviors ($r = .585, p < .001$). Laxness, as characterized by an overly submissive or inconsistent discipline strategies, was also related to higher frequencies of problem child behaviors ($r = .386, p = .005$). Table 3 presents the Pearson correlations between these variables.

To further investigate the correlation between parenting strategies and child problem behaviors, scale scores from the PS (Laxness, Overreactivity, and Total) were correlated with the Problem score of the ECBI using Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients. It was hypothesized that less effective parenting strategies would be associated with higher scores on the Problem scale, indicating a higher perception that a

given behavior is problematic. Less effective parenting overall, as implied by higher scores on the PS Total score were not related to higher perceptions of child misbehavior. Likewise, Laxness was not correlated with higher perceptions of child misbehavior. Scores on the Overreactivity scale were positively correlated with Problem scores ($r = .311, p = .026$) using the conventional level of .05; however this failed reach a significance level of .0167 derived by the modified Bonferroni calculation. Table 3 presents the Pearson product-moment correlations between these variables.

Other Factors of Parenting

The Santa Clara Strength of Religious Faith Questionnaire (SCSORFQ) provided a total score designed to measure strength of religious faith regardless of denomination. Given that Hispanics are generally found to be highly religious, this measure was included. Total scores range from 10 to 40; participants who receive a score of 26 or above are labeled as high faith, where those scoring below 26 are labeled low faith. The mean total score was 34 (range 10-40). Of the participants 7.4% scored in the low faith range, with the remaining 92.8% scoring in the high faith range. Cronbach's alpha for the current study is .94 on the measure of religiosity. The alpha coefficient from the current sample is similar to the alpha coefficient calculated in the standardization sample (.95).

The Santa Clara Strength of Religious Faith Questionnaire was correlated with the ECBI Intensity and Problem scores and the PS Scores (Laxness, Overreactivity, and Total) to explore the association between religiosity and parenting strategies and child problem behaviors. An exploratory analysis was conducted to first check a possible link between religiosity and parenting strategies (PS Laxness, Overreactivity and Total). To

control for the number of analyses, a modified Bonferroni correction was used, yielding an alpha level of .0167.

Next, analyses explored whether religiosity was linked to child behavior (ECBI Intensity and Problem scores). More sensitivity of problems as indicated by higher values on the ECBI Problem score was related to strength of religiosity ($r = -.324, p = .018$). No other associations between religiosity, parenting strategies, and problem child behaviors were significant. See Table 4 for Pearson product-moment correlations between these variables.

The Bidimensional Acculturation Scale for Hispanics (BAS) provided two scores that were utilized to measure the participants' level of acculturation. The Hispanic (HISP) and Non-Hispanic (NON-HISP) domains ranged from 1 to 4 for each cultural domain. The two scores are used to define the level of acculturation of the participant. A score above 2.5 is considered high level of acculturation while less than 2.5 is considered a low level of acculturation. Scores above 2.5 on both domains is interpreted as biculturalism. Results indicated that 1.8% (one participant) identified with neither Hispanic nor Non-Hispanic culture. Of the sample, 12.5% (7 participants) identified with Hispanic acculturation. The majority of the participants (60.7% [34 participants]) identified as predominantly Non-Hispanic, while 23.2% (13 participants) identified as bicultural, meaning they had similar levels on both the Hispanic and Non-Hispanic domains of the BAS.

Finally, the Bidimensional Acculturation Scale for Hispanics (BAS) was correlated with the ECBI Intensity and Problem scores and the PS scores (Laxness, Overreactivity, and Total) to explore the association between acculturation, parenting

strategies, and child problem behaviors. First, the BAS was correlated with the PS scores (Laxness, Overreactivity, and Total) to explore the link between acculturation and parenting strategies. Next, the BAS was correlated with the ECBI scores (Intensity and Problem) to explore the link between acculturation and child problem behaviors. Significant correlations were not found between acculturation, parenting strategies and child problem behaviors, thus, levels of acculturation do not appear to affect parenting strategies or the way parents perceive their child's problem behaviors. See Table 5 for Pearson product-moment correlations between these variables.

In order to examine the relationship of religiosity and acculturation on frequency of child behavior, in addition to the influences of parenting strategies, a regression analysis was used. Parenting strategies (PS Total) was entered into the regression equation on step 1, with the ECBI Intensity score as the criterion variable. The use of dysfunctional parenting strategies (PS Total) and the frequency of child problem behaviors (ECBI Intensity score) captured 23.6% of the variance $F(1, 45) = 15.237, p < .001$. The addition of religiosity and acculturation in the following steps did not account for any additional variance in child behavior. See Table 6.

A second regression was conducted to examine the influences of religiosity and acculturation on parenting strategies and the overall index of the number of behaviors rated as problematic. In the first step of the stepwise regression, parenting strategies (PS Total score) was entered, with parent's perceptions behavior as problematic (ECBI Problem score) as the predicted variable. The use of dysfunctional parenting strategies (PS Total) and the perception of problem child behaviors (ECBI Problem score) captured 4.3% of the variance $F(1,45) = 3.078, p = .086$. The addition of religiosity in the second

step of the regression accounted for an additional 14.5% of incremental variance $F(1,44) = 6.377, p = .015$. Lastly, acculturation was added into the equation, which did not account for any added variance in the equation. Please see Table 7.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

The present study examined parenting and demographic characteristics in a diverse sample of Hispanics living in the southwestern United States. The study included parents and/or primary caregivers of children between the ages of four and thirteen, and had four purposes: 1) collect descriptive information about traditional family values among Hispanic families; 2) examine the link between parenting strategies and child problem behaviors in a sample of Hispanic families; 3) compare the data collected from Hispanic families to the norms from popular measures to determine if there were significant differences; and 4) examine any possible links between family values, religiosity, child problem behaviors, and parenting discipline strategies. The following section will first discuss the findings of the current research project, followed by the limitations and strengths of the study, and lastly discuss directions for further research.

Hispanic Family Characteristics

The first goal of this project was to provide descriptive information about the parenting and family characteristics, including the involvement of extended family members in childrearing. Most participants of the study were biological parents, with few being grandparents; however approximately one third of the sample indicated some help from extended family members in raising their children. The extended family members that were involved in childrearing responsibilities were mainly grandparents,

great-grandparents, aunts, uncles, and stepparents. The childrearing assistance from extended family members is consistent with what the researchers expected given previous knowledge of Hispanic family dynamics (Altarriba & Bauer, 1998). Overall, however, a higher rate of involvement was expected from extended family members in the sample. Reasons for the lower involvement of extended family members could be a result of the sample in general. In general, the sample endorsed low identity with Hispanic acculturation domains, which might include child-rearing assistance from extended family members.

The next areas that were examined were aspects of discipline and parenting competence. Overall, parents were highly confident in their parenting strategies, had relatively low levels of frustration towards their child, and believed they made good decisions regarding their children. Furthermore, most of the caregivers in the sample were responsible for disciplining their children, and felt they were consistent with these disciplinary actions. This is consistent with the reports of high confidence in parenting strategies in general. It would be expected that a competent and confident parent would also display consistent discipline strategies for their children. (e.g. Barber, 1996).

The last area that was examined for family characteristics was educational goals for the children. The entire sample reported wanting their children to receive a good formal education. More specifically, most participants felt it was important for their child to get a college degree. Given the changing educational and economic dynamics, this is consistent with what was expected from the researchers. However, the researchers were somewhat surprised by the large number of participants wanting their children to receive a graduate school degree. These responses could also be due to knowledge that

continuing education is becoming a necessity for an individual to secure a good job. Additionally, it is important to note that many write-in comments stated that they would be supportive of their child even if they chose not to go to college and get a degree. As long as their children were happy in what they chose to do in life, the parents stated they too would be happy and supportive.

Comparison of Standardized Measures to Normative Data

During examination of the scores on standardized measures of parenting a child behavior, a range of scores was found. One of the research questions of the current study with regards to the ECBI, was would data collected from the Hispanic sample differ significantly from the normative data due to the lack of Hispanics included in research. The analyses conducted did not reveal any significant differences between the Hispanic sample and the normative population sample on the ECBI. The measure appeared to be tapping into the same dimension as conceptualized in previous studies. This claim however, is difficult to make, as demographic data including mean age and education level are not reported for the normative samples. Therefore, we can only presume that our sample was similar to the normative sample in other demographics. Since no differences were found, this indicates that the ECBI may be appropriate to use with a Hispanic sample. However, a follow-up study of a larger more representative sample of Hispanics should be conducted. Given the majority of the Hispanics from the current sample identified more closely with non-Hispanic traditions, the results should not be generalized to other groups of Hispanics. Furthermore, it should be noted that the current sample did not have an even distribution of female and male children. Research (Colvin, Eyberg, & Adams, 1999; Eyberg & Ross, 1978) however, does not include separate

norms for male and female children; therefore, the differences in gender were not further explored.

The researchers also explored the idea that scores on the PS might differ from the normative sample. Similarly, data analyses that were conducted did not indicate any differences between the current sample and the normative sample. The Laxness, Overreactivity, and Total scales have been reported as stable scores, and our findings were consistent with the current literature (Arnold et al., 1993; Harvey et al., 2001). The subscale of Verbosity has been stated as being less stable and robust in samples of older children (Harvey et al., 2001), therefore it was not included in this sample. However, follow-up studies should be conducted especially with younger children to determine the relativity of Verbosity in a Hispanic population. According to the current sample, Hispanics responded to the standardization measures in a manner that is consistent with the normative group, indicating the PS may be appropriate for future use with a Hispanic population.

Links between Parenting Strategies and Child Problem Behaviors

A major goal of the current study was to test the hypothesis that less effective parenting strategies would be related to higher frequency and problem levels of child behaviors. The hypothesis was only partially supported by the current study. Parents who endorsed higher levels of dysfunctional parenting techniques overall (PS Total score) did report higher frequencies of child misbehavior, but did not report higher levels of problematic behaviors. Previous studies that included clinic samples of children (Patterson, 1982; Patterson, Reid, & Dishion, 1992; Hemphill, 1996; Martin et al., 2005) have found strong links between inconsistent or faulty discipline strategies and high

levels of problematic behavior in children. However, this finding was not completely supported in the current example. Few participants endorsed symptoms consistent with unacceptable levels of problem child behaviors. Most of the child problem behaviors of the sample fell within the range that would be expected given an average child. Likewise, few participants reported severely dysfunctional parenting strategies.

Finally, the Laxness, Overreactivity, and Total scales on the PS were not related to increased perceptions of problem child behaviors. Parents who endorsed more dysfunctional parenting strategies did not perceive their child as displaying problematic behaviors. This is inconsistent with previous research. Had a larger sample been included in the current study, a link might have been found between Overreactivity and perceptions of problematic child behaviors. However, given the stringency of the analyses, this link was not established. It is unclear why the link between problem behaviors and dysfunctional parenting was not found in the current sample.

While less effective parenting overall was not related to an increase in problematic child behaviors, Overreactivity (excessive displays of anger, irritability, and meanness) Laxness (overly permissive and inconsistent discipline), and Total were linked to a higher frequency of child problem behaviors. In general, parents who reported a higher frequency of a problematic behavior occurring also endorsed more dysfunctional parenting strategies in both Overreactivity and Laxness. Previous research has found that overreactive and lax parenting can lead to more problematic displays of behavior in children eliciting reactions such as anger, irritability, and meanness towards others (Arnold et al., 1993). Future research should further investigate the association between these variables.

Other Possible Factors of Parenting

Another goal of the current study was to examine other factors in a Hispanic population that could be an influence to parenting strategies. Two areas of interest that were included were religiosity and acculturation. It was expected that the less acculturated an individual was to the mainstream culture, the more likely he/she would endorse dysfunctional parenting and problem child behaviors. Acculturation did not show an association to parenting strategies or child problem behaviors in the current sample of Hispanics. There are many explanations that could clarify why this link was not found. The current sample included a majority of Hispanics who did not identify with a solely Hispanic culture, but rather most who identified with a more mainstream culture. Additionally, the current sample was gathered in one area of the southwestern United States. Although the link was not found with the current sample, it cannot be generalized to all Hispanics, that acculturation does not play an important role in parenting strategies. Further research should investigate this potential link with a larger and more generalizable sample of Hispanics.

Another factor that researchers thoughts might influence parenting strategies was religiosity. Historically, many Hispanics identify themselves as highly religious, but research has not been conducted to establish a link between this religiosity and strategies for raising children. It was found that religiosity did play a role in a parent's perceptions of problem behaviors. The researchers are unsure of reasoning behind this link being found, however offer some possible explanations. The study included a Hispanic sample that overall was relatively high in religiosity. Furthermore, parents who identify themselves as highly religious reported less problematic child behaviors. This could be

due to a more patient parent who asserts that children will be children, and do not perceive their behavior as problematic as others who might identify as less religious. Future studies assessing a link between religiosity and parenting strategies should be conducted to pinpoint an explanation for the link found in the current sample.

Clinical Implications

There are a number of clinical implications that have emerged from the results of the current study. The data indicate that the current sample is similar in some aspects to previous research in the area of parenting and problem child behaviors. However, there are also some differences that were found in the current sample.

The current study provides tentative support for standardized measures such as the ECBI and PS are appropriate to use with participants from a Hispanic population. It was found that the problem level or frequency of child misbehaviors and parenting sense of competence did not differ significantly from what was reported for the normative sample. It is, however, important to note that this study only provides tentative support and future research should be conducted to better understand the links found in this Hispanic population. Participants were recruited from a single southwestern state, so it is possible that Hispanics from different geographical regions of the United States may respond to the measures differently. Moreover, the sample that was included was a non-clinical sample, so perhaps research in a clinical setting might explain some of the discrepancies that were found in the current study. Research in a clinical setting would also offer more supportive evidence that the measures are appropriate for a Hispanic population, especially the ECBI and the PS given they were developed and widely used for a clinical sample.

Lastly, it is important to consider the clinical implications of the current study in regard to acculturation. Although this study did not find acculturation to affect parenting strategies or child behaviors, the sample included in the study may not be a representative sample of Hispanics. The majority of the participants did not report to being acculturated to traditional Hispanic culture. If traditional Hispanics were included in a future study, acculturation might have played more of a role in parenting than was found here. It is likely that there are many areas of acculturation that were not tapped into in the current study, and should therefore be considered for follow-up studies.

Limitations and Strengths

In general, there are several limitations to the current study that should be noted. First, a sample of 56 caregivers recruited from Northwest New Mexico served as the participants for the current project. It is possible that the restricted geographic area from which the participants were recruited did not have enough variability for responses on the variables being studied. Future research in this area should aim to include a broader geographical area, to see if the results are similar to the current study. Another limitation to the study is that all measures were completed in a self-report fashion. Furthermore, all information gathered in the current study was from the same source. It is unclear how these self-reports could have affected the results of the study. An addition of various types of data collection (e.g. interviews, observations) could provide additional information to the researchers.

Although the current study had a response rate that is consistent with most survey research, it is important to acknowledge the possibility of a response bias. Individuals who participated in the study may have been more acculturated or educated, therefore

being more interested in participating in the study, than individuals who were less acculturated or less educated. Furthermore, the study was only provided in English. This limited individuals who were not fluent in English from participating in the study. Future research should consider the possibility of a bilingual packet, to ensure that all Hispanics are given an equal opportunity to participate in the study. It is important to note however, that the current study had a response rate that is consistent with most survey research.

Although the current study did have a number of limitations, it is also important to note the significant strengths of the study. This project collected both descriptive and qualitative data on Hispanic parents and also provided information about family dynamics, parenting strategies, problem child behaviors, religiosity and acculturation. Thus, it can be considered a comprehensive study of aspects that may be important in a Hispanic population. An additional strength of this study was the examination of the appropriateness of well-accepted measures with a Hispanic sample; a population that thus far has been largely neglected in normative samples of many psychological measures. By providing support of the measures in a Hispanic population, clinicians can have confidence in the utilization of these measures when working with individuals from a Hispanic population. However, it is emphasized that this strength could be related to the response bias noted earlier. It could be that standardized measures used in the current study may be appropriate to use with individuals who felt inclined to participate in the study, but may not be as appropriate for individuals who did not participate in the study. This study also gathered information about acculturation and religiosity in order to provide a more thorough understanding of the current sample. Collection of this type of

data may vary based upon location and level of acculturation. As stated earlier, the participants in the current study came from the same geographical area, which is important to keep in mind with the interpretations of the results.

Areas for Future Research

There are a number of areas that should be considered for future research. Although the information that was gathered in the current project is beneficial, additional research is needed. Future studies should attempt to recruit a larger and more diverse sample of participants. More specifically, it would be beneficial if future studies could include Hispanics from various geographical regions as well as those with varying levels of acculturation. A more diverse sample would provide better understanding of how representative the results of this study are, as well as the relevance to other Hispanic families outside the southwest United States.

Furthermore, future research should include both standardized and descriptive measures of parenting and child behavior. The inclusion of both will likely lead to a rich database of information, that could be utilized in comparing results from future studies to the results of past studies. Including descriptive, qualitative, and quantitative measures in a study can give us additional information about aspects of Hispanic parenting that should be included in research.

Follow-up research should be conducted to further examine the link between parenting strategies and problem child behaviors in a Hispanic population. The results from the current study supported a link between parenting strategies and the frequency of problem child behaviors, however, did not support a link between parenting strategies and the perceptions of problem child behaviors. It is imperative to examine if these

characteristics are unique to a Hispanic population, or only to the current sample. Furthermore, additional research should concentrate on the role of religiosity and/or acculturation in the role of parenting and problem child behaviors. The current study offers some preliminary findings, but additional research needs to be conducted in order to establish any possible links.

Conclusions

This project collected both descriptive and quantitative data from a sample of Hispanic participants and provided descriptive data about parenting strategies, problem and frequencies of child behaviors, acculturation, and religiosity. The results of this study indicate that this sample of Hispanic parents are highly involved in child-rearing, and have primary responsibility for many aspects of their children's lives. Overall, the sample had low acculturation to traditional Hispanic traditions, and was highly religious. Additionally, the results of this study provided tentative support for the use of popular psychometrically sound measures with a Hispanic population.

REFERENCES

- Achenbach, T. M. (1982). *Child Behavior Checklist*. Burlington, VT: University of Vermont.
- Achenbach, T. M. & Edelbrock, C. (1983). Manual for the Child Behavior Checklist and revised child behavior profile. Burlington, VT: University of Vermont.
- Achenbach, T. M., Edelbrock, C., & Howell, C. T. (1987). Empirically based assessment of the behavior/emotional problems of 2- and 3-year-old children. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, *15*, 629 – 650.
- Altarriba, J. & Bauer, L. M. (1998). Counseling the Hispanic client: Cuban Americans, Mexican Americans, and Puerto Ricans. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, *76*, 389 – 396.
- Arnold, D. S., O’Leary, S. G., Wolff, L. S., & Acker, M. M. (1993). The Parenting Scale: A measure of dysfunctional parenting in discipline situations. *Psychological Assessment*, *5*, 137 – 144.
- Aunula, K., & Nurmi, J. E. (2005). The role of parenting styles in children’s problem behavior. *Child Development*, *76*, 1144 – 1159.
- Barber, B. K. (1996). Parental psychological control: Revisiting a neglected construct. *Child Development*, *67*, 3296 – 3319.
- Baumrind, D. (1966). Effects of authoritative parental control on child behavior. *Child Development*, *37*, 887 – 907.

- Baumrind, D. (1968). Child care practices anteceding three patterns of preschool behavior. *Genetic Psychology Monographs*, 75, 43 – 88.
- Baumrind, D. (1989). Rearing competent children. In W. Damon (Ed.), *Child development today and tomorrow* (pp. 349 – 378). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Baumrind, D. (1991). The influence of parenting styles on adolescent competence and substance use. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 11, 56 – 95.
- Bell, R. (1968). A reinterpretation of the direction of effects in studies of socialization. *Psychological Review*, 75, 81 – 95.
- Boggs, S. R., Eyberg, S., & Reynolds, L. A. (1990). Concurrent validity of the Eyberg Child Behavior Inventory. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology*, 19, 75 – 78.
- Burns, G. L., & Patterson, D. R. (1990). Conduct problem behaviors in a stratified random sample of children and adolescents: New standardization data on the Eyberg Child Behavior Inventory. *Psychological Assessment: A Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 2, 391 – 397.
- Campbell, S. B. (1995). Behavior problems in preschool children: A review of recent research. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 36, 113 – 149.
- Campbell, S. B. (2002). *Behavior problems in preschool children: Clinical and developmental issues*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Campbell, S. B., Pierce, E. W., March, C. L., Ewing, L. J., & Szumowski, E. K. (1994). Hard to-manage preschool boys: Symptomatic behavior across contexts and time. *Child Development*, 65, 836 – 851.
- Cairns, R. B., Cairns, B. D., & Neckerman, H. J. (1989). Early school drop-out: Configurations and determinants. *Child Development*, 60, 1437 – 1452.

- Chapman, M., & Zahn-Waxler, C. (1982). Young children's compliance and noncompliance to parental discipline in a natural setting. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 5*, 81 – 94.
- Cole, P. M., Zahn-Waxler, C., Fox, N. A., Usher, B. A., & Welsh, J. D. (1996). Individual differences in emotion regulation and behavior problems in preschool children. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 105*, 518 – 529.
- Colvin, A., Eyberg, S. M., & Adams, C. D. (1999). *Restandardization of the Eyberg Child Behavior Inventory*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Coplan, R. J., Hastings, P. D., Lagacé –Séguin, D. G., & Moulton, C. E. (2002). Authoritative and authoritarian mothers' parenting goals, attributions, and emotions across different childrearing contexts. *Parenting: Science and Practice, 2*, 1 – 26.
- Darling, N., & Steinberg, L. (1993). Parenting style as context: An integrative model. *Psychological Bulletin, 113*, 487 – 496.
- Denham, S. A., Workman, E., Cole, P. M., Weissbrod, C., Kendziora, K. T., & Zahn-Waxler, C. (2000). Prediction of externalizing behavior problems from early to middle childhood: The role of parental socialization and emotion expression. *Development and Psychopathology, 12*, 23 – 45.
- Dishion, T., & Patterson, G. R. (1992). Age effects in parent training outcome. *Behavior Therapist, 23*, 719 – 729.
- Dodge, K. A., Pettit, G. S., & Bates, J. E. (1994). Socialization mediators of the relation between socioeconomic status and child conduct problems. *Child Development, 65*, 649– 665.

- Eisenberg, N., Cumberland, A., Spinrad, T. L., Fabes, R. A., Shepard, S. A., Reiser, M., et al. (2001). The relations of regulation and emotionality to children's externalizing and internalizing problem behavior. *Child Development, 71*, 1112 – 1134.
- Eyberg, S. M. & Robinson, E. A. (1983). Conduct problem behavior: Standardization of a behavioral rating scale with adolescents. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology, 12*, 347 – 357.
- Eyberg, S. M., & Ross, A. W. (1978). Assessment of child behavior problems: The validation of a new inventory. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology, 7*, 113 – 116.
- Galambos, N. L., Barker, E. T., & Almeida, D. M. (2003). Parents do matter: Trajectories of change in externalizing and internalizing problems in early adolescence. *Child Development, 74*, 578 – 594.
- Gardner, F. E. M. (1987). Positive interaction between mothers and conduct problem children: Is there training for harmony as well as for fighting? *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 15*, 283 – 293.
- Gardner, F. E. M. (1989). Inconsistent parenting: Is there evidence for a link with children's conduct problems?. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 17*, 223 – 233.
- Gray, M. R., & Steinberg, L. (1999). Unpacking authoritative parenting: Reassessing a multidimensional construct. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 61*, 574 – 587.
- Gross, D., Fogg, L., Young, M., Ridge, A., Cowell, J., Sivan, A., & Richardson, R. (2007). Reliability and validity of the Eyberg Child Behavior Inventory with

- African-American and Latino parents of young children. *Research in Nursing and Health*, 30, 213 – 223.
- Harris, J. R. (1995). Where is the child's environment?. A group socialization theory of development. *Psychological Review*, 102, 458 – 489).
- Hart, C. H., Newell, L. D., & Olsen, S. F. (2003). Parenting skills and social communicative competence in childhood. In J. O. Greene & B. R. Burleson (Eds.), *Handbook of communication and social interaction skills* (pp. 753 – 797).
- Harvey, E., Danforth, J. S., Ulaszek, W. R., & Eberhardt, T. L. (2001). Validity of the parenting scale for parents of children with attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 39, 731 – 743.
- Heller, T. L., Baker, B. L., Henker, B., & Hinshaw, S. P. (1996). Externalizing behavior and cognitive functioning from preschool to first grade: Stability and predictors. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology*, 25, 376 – 387.
- Hemphill, S. H. (1996). Characteristics of conduct-disordered children and their families. *Australian Psychologist*, 31, 109 – 118.
- Hispanic. (2008). In *Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary*. Retrieved May 27, 2008, from <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/Hispanic>
- Holden, G. W. (1983). Avoiding conflict: Mothers as tacticians in the supermarket. *Child Development* (Vol. 54, pp. 233): Blackwell Publishing Limited.
- Huey, S. J. Jr, & Weisz, J. R. (1997). Ego control, ego resiliency, and the Five-Factor model as predictors of behavioral and emotional problems in clinic-referred children and adolescents. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 106, 404 – 415.

- Institute of Medicine. (1994). *Reducing risks for mental disorders: Frontiers for preventive intervention research*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Irvine, A. B., Biglan, A., Smolkowski, K., & Ary, D. V. (1999). The value of the Parenting Scale for measuring the discipline of parents in middle school children. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, *37*, 127 – 142.
- Johnson, S. M. & Lobitz, G. K. (1974). Parental manipulation of child behavior in home observations. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, *7*, 23 – 31.
- Keenen, K., Shaw, D., Delliquadri, E., Giovanelli, J., & Walsh, B. (1998). Evidence for the continuity of early problem behaviours: Application of a developmental model. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, *26*, 441 – 454.
- Kochanska, G., & Aksan, N. (1995). Mother-child mutually positive affect, the quality of child compliance to requests and prohibitions, and maternal control as correlates of early intervention. *Child Development*, *66*, 236 – 254.
- Kuczynski, L. (1984). Socialization goals and mother-child interaction: Strategies for long-term and short-term compliance. *Developmental Psychology*, *20*, 1061 – 1073.
- Locke, H. J., & Wallace, K. M. (1959). Short marital adjustment and prediction tests: Their reliability and validity. *Marriage and Family Living*, *21*, 231 – 235.
- Lytton, H. (1977). Correlates of compliance and the rudiments of conscience in two-year old boys. *Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science*, *9*(3), 242 – 251.
- Lytton, H., & Zwirner, W. (1975). Compliance and its controlling stimuli observed in a natural setting. *Developmental Psychology*, *11*, 769 – 777.
- Maccoby, E., & Martin, J. (1983). Socialization in the context of the family: Parent-child

- interaction. In E. M. Hetherington (Ed.), P. H. Mussen (Series Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology: Vol. 4. Socialization, personality, and social development* (pp. 1- 101). New York: Wiley.
- Marín, G., & Gamba, R. J. (1996). A new measurement of acculturation for Hispanics: The bidimensional acculturation scale for Hispanics (BAS). *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 18*, 297 – 316.
- Marín, G., Sabogal, F., Marín, B. V., Otero-Sabogal, R., & Pérez-Stable, E. J. (1987). Development of a short acculturation scale for Hispanics. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 9* 183 – 205.
- Martin, J. A. (1981). A longitudinal study of the consequences of early mother-infant interaction: A microanalytic approach. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 46*.
- Martin, A. J., Linfoot, K. W., & Stephenson, J. (2005). Problem behaviour and associated risk factors in young children. *Australian Journal of Guidance & Counselling, 15*, 1 – 16.
- McCloskey, D. M., Hess, R. S., & D'Amato, R. C. (2003). Evaluating the utility of the Spanish version of the Behavior Assessment System for Children-Parent report system. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment, 21*, 325 – 337.
- 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.
- Minton, C., Kagan, J., & Levine, J. A. (1971). Maternal control and obedience in the two-year-old. *Child Development, 42*, 1873 – 1894.

- Patterson, G. (1982). *Coercive family process: A social learning approach*. Eugene, OR: Castalia.
- Patterson, G. R., Reid, J. B., & Dishion, T. J. (1992). *Antisocial boys*. Eugene, OR: Castalia.
- Plante, T. G., & Boccaccini, M. T. (1997). The Santa Clara Strength of Religious Faith Questionnaire. *Pastoral Psychology, 45*, 375 – 387.
- Ramirez, R. R. (2004). We the people: Hispanic in the United States. *Census 2000 Special Reports*.
- Reitman, D., Currier, R. O., Hupp, S. D., Rhode, P. C., Murphy, M. A., & O’Callaghan, P. M. (2001). Psychometric characteristics of the Parenting Scale in a Head Start population. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology, 30*, 514 – 524.
- Roeser, R., Eccles, J., & Strobel, K. (1998). Linking the study of schooling and mental health: Selected issues and empirical illustrations at the level of the individual. *Educational Psychologist, 33*, 153 – 176.
- Robinson, E. A., Eyberg, S. M., & Ross, A. W. (1980). The standardization of an inventory of child problematic conduct behaviors. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 9*, 22 – 28.
- Sandoval, J. & Echandia, A. (1994). Behavior Assessment System for Children. *Journal of School Psychology, 32*, 419 – 425.
- Shaw, D. S., Gillion, M., Ingoldsby, E. M., & Nagin, D. S. (2003). Trajectories leading to school-age conduct problems. *Developmental Psychology, 39*, 189 – 200.
- Siatkowski, A. A. (2007). Hispanic acculturation: A concept analysis. *Journal of Transcultural Nursing, 18*, 316 – 323.

- Steele, R. G., Nesbitt-Daly, J. S., Daniel, R. C., & Forehand, R. (2005). Factor Structure of the Parenting Scale in a Low-Income African American Sample. *Journal of Child and Family Studies, 14*, 535 – 549.
- Steinberg, L. (2001). We know some things: Parent-adolescent relationships in retrospect and prospect. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology, 25*, 225 – 247.
- Stormont, M. (1998). Family factors associated with externalizing disorders in preschoolers. *Journal of Early Intervention, 21*, 323 – 351.
- Stormont, M. (2002). Externalizing behavior problems in young children: Contributing factors and early intervention. *Psychology in the Schools, 39*, 127 – 138.
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2000). Retrieved March 28, 2008, from http://www.census.gov/population/www/socdemo/hispanic/files/Internet_Hispanic_in_US_2006.pdf
- U.S. Department of Health and Human Services; The Office of Minority Health. (2007). *Hispanic/Latino profile*. Retrieved May 27, 2008, from <http://www.omhrc.gov/templates/browse.aspx?lvl=3&lvlid=31>
- Webster-Stratton, C. (1997). Early intervention for families of preschool children with conduct problems. In M. J. Guralnick (Ed.), *The effectiveness of early intervention* (pp. 429 –453). Baltimore, MD: Brookes.
- Weiss, L. H., & Schwarz, J. C. (1996). The relationship between parenting types and older adolescents' personality, academic, achievement, adjustment, and substance use. *Child Development, 67*, 2101 – 2114.
- Wolfson, J., Fields, J. H., & Rose, S. A. (1987). Symptoms, temperament, resiliency, and

control in anxiety-disordered preschool children. *The American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 26, 16 – 22.

Zwirs, B. W., Burger, H., Buitelaar, J. K., & Schulp, T. W. (2006). Ethnic differences in parental detection of externalizing disorders. *European Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*, 15, 418 – 426.

APPENDIX A

_____Married _____Divorced _____Separated _____Single
_____Widowed _____Living with partner

9. If married or living with partner, please provide the following information about your spouse/partner:

a) Spouse/partner's relationship to the child:

_____Biological parent

_____Step-parent

_____Adoptive parent

_____Other

b) Spouse/partner's age_____

c) Spouse/partner's ethnicity:

_____Caucasian _____American Indian_____ (tribe/nation)

_____African-American _____Biracial_____ (please describe)

_____Hispanic/Latino _____Other_____ (please describe)

_____Asian/Asian-American

d) Spouse/partner's highest level of education completed (please circle year)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 (Grade School)

9 10 11 12 (High School)

13 14 15 16 (College)

17 and over (Graduate School)

e) Spouse/partner's occupation: _____

10. Please provide the following information about the child participating in this study:

a) Age in years: _____

b) Sex: Male_____ Female_____

c) Child's ethnicity:

_____Caucasian	_____American Indian_____
	(tribe/nation)
_____African-American	_____Biracial_____
	(please describe)
_____Hispanic/Latino	_____Other_____
	(please describe)
_____Asian/Asian-American	

11. Does the child have siblings?

_____No _____Yes

If yes please answer the following:

Age	Sex		Living in the home	
_____	M	F	Y	N
_____	M	F	Y	N
_____	M	F	Y	N
_____	M	F	Y	N
_____	M	F	Y	N

12. Including you and your child, how many people are living in your home?

APPENDIX B

Parenting Survey

1. Upbringing

In some families the mother and/or father are the ones primarily responsible for raising the children, but in other families extended family members assist in the child rearing. Given this information, please choose one sentence (a-f) that is most consistent with the way in which your child is raised. **Choose one sentence only.**

a) _____ My spouse/partner and I **share** responsibility equally.

b) _____ My spouse/partner and I **share** responsibility, but I am more involved than he/she is.

c) _____ My spouse/partner and I **share** responsibility, but he/she is more involved than I am.

d) _____ My spouse/partner and I **share** responsibility equally, but other's are involved.

If YES, please indicate who shares responsibility (check all that apply):

- | | |
|---------------------------------|------------------------------|
| _____ child's grandmother | _____ child's aunt |
| _____ child's grandfather | _____ child's uncle |
| _____ child's great grandmother | _____ child's cousin |
| _____ child's great grandfather | _____ child's older sibling |
| _____ child's stepmother | _____ other (please specify) |
| _____ child's stepfather | _____ |

e) _____ I **share** responsibility with another person (other than my spouse/partner).

If YES, please indicate who shares responsibility (check all that apply):

- | | |
|---------------------------------|------------------------------|
| _____ child's grandmother | _____ child's aunt |
| _____ child's grandfather | _____ child's uncle |
| _____ child's great grandmother | _____ child's cousin |
| _____ child's great grandfather | _____ child's older sibling |
| _____ child's stepmother | _____ other (please specify) |
| _____ child's stepfather | _____ |

f) _____ I have **primary** responsibility for my children, but other play a significant role in my child's life.

If YES, please indicate who shares responsibility (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> child's grandmother | <input type="checkbox"/> child's aunt |
| <input type="checkbox"/> child's grandfather | <input type="checkbox"/> child's uncle |
| <input type="checkbox"/> child's great grandmother | <input type="checkbox"/> child's cousin |
| <input type="checkbox"/> child's great grandfather | <input type="checkbox"/> child's older sibling |
| <input type="checkbox"/> child's stepmother | <input type="checkbox"/> other (please specify) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> child's stepfather | _____ |

g) I have **primary** responsibility for my children.

2. Confidence in Parenting Abilities

Circle the number that corresponds most closely with your beliefs and values regarding your child.

A) I am a good parent.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
never *sometimes* *half the time* *most of the time* *always*

B) I am easily frustrated by my child.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
never *sometimes* *half the time* *most of the time* *always*

C) I make good decisions regarding my children.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
never *sometimes* *half the time* *most of the time* *always*

3. Teaching

Circle the number that corresponds most closely with your beliefs and values regarding your child.

A) I am the person responsible for teaching my child right from wrong.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
never *sometimes* *half the time* *most of the time* *always*

B) I am the person responsible for teaching my child how to take care of him/herself

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
never *sometimes* *half the time* *most of the time* *always*

C) I am the person my child asks for guidance when faced with important life decisions.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
never *sometimes* *half the time* *most of the time* *always*

4. Discipline

Circle the number that corresponds most closely with your beliefs and values regarding your child.

A) I am the person responsible for disciplining my child.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
never *sometimes* *half the time* *most of the time* *always*

B) I am consistent in the disciplining of my child.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
never *sometimes* *half the time* *most of the time* *always*

C) Girls should receive the same type of discipline as boys.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
never *sometimes* *half the time* *most of the time* *always*

5. Education

Circle the number that corresponds most closely with your beliefs and values regarding your child.

A) It is important that my child receives a good formal education

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
not important *somewhat important* *important* *very important* *extremely important*

B) Education and Earning a Living

1) How important is completing middle school in your child eventually earning a living and supporting him/herself and his/her family?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
not important *somewhat important* *important* *very important* *extremely important*

2) How important is getting a high school diploma in your child eventually earning a living and supporting him/herself and his/her family?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
not important *somewhat important* *important* *very important* *extremely important*

3) How important is getting a trade school/vo-tech certificate or diploma in your child eventually earning a living and supporting him/herself and his/her family?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
not important *somewhat important* *important* *very important* *extremely important*

4) How important is attending some college in your child eventually earning a living and supporting him/herself and his/her family?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
not important somewhat important important very important extremely important

5) How important is getting a college degree in your child eventually earning a living and supporting him/herself and his/her family?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
not important somewhat important important very important extremely important

6) How important is getting a graduate school degree in your child eventually earning a living and supporting him/herself and his/her family?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
not important somewhat important important very important extremely important

C) Choose the sentence below that is most consistent with the goals you have for your child

- _____ I want my child to complete middle school
- _____ I want my child to graduate from high school
- _____ I want my child to receive technical training or go to vo-tech
- _____ I want my child to go to college
- _____ I want my child to get a college degree
- _____ I want my child to get a graduate degree

The following is an area reserved for your comments. Feel free to add anything about parenting that you feel is important, but that may not have been covered in this questionnaire. Thank you!

APPENDIX C

TABLES

Table 1.

Summary of Demographic Information

<u>Relationship to child</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Family income (yearly)</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Biological Parent	50	89.3	Less than \$10,000	3	5.4
Other	6	10.7	\$10,001 - \$20,000	6	10.7
			\$20,001 - \$30,000	3	5.4
			\$30,001 - \$40,000	11	19.6
			\$40,001 - \$50,000	4	7.1
<u>Gender of respondent</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>Percent</u>	\$50,001 - \$60,000	3	5.4
Male	13	23.2	\$60,001 - \$70,000	4	7.1
Female	43	76.8	\$70,001 - \$80,000	3	5.4
			\$80,001 - \$90,000	4	7.1
<u>Gender of child</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>Percent</u>	\$90,000 - \$100,000	5	8.9
Male	18	32.1	Over \$100,000	6	10.7
Female	35	62.5	No Answer	4	7.1
No Answer	3	5.4			
<u>Marital status</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>Percent</u>		<u>Mean</u>	<u>Range</u>
Married	36	64.3	Age of respondent	36.91	21 to 61
Divorced	8	14.3			
Separated	2	3.6	Child age	8.47	4 to 13
Single	5	8.9			
Widowed	2	3.6			
Living with Partner	3	5.4			
<u>Years of education</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>Percent</u>			
6 th to 11 th Grade	9	16.2			
Completed High School	15	26.8			
1-3 Years of College	16	28.5			
Completed Bachelor's	9	16.1			
Graduate Education	5	10.7			
No Answer	1	1.8			

Table 2.

One-sample <i>z</i> -test for ECBI and PS					
	<u><i>z</i>-test</u>	Current Sample		Normative Sample	
		<u><i>M</i></u>	<u><i>SD</i></u>	<u><i>M</i></u>	<u><i>SD</i></u>
ECBI Intensity Score	- .74	70.58	23.84	96.6	35.2
ECBI Problem Score	- .32	4.69	6.04	7.1	7.7
PS Laxness Score	- .88	2.09	.75	2.4	.8
PS Overreactivity Score	- .33	2.58	.92	2.4	.7
PS Total Score	- .2	2.73	.62	2.6	.6

Table 3.

Pearson Product-Moment Correlations between Parenting Scale and Eyberg Child Behavior Inventory

	<u>PS</u> <u>Laxness</u>	<u>PS</u> <u>Overreactivity</u>	<u>PS</u> <u>Total</u>
ECBI Intensity Score	0.386*	0.585**	0.502**
<i>p</i> -value	.005	0.000	0.000
ECBI Problem Score	.12	.311	.245
<i>p</i> -value	.399	.026	.086

Note: Correlations in bold remain significant after the modified Bonferroni correction

* $p = 0.0167$

** $p < 0.001$

Table 4.

Pearson Product-Moment Correlations between SCSORFQ, ECBI, and PS

	<u>ECBI</u> <u>Intensity</u>	<u>ECBI</u> <u>Problem</u>	<u>PS</u> <u>Laxness</u>	<u>PS</u> <u>Overreactivity</u>	<u>PS</u> <u>Total</u>
SCSORFQ Total	- .071	- .324	- .06	.121	.044
<i>p</i> -value	.616	.018	.674	.401	.763

Table 5.

Pearson Product-Moment Correlations between BAS, ECBI, and PS

	<u>ECBI</u> <u>Intensity</u>	<u>ECBI</u> <u>Problem</u>	<u>PS</u> <u>Laxness</u>	<u>PS</u> <u>Overreactivity</u>	<u>PS</u> <u>Total</u>
BAS - NONHISP	- .021	.024	- .047	- .048	- .093
<i>p</i> -value	.12	.866	.739	.739	.522
BAS - HISP	.2	- .175	- .03	.036	.043
<i>p</i> -value	.146	.206	.833	.802	.769

Note: Correlations in bold remain significant after the modified Bonferroni correction

* $p = 0.0167$ ** $p < 0.001$

Table 6.

Summary of Stepwise Regression for Variables Predicting the Intensity Score of the ECBI

Step		β	Adjusted R^2	F Change
1.			.236	15.237**
	PS Total	.503		
	SC Total ^a	- .047		
	BASHISP ^a	.008		
	BASNONHISP ^a	.009		
* $p < .05$ ** $p < .001$ ^a = Excluded Variable				

Table 7.

Summary of Stepwise Regression for Variables Predicting the Problem Score of the ECBI

Step		β	Adjusted R^2	F Change
1.			.043	3.078
	PS Total	.253		
2.			.145	6.377*
	PS Total	.263		
	SC Total	- .344		
	BASHISP ^a	- .249		
	BASNONHISP ^a	.076		
* $p < .05$ ** $p < .001$ ^a = Excluded Variable				

VITA

Sasha D. Jaquez

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Science

Thesis: EXAMINING THE LINK BETWEEN PARENTING DISCIPLINE STRATEGIES AND CHILD PROBLEM BEHAVIORS IN A HISPANIC POPULATION

Major Field: Psychology

Biographical:

Education: Graduated *Crimson Graduate with Honors* with a Bachelor of Arts in Psychology, and minor concentrations in Spanish and Counseling and Educational Psychology from New Mexico State University in May 2007. Completed the requirements for the degree of Master of Science from Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma in May 2009.

Experience: Completed a practicum in clinical psychology at the Psychological Services Center at Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma, 2007 to present.

Professional Memberships: Association for Behavioral and Cognitive Therapies, American Psychology Association, Alpha Chi National Honor Society, Psi Chi National Honor Society.

Name: Sasha D. Jaquez

Date of Degree: May, 2009

Institution: Oklahoma State University

Location: Stillwater, Oklahoma

Title of Study: EXAMINING THE LINK BETWEEN PARENTING DISCIPLINE
STRATEGIES AND CHILD PROBLEM BEHAVIORS IN A HISPANIC
POPULATION

Pages in Study: 83

Candidate for the Degree of Master of Science

Major Field: Psychology

Findings and Conclusions:

This project collected both descriptive and quantitative data from a sample of Hispanic child behaviors, acculturation, and religiosity. The results of this study indicate that this sample of Hispanic parents are highly involved in child-rearing, and have primary responsibility for many aspects of their children's lives. Overall, the sample had low acculturation to traditional Hispanic traditions, and was highly religious. Additionally, the results of this study provided tentative support for the use of popular psychometrically sound measures with a Hispanic population.

ADVISER'S APPROVAL: Maureen A. Sullivan, PhD
