Parenting Practices Among First Generation
Spanish-Speaking Latino Families:
A Spanish Version of the Alabama Parenting Questionnaire

Melissa R. Donovick
Utah State University

Melanie M. Domenech Rodríguez
Utah State University

The present study examined the applicability of the Alabama Parenting Questionnaire to a Spanish-speaking Latino population. Results of the reliability and concurrent validity testing suggest that the Alabama Parenting Questionnaire may be a valuable tool for use with Spanish-speaking Latino families. The Alabama Parenting Questionnaire in Spanish assessed parenting practices among 50 first-generation Spanish-speaking Latino families of primarily Mexican origin with a child between 4 and 9 years of age ($n = 96$ parents, $n = 50$ children). Mothers and fathers completed questionnaires in Spanish to assess parent and child behaviors. Results show that over 80% of parents included in the sample endorsed high levels of monitoring; they also reported using physical affection as a way to praise their child and frequent engagement in conversation with their children about school activities. Few parents used time-out or ignoring as methods of discipline, and very few reported using corporal punishment. Parental involvement, positive parenting, and monitoring significantly predicted externalizing and total behavioral problems among Latino children.

The parent-child relationship is critical to early socialization and the development of the child's social system. The U.S. is becoming increasingly multicultural and has experienced a recent growth in the Latino population. A recent report indicated that over the past three decades, the Latino population has become the largest ethnic minority population, comprising 12.5% of the population in the United States of America (Takeuchi, Alegría, Jackson, & Williams, 2007). Yet, there are few empirically supported culturally appropriate parenting intervention and prevention programs available to serve the mental health needs of Latino populations. Furthermore, the theoretical frameworks that guide parenting theories are based on empirical data on White families. There is a growing literature supporting cultural adaptations of interventions, which involve taking into account cultural values so that the intervention is relevant, easily understood, and feasible to implement (Domenech Rodríguez & Wieling, 2004; Lau, 2006). Cultural adaptations can include changes in the structure, process, and language of the intervention (Bernal, Bellido, & Bonilla, 1995). A recent meta-analysis shows that culturally adapted interventions are significantly more effective than non-adapted ones (Griner & Lambert, 2006). Surprisingly, however, little is known about the specific cultural values, beliefs, and parenting practices of Latino families

(Hill, Bush, & Roosa, 2003), which may be used to reliably and consistently make culturally appropriate adaptations to interventions. Therefore, further research is needed to examine common parenting practices among Latino families and to better understand their relationship to child outcomes among Latino families. This examination can contribute to the development and implementation of culturally appropriate parenting programs. It is essential that mental and health care providers gain a better understanding of parenting among Latino families for both research and clinical purposes, and most importantly to better serve the mental health needs of the growing Latino population. The current study examines parenting practices and their relation to child outcomes among first generation Spanish-speaking Latino families of primarily Mexican origin. The parenting practices are examined using the Alabama Parenting Questionnaire based on the Social Interaction Learning theory framework in an effort to provide basic reliability data and examine its applicability to Latino families.

Social Interaction Learning Theory

Social Interaction Learning (SIL) states that individuals influence each other in the transactions of everyday life, mainly through modeling, punishments, and rewards that comprise social interaction (Patterson, 1982). Forgatch and Martinez (1999) describe the social interaction learning model as the process in which parents directly influence their child's development by means of parental practices and indirectly by contextual factors that surround the fam-

ily environment. SIL incorporates social interaction and social learning theories, and conceptualizes the parent and child relationship from one integrated approach that can be understood by examining the two contributing theories. First, SIL, also known as coercion theory, describes the negative parent-child interaction processes that lead to negative outcomes for the child. For example, a parent may use nagging, scolding, and yelling in response to the child's misbehavior, and the child responds by continuing to misbehave with increased aggression. The parent eventually concedes and does not follow through with disciplining the child. The child thus learns that she can get what she wants by not minding her parent. Coercion theory posits that negative parent-child processes are learned over repeated trials and become over-learned (Dishion, Patterson, & Kavanagh, 1992). These negative interactions escalate over time as the result of (negative) reinforcement from previous trials, creating a coercive pattern that becomes automatic. Coercion theory places child conduct problems in the context of the parent-child relationship, thus underscoring the importance of parenting processes (Dadds, Maujean, & Fraser, 2003).

The second component to the SIL theory is the social learning perspective, which states that behavior is regulated by consequences one anticipates for performing the behavior (Bandura, 1965). When applied to parenting, the social learning perspective explains how parent-child interaction patterns are maintained over time and function within family systems (Forgatch & Bank, 2002). Positive parenting practices stem from this theoretical framework, and are those that have been found to be related to positive child outcomes. According to SIL theory, there are five core positive parenting practices: positive involvement, monitoring, effective discipline, problem solving, and skills encouragement. To successfully change the problem behavior of a child, one must change how the social environment reacts to the child (Reid, Patterson, & Snyder, 2002), ideally increasing the positive parent-child interactions, while decreasing the coercive interactions to create a "balance" of five positive parent-child interactions for every negative one.

The third component to the SIL theory involves contextualizing parenting processes. The SIL theory provides an integrated view of the parent-child interaction that takes into account the context in which that relationship is embedded. SIL stresses the importance of contextual factors such as culture, family transitions, socioeconomic status, stress, social support, and neighborhood as influences on child behavior. According to the theory, the contextual variables exert their influence upon parents, whose parenting then impacts the child. For example, a parent who has recently lost her job may feel extremely stressed and concerned about the financial impact of her loss for her family; her distress may lead to poor choices in parenting (e.g., yelling instead of giving a good direction). This mediational model has been supported empirically (Forgatch & Bank, 2002).

The five core positive parenting practices are related and the skills used to build one, also build others. Positive involvement involves doing pleasant things together as a family and providing positive parental attention. Monitoring refers to knowing where the child is, with whom, and what the child is doing. Effective discipline refers to developmentally appropriate rule setting with mild consequences for violations; consistency and immediacy are critical to effective discipline. Problem solving incorporates skills that parents use to resolve family disagreements, negotiate rules, and establish positive and negative consequences for behavior. Finally, skills encouragement refers to parents' success in promoting children's desired behaviors through positive reinforcement. The core parenting practices outlined above have been integrated into a parent management intervention which has been effective in reducing problem behaviors in White families and children (Kazdin &Weisz, 1998).

Culture and the Social Interaction Learning Model

The focus on context is a strength of the Social Interaction Learning model. Culture is one larger context in which parent-child learning processes takes place. Cultural values and beliefs have been shown to play a role in the way parents socialize their children (Harwood, Scholmerich, Schulze, & Gonzalez, 1999; Zayas, 1992). Researchers have suggested that the socialization goals of a cultural group influence parenting cognitions and practices (Bronstein & Cote, 2003). Therefore, it is possible that Latino parents socialize their children differently than White children. Normative parenting practices and optimal child outcomes for White children may not generalize to Latino families. Few studies to date have included the role of culture in parenting and even fewer studies have examined parenting practices among Latino families. The remaining challenge is to apply the SIL model of parenting to other cultures, and examine the core parenting practices (i.e., skills encouragement, effective discipline, monitoring, problem solving, and positive involvement) and their relationship to child outcomes among Latino families. This knowledge will enable the development of culturally appropriate intervention and prevention methods for Latino families.

Latinos and Parenting

Some research suggests that Latina mothers' parenting practices are different than White mothers' and reflect Latina cultural values (e.g., Harwood, 1992). Harwood's findings in the area of infant attachment provide evidence that Latina mothers perceive and interpret infant behavior differently than White mothers. More specifically, Harwood's study finds that Puerto Rican mothers are more likely to control and structure the parent-child interaction as compared to White mothers. The higher structure and control is a caregiving activity thought to be in line with

Puerto Rican cultural values of proper demeanor and inter-dependence (Harwood, 1992).

Very few studies have examined the SIL five core parenting practices among Latino families. However, research in the area of child development among Latino families has provided information for similar parenting constructs. Some studies have described Latino parenting as more authoritarian (Knight, Virdin, & Roosa, 1994), controlling, and relying on physical punishment (Gutierrez, Sameroff, & Karrer, 1988), when compared to White families. Alternatively, Escovar and Lazarus (1982) found that Latino parents expressed high levels of open verbal and physical expressions of affection and nurturance. Finkelstein, Donenberg, and Martinovich (2001) described Latino parents as more permissive, as compared to White middle class and African American parents. Yet another study suggested that Latino families are not overwhelmingly authoritarian, as portrayed in past research findings and the media. Instead, Latino fathers were found to be warm and responsive and exerted minimal to low amounts of control (Staples & Miranda, 1980). More recently, an observational study to examine Latino parenting styles with 4 to 9 year old children found uniformly high levels of warmth among both mothers and fathers regardless of the child's gender (Domenech Rodríguez, Donovick, & Crowley, 2008). However, levels of autonomy-granting and demandingness varied across gender, with parents of girls exhibiting lower autonomy-granting and higher demandingness than boys. These authors found that, when all three parenting dimensions are taken into account, Latino parents do not fit neatly into the mainstream categories of permissive, neglectful, authoritative, or authoritarian. It is clear that findings regarding a comprehensive characterization of Latino parenting are inconsistent and fail to reach agreement at this time.

The purpose of the current study is to examine parenting practices among first generation Spanish-speaking Latino families of primarily Mexican origin, in an effort to determine common parenting practices and report basic validity data on the Spanish version of the APQ. We also examine the relationship between self-reported parenting practices and child outcomes among primarily Mexican origin Spanish-speaking Latino families.

Method

Participants

Fifty Spanish-speaking Latino families of Mexican origin (83%) or other Latin American countries (e.g., Columbia, El Salvador; 17%) were recruited from a rural community in the western United States. Intact families (two biological parents), single parent, and stepparent families with at least one child between 4 and 9 years of age participated in the study. If a family had more than one child between the ages of 4 and 9, then the parent had the option to select which child to focus on for the study. Of the total sample, 44 families (88%) were two-parent intact families, two (4%) were two-parent stepfamilies, and four (8%) were single parents with three single mothers and one single father. A total of 47 fathers and 49 mothers participated in the study. The average age of children who participated in the study was 7 years old. Thirty (60%) children were female. All parents were first generation Latinos (i.e., foreign-born). Although language ability was not assessed formally, nearly all parents reported to be primarily Spanish-speaking with a few parents demonstrating minimal bilingual (Spanish/English) skills. Most families (96%) reported a yearly income of $19,000-$35,000, and about 4% reported earning more than $35,000. Based on the Acculturation Rating Scale for Mexican Americans (ARSMA-II; Cuellar, Arnold, & Maldonado, 1995), most of the participants (80%) were categorized as traditional or separated, meaning that they retained their culture of origin and reported not being particularly integrated into mainstream American culture. Some participants (18%) were bicultural (i.e., similar degree of functioning in culture-of-origin and mainstream culture) with two participants (1%) indicating assimilated or marginalized status.

Procedure

The research study described here is part of a larger study to culturally adapt a parenting intervention for Spanish-speaking Latino families. As part of the protocol, parents completed a variety of self-report questionnaires on demographic characteristics, developmental expectations, parenting practices, and child outcomes during a single appointment at a University laboratory. Although all measures were available in Spanish and English, all participants chose to complete all measures in Spanish. The questionnaires used that are relevant to this study are the Alabama Parenting Questionnaire (APQ) and the Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL).

The sample was recruited through local churches, announcements at schools and community parent support groups, flyers placed throughout the community, personal face-to face recruitment by bicultural research assistants, and word of mouth by participants. Media outreach was also utilized, including a radio advertisement on a local station during Spanish-language programming and a web posting. Visiting Latino neighborhoods, door to door solicitation, and utilization of personal networks have proven to be successful in recruiting Latino families into research studies (Harachi, Catalano, & Hawkins, 1997). However, for this study, word-of-mouth was the most powerful recruitment method with 46% ($n = 23$) of participants enrolling in the study after being approached by a friend or relative (Domenech Rodríguez, Rodriguez & Davis, 2006).

Interested families made initial contact with a bicultural, bilingual researcher via telephone. Participants were informed of the study procedures, duration, location, and incentives. Families were included in the study that had parents who were Spanish-speaking, and had at least one

child between the ages of 4 and 9. Special efforts were made to ensure cultural sensitivity during the research study. For example, appointments were arranged at the convenience of the family members, including evening and weekend appointments. Childcare was provided for families and, when needed, transportation was also provided. Bilingual, bicultural staff was present for all research assessment procedures.

The data collection visit lasted about 1.5 hrs. A brief introduction to the protocol was provided, first showing parents the room where data would be collected and where the target child would remain for child care (during survey data collection). Informed consent was read to participants if they desired; otherwise, participants were given time to read through the informed consent and ask any questions. Special emphasis was made to assure participants that sensitive information would be kept confidential. Information regarding legal status was not obtained to avoid any data collection activities that might cause a distressing environment. We know anecdotally, however, that most of the families were undocumented. Families were paid for their participation, $25 per parent and a small gift ($5 or under) for the child. This amount equals about $10 per hour for participation, which is consistent with payment in similar studies.

Measures

Socioeconomic variables. Socioeconomic and demographic information were obtained from a self-report questionnaire. The inventory assessed age, household annual income, marital status, postal code, educational status, and number of persons and children currently living in the household.

Acculturation. Level of acculturation was assessed using Cuellar, Arnold, and Maldonado's (1995) Acculturation Rating Scale for Mexican Americans-II (ARSMA-II). This 30 item, self-report, 5-point Likert scale assesses for level of acculturation status with scores indicating two orientation scores, Mexican and Anglo, which are then used to determine acculturation status: integrated, separated, assimilated, and marginalized. The Spanish version of the ARSMA-II was administered. The ARSMA-II in Spanish has good internal reliabilities for both the Mexican Orientation scale (Cronbach alpha = .88) and the Anglo Orientation scale (Cronbach alpha = .86). The ARSMA-II in Spanish also shows good test-retest reliability (.96) and good concurrent validity with the original ARSMA in Spanish (.89; Cuellar et al., 1995). The ARASMA-II in Spanish is appropriate for use with other Latino populations (Schwartz, Zamboanga, & Jarvis, 2007). Consistent with Schwartz et al.'s research, participants were instructed to substitute the name of their country of origin where the form indicated Mexico.

Alabama Parenting Questionnaire (APQ). The APQ is a self-report measure assessing the five core parenting processes of SIL theory that are conceptualized to be important parental practices related to child outcomes: involvement, positive parenting, poor monitoring/supervision, inconsistent discipline, and corporal punishment. This measure was developed using the Oregon Social Learning Center (OSLC) Parent Management Training system and SIL theory, and includes questions on discipline practices (Shelton, Frick, & Wooton, 1996). The APQ has 42 items, which are answered on a Likert scale ranging from 1 (never) to 5 (always). The APQ demonstrated good psychometric properties in the original scale development (Shelton et al., 1996). Internal consistency reliability alphas for the involvement scale (.80) and the positive parenting (.80) scales were strongest. Poor supervision/monitoring (.67) and inconsistent discipline (.67) had marginally acceptable reliabilities. The corporal punishment (.46) did not yield an acceptable reliability. The reliability coefficients of the normative sample suggest that the APQ's most reliable subscales are the involvement and positive parenting sub scales. The normative sample did not respond consistently to the poor supervision/monitoring and inconsistent discipline subscales, and the corporal punishment scale did not reach adequate levels of internal consistency reliability. The low reliability coefficient of the corporal punishment scale is most likely due to the limited number of items included in the scale ($n = 3$), and the normative sample demonstrated limited range of responses (Shelton, Frick, & Wooton, 1996). The normative sample was based on a clinically referred and community sample in the United States, and we predicted that given that our sample consists of a community sample, we may find similar reliability coefficients. The APQ was well suited for research in the current study because the APQ has previously shown good psychometric properties both within the U.S. and internationally with parents of children between the ages of 4-10 (Dadds, Maujean, & Fraser, 2003; Dhaule, Bhagat, & Thakkar, 2005; Hawes & Dadds, 2006).

The APQ was not available in Spanish. The measure was translated using back translation and a bilingual committee (Marin & Marin, 1991). Measures were first translated into Spanish, then back-translated into English by an independent translator unfamiliar with the measure. Finally, differences were resolved through a bilingual committee. Equivalence and conceptual understanding was examined and resolved. A complete list of the translated items is found in the Appendix at the end of this article. The items are rated on a five point scale from never to always. In Spanish, the anchors are nunca (never), no mucho (not so much), algunas veces (sometimes), frecuentemente (frequently), and siempre (always).

Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL). Childhood behavioral problems were assessed using Achenbach and Rescorla's (2000) Child Behavior Checklist. The CBCL has two forms, one for children ages 1.5 to 5 years old, and another for children ages 6 to18 years old. This is a self-report measure that is completed by parents or caregivers to assess behavioral, emotional, and social functioning (for children 1.5 to 18 years old) and competence (for children

6 to 18 years old). The CBCL is available in English and Spanish. The Spanish version was administered to participants.

The CBCL generates scores representing two broad groupings of symptoms. One grouping is the internalizing domain, which consists of symptoms of anxiety and depression, somatic complaints, and withdrawal. For children 1.5 to 5, emotional reactivity is also assessed in the internalizing domain. The second grouping is the externalizing domain, which consists of attention problems and aggressive behavior. A total problem score can also be derived, and is an indication of the total sum of scores on the 99 specific problem behavior items of the CBCL. Scores can range from 0 to 200. The CBCL for ages 1.5 to 5 years old shows excellent test-retest alpha reliabilities for the internalizing scale (.90) externalizing (.87) and total problems (.90). The CBCL for children ages 6-18 years old also has good psychometric properties, with excellent test-retest alpha reliabilities for the internalizing (.91), externalizing (.92) and total problems (.94) scales. The CBCL has been standardized and normed utilizing a sample that included Latino children. The CBCL also possesses adequate construct, content, and criterion-related validity (Achenbach & Rescorla, 2000). The CBCL in Spanish also demonstrated excellent test-retest alpha reliabilities for the internalizing scale (.90) externalizing scale (.94) and total problems (.97) (Gallo, Muñoz, Vargas, Cardenas, Perez, & Villanueva, 2005).

Results

The purpose of this study was to describe common parenting practices of first generation Spanish-speaking Latino families with a child between the ages of 4 and 9 years old, and report basic reliability data for the Spanish version of the APQ. Additionally, we examined the relationship between self-reported parenting practices and child outcomes. An analysis of frequencies was used to determine common parenting practices. Alpha coefficient estimates were calculated to determine basic APQ reliability data. Regression analyses were preformed to examine the relationship between self-reported parenting practices and child outcomes.

Common Parenting Practices

Common parenting practices were calculated by examining the response pattern to each APQ individual item. Those items that participants endorsed as occurring "always" and "frequently" – and on the reversed scored items, those that participants endorsed as "never" and not "so much" – by 80% of the sample were considered common parenting practices. The current examination of common parenting practices is modeled after research carried out by Calzada and Eyberg (2002), who examined parenting practices of Dominican and Puerto Rican mothers with a child between the ages of 2 and 6 years old. Of the APQ's 42

items, 12 seemed to tap common parenting practices for the current sample. When analyzed by parent gender, the common parenting practices stay fairly stable with the exception of three items.

Positive parenting. Two items were highly endorsed by both fathers and mothers. Over 80% of fathers and mothers reported letting their child "know when he or she is doing a good job with something" and hugging or kissing their child "when he or she has done something well," either "always" or "most of the time." Fathers reported high endorsement (over 80% of the time reporting "frequently" or "always") for two additional items: "You praise your child if he or she behaves well," and "You tell your child that you like it when he or she helps around the house." Mothers endorsed these items 73.5% and 77.1% of the time, respectively.

Involvement. Only one item in this 10-item subscale was highly endorsed by parents. Most mothers (87.5%) reported "frequently" or "always" to the item "You ask your child about his or her day at school." Fathers endorsed the item frequently as well, but did not reach the 80% cutoff to be considered highly endorsed.

Poor monitoring. The monitoring scale had the highest number of common parenting practices. In other words, Latino families reported monitoring their children very closely. Of the 12 items, 7 tapped common parenting practices for the current sample. Eighty percent of parents reported "not so much" or "never" to the following parental monitoring items: "Your child stays out in the evening past the time he/she is supposed to be home," "Your child is out with friends you don't know," "Your child goes out without a set time to be home," "Your child is out after dark without an adult with him/her," "You get so busy you forget where your child is and what he/she is doing," "Your child comes home from school more than an hour past the time you expect him/her home," and "Your child is at home without supervision."

Other discipline practices. Eighty percent of parents responded "not so much" or "never" to the following discipline items: "You use time-out (make him/her sit or stand in a corner) as punishment," and "You ignore your child when he or she is misbehaving."

Corporal punishment. Over 80% of parents in the current sample responded "not so much" or "never" to the following APQ items: "You hit your child with a belt, switch, or other object when he/she has done something wrong," and "You slap your child when he or she has done something wrong."

Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL)

Results of child mental health among Latino families in the current study did not reveal clinically significant levels of internalizing or externalizing disorders. Based on the criteria set forth in the CBCL manual, T scores above 67 indicate a clinically significant child behavioral problem (Achenbach & Rescorla, 2000). Both mothers' and fathers'

responses on the internalizing subscale (e.g., withdrawn, depressed) yielded t-scores below this cutoff ($M = 58.04$, $SD = 8.94$, and $M = 55.17$, $SD = 10.10$, respectively). Likewise, mothers' and fathers' responses on the externalizing subscale (e.g., acting out, aggression) did not yield clinically significant t-scores ($M = 54.63$, $SD = 9.80$, and $M = 53.64$, $SD = 9.43$, respectively). Finally, mothers' and fathers' responses on the total behavior problems subscale, again yielded t-scores below the clinical cutoff ($M = 56.33$, $SD = 9.52$, and $M = 54.38$, $SD = 9.25$, respectively). While these results suggest that Latino parents did not report clinically significant symptoms of child emotional and behavioral problems, an informal trend is worth noting. Both mothers and fathers reported slightly more internalizing problems, compared to externalizing and total behavior problems.

APQ Reliabilities

The original APQ contains 42 items and five parental constructs, plus a group of discipline questions. The entire scale was administered to each parent in the study. Of the five scales, two scales worked well with our sample in their original form: positive parenting and involvement. A third scale, poor monitoring, showed good reliability in a revised form. Findings for each of the scales follow.

Positive parenting scale. Six items contained in this scale reflect the use of positive reinforcement. Sample items are: "You compliment your child when he or she has done something well," and "You reward or give something extra to your child for obeying you or behaving well." Cronbach's alpha for parents' scores on the APQ scale for positive parenting was .72 ($M = 24.91$; $SD = 3.22$). The possible range for the positive parenting scale was 6-30.

Involvement scale. Ten items included in this scale reflected parental involvement. Sample items are: "You ask your child about his/her day at school," and "You play games with your child or do other fun things with your child." Cronbach's alpha for parents' score on the involvement scale was .77 ($M = 35.99$; $SD = 6.11$). The possible range for the involvement scale was 10-50.

Poor monitoring scale, revised. Items in this scale reflect the lack of monitoring and supervision of the child. The original APQ Monitoring Scale has 10 items. The original version of the Poor Monitoring Scale showed poor reliability with the current sample, with a Cronbach's alpha of .55. Upon further examination of common parenting practices it became evident that 7 of the 10 items represented common parenting practices for parents in our sample. As such, the items did not provide enough variability to be viable for inclusion in this scale. When the highly endorsed parenting practices items were removed, only three items remained: "Your child fails to leave a note or to let you know where he or she is going," "You don't check that your child comes home from school when he or she is supposed to," and "You don't tell your child where you are going." Despite the sparse number of items, Cronbach's

alpha for parents' score on the modified scale was .73 ($M = 9.33$, $SD = 4.10$). The possible range of scores for the APQ revised poor monitoring scale was 3-15.

Inconsistent discipline scale. This scale contains six items that reflect lack of consistency in applying discipline. Sample items include: "You threaten to punish your child and then do not actually punish him/her," and "Your child is not punished when he or she has done something wrong." Cronbach's alpha for the Inconsistent Discipline scale was .58 ($M = 13.72$, $SD = 3.45$). The Inconsistent Discipline scale yielded a rather low alpha due to lack of variability of responses and the wide range of severity of the items. The range for the inconsistent discipline scale was 6-30.

Corporal punishment scale. This scale contains three items that assess for the use of corporal punishment. Sample items include: "You slap your child when he or she has done something wrong," and "You hit your child with a belt, switch, or other object when he or she has done something wrong." The Cronbach's alpha of parents' reported scores on the Corporal Punishment Scale was .41 ($M = 4.57$, $SD = 1.46$). The Corporal Punishment Scale yielded a low alpha due to the limited number of items included in the subscale, the lack of variability of responses, and the wide range of severity of the items. The range of items on the Corporal Punishment Scale was 3-15.

Concurrent Validation

Parenting practices such as ineffective discipline and poor monitoring have been shown to be correlated with children's externalizing behavior problems among White families (Bank, Forgatch, Patterson, & Fetro, 1993). Parent interventions that encourage and develop parents' monitoring and discipline skills have been effective in reducing antisocial child behavior (e.g., Bank, Marlowe, Reid, Patterson, & Weinrott, 1991; Chamberlain & Reid, 1991; Forgatch, 1991; Patterson, Chamberlain, & Reid, 1982). In another study, elevations on the APQ parenting scales showed correlations with disruptive behavioral disorders among children (Shelton, Frick, & Wootton, 1996). Based on previous literature findings, it was expected that APQ parental practices would correlate with CBCL scores, and thus provide a concurrent validity check.

Correlations were calculated for mothers and fathers in order to examine the relationship between self-reported parenting practices and child outcomes. Correlations of self-reported parental practices and internalizing behavior problems were in the expected directions (see Table 1). Fathers' parental involvement ($r = -.43$, $p < .01$) and positive parenting ($r = -.40$, $p < .01$) were significantly related to externalizing behavior problems, wherein increased endorsement of involvement and positive parenting was associated with fewer externalizing behavior problems. Based on a previous study, Williams (2003) found that White fathers' self-reported parental involvement was correlated with child externalizing behavioral disorders. Mothers'

poor monitoring was significantly correlated with externalizing problems ($r = .37, p < .05$). Mothers' scores on the original version of the Poor Monitoring Scale were used in the analysis. Thus, mothers who endorsed higher levels of poor monitoring were more likely to report increased child externalizing behavioral problems. When examining total behavior problems, fathers' ($r = -.42, p < .01$) and mothers' ($r = -.36, p < .05$) involvement, and fathers' positive parenting ($r = -.46, p < .01$) emerged as statistically significant correlations. The correlations indicate a significant relationship between increased involvement and positive parenting, and decreased total behavioral problems. Caution must be taken regarding clinical significance given the small correlation coefficients. Based on the basic reliability data and concurrent validity checks, it seems likely that the Spanish APQ is a promising scale that can be used with first generation Spanish-speaking Latino families of primarily Mexican origin. However, continued research is needed to further demonstrate reliability and validity with other Latino populations.

In an effort to further examine the relationship between self-reported parenting practices and internalizing, externalizing, and total behavior problem scores on the CBCL, regression analyses were conducted. Given the complexity of using parents' ratings on the same child, mothers' and fathers' scores were analyzed separately. Regression analyses included mothers' and fathers' scores on the following APQ scales: involvement, positive parenting, and the original poor monitoring scale. Only these three scales were used as predictors because the others did not have acceptable levels of internal consistency. Although the original poor monitoring scale yielded low reliability, it was included in the analysis due to the strong response pattern indicating common parenting practices around monitoring.

Table 1
Correlations among parenting practices and child internalizing, externalizing, and total problems for mothers and fathers

Parenting Practice	INT	EXT	TOT
Mother			
Involvement	-.28	-.29	-.36*
Positive parenting	-.14	.12	.01
Poor monitoring	-.10	.37*	.03
Father			
Involvement	-.25	-.43**	-.42**
Positive parenting	-.29	-.40**	-.46**
Poor monitoring	-.08	-.08	-.12

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

Therefore, including the full scale (original poor monitoring scale) in the analysis could provide conceptually meaningful data regarding common parenting practices and their relationship with child mental health. The outcome variables were mother and father reported scores on the internalizing, externalizing, and total problem subscales of the CBCL.

Preliminary analyses were conducted to determine if background factors were associated with primary study variables. Socioeconomic status among Spanish-speaking Latino families of primarily Mexican origin was examined by analyzing frequencies for income and educational attainment. For the current sample, 96% ($n = 92$) of Latino parents reported earning less than $35,000 per year, and 4% ($n = 4$) reported earning more than $35,000. Given the lack of variability in socioeconomic status, these variables were dropped from further analyses. Educational attainment was generally low with 83% ($n = 80$) of participants having a high school diploma or less, 7% ($n = 7$) having some college education, and 6% ($n = 6$) having a college degree. Since the majority of parents fell into one category, the educational status variable was dropped from further analyses. Acculturation status was examined by analyzing the frequencies of categorical constructs. For the current sample, 80% ($n = 77$) of parents were categorized as traditional/separated, 18% ($n = 17$) were classified as bicultural, 1% ($n = 1$) was classified as assimilated, and 1% ($n = 1$) was categorized as marginalized. Given that the assimilated and marginalized categories only included one parent, the acculturation variable was dropped from further analyses.

Mothers' scores of positive parenting, parental involvement, and the original version of poor monitoring together significantly predicted externalizing child behavioral problems, $F(3, 33) = 4.4, p = .01$, and the model accounted for 28% of the variance. All predictors made a significant contribution to the model (see Table 2). The model for fathers' scores of positive parenting, parental involvement, and poor monitoring (original) predicted externalizing child behavioral problems, $F(3, 37) = 2.9, p = .05$, accounting for 19% of the variance. However, none of the individual predictors had significant independent contribution. The fathers' model predicting total behavioral problems was also significant, $F(3, 37) = 3.6, p = .02$, accounting for 22% of the variance. However, none of the individual predictors had significant independent contribution (see Table 3). None of the self-reported parenting practices significantly predicted internalizing behavior problems.

Discussion

One of the primary goals of this research was to examine the applicability of the Spanish version of the APQ with a sample of first generation Spanish-speaking Latino families. Based on the current study's reliability and concurrent validity findings, the Spanish version of the

Table 2

Simultaneous Multiple Regression of mother's positive parenting, parental involvement, and poor monitoring predicting externalizing behavioral problems on the CBCL

	B	SE	t	p
Intercept	36.13	11.39	4.05	.00
Positive Parenting	.90	.46	1.96	.06
Parental Involvement	-.58	.23	-2.50	.02
Poor Monitoring	.78	.35	2.24	.03

R_ = .28

Table 3

Simultaneous Multiple Regression of father's positive parenting, parental involvement, and poor monitoring predicting externalizing behavioral problems and total behavioral problems on the CBCL

	B	SE	t	p
Externalizing Behavior Problems				
Intercept	82.80	12.59	6.57	.00
Positive parenting	-.69	.54	-1.28	.20
Parental involvement	-.48	.35	-1.37	.18
Poor monitoring	.32	.34	.96	.34
Total Behavioral Problems				
Intercept	89.10	12.15	7.33	.00
Positive parenting	-1.00	.52	-1.92	.06
Parental involvement	-.35	.34	-1.04	.30
Poor monitoring	.15	.33	0.47	.64

R_ = .19 for externalizing behavioral problems, and R_ = .22 for total behavioral problems

APQ appears acceptable for use with first generation Spanish-speaking Latino families. Results indicate acceptable levels of internal consistency and reliability for the positive parenting and involvement scales of the APQ in Spanish. Although the poor monitoring scale demonstrated low reliability in its original form, a revised poor monitoring scale demonstrated acceptable reliability with the current sample. Future studies with older children may want to include the full scale, as these findings may be developmentally bound. The inconsistent discipline scale and cor-

poral punishment scale revealed low reliability alphas in the current sample. This finding is most likely due to the limited amount of items included in the scales and the wide range of severity of the items.

The second goal of this research was to examine the common parenting practices among Spanish-speaking Latino families utilizing a parenting questionnaire. Results indicate a number of parenting practices that could be considered common parenting practices among Spanish-speaking Latino parents of young children (4-9 years of age) primarily of Mexican origin. Over 80% of the sample's parents endorsed "frequently" or "always" to hug or kiss their child when he or she has done something well and to ask their child about their day at school. Interestingly, a previous study (Calzada & Eyberg, 2002) found similar results with a different Latino sample consisting of Puerto Rican and Dominican mothers. Calzada and Eyberg found that over 85% of first generation Puerto Rican and Dominican mothers in their sample endorsed "always" for the item "I express affection by hugging, and kissing my child." Both studies highlight a similar common positive parenting practice; both Latino samples reported frequently expressing physical warmth with their children. It may be that positive parenting practices such as parental warmth may be related to Latino cultural values common among first generation Puerto Rican, Dominican, and Mexican parents.

More than 80% of parents reported "not so much" or "never" using time-out as a punishment when their children misbehave. Additionally, 80% of parents reported "not so much" or "never" hitting their children with a belt or switch or other object when they have done something wrong. These findings are consistent with previous research carried out by Calzada and Eyberg (2002), who found that over 80% of their Latino sample of mothers reported "seldom" or "never" using physical punishment, criticism, or argument as discipline. Thus, both studies found that parents tended to not use physical punishment as a discipline method despite both samples representing heterogeneous Latino countries, again suggesting that this might not be common parenting practice among parents across various Latino countries. Interestingly, these results differ from previous research, which found that Latina mothers did not tend to use positive parenting techniques (Garcia Coll, 1990; Laosa, 1980), and rather tended to use physical punishment as discipline (Fracasso, Busch-Rossnagel, & Fisher, 1994; Knight, Virdin, & Roosa, 1994). Thus, it seems that there might be heterogeneous methods of discipline common among Latino families. Alternately, there may be other important factors such as acculturation that play a significant role in common parenting practices. The current study utilized a sample of first generation Latino families, while other studies utilized second generation or more acculturated samples (Garcia Coll, 1990; Laosa, 1980; Fracasso et al., 1994; & Knight et al., 1994), and some studies failed to mention acculturation status of Latino parents.

In terms of discipline practices, over 80% of the Spanish-speaking Latino families of primarily Mexican origin included in the sample reported that they do not ignore their children's misbehavior. This finding is also consistent with Calzada and Eyberg (2002), who found that 92% of Puerto Rican and Dominican mothers denied ignoring their children's misbehavior. In addition, Spanish-speaking Latino parents of primarily Mexican origin in the current study reported consistently following through with discipline and consequences when their children misbehave. This finding is in line with Calzada and Eyberg (2002), who describe Puerto Rican and Dominican mothers as highly consistent with discipline following children's misbehavior. In cross-cultural studies, evidence suggests that consistent follow-through with discipline is congruent with raising a child who is well-behaved or *bien educado*; being well-behaved (e.g., proper behavior, interdependence) has been documented as important to Latino parents (Carlson & Harwood, 2003). This suggests that Latino parents socialize their children in ways that may be consistent with their cultural values.

The corporal punishment and inconsistent discipline scales did not reach conventional standards of reliability. Domenech Rodríguez and Villatoro (2004) used the Spanish-language APQ presented herein with a sample of Mexican parents living in Mexico City, and the discipline scales reliably assessed parenting practices. It may be possible that parents living in the United States are reluctant to report their discipline practices. For example, based on focus group data, Domenech Rodríguez (2004) found that first-generation parents reported fear of Child Protective Services involvement as a result of differences in parenting practices between Latinos and "Americans." Related to this, it may be that parents' responses reflect a social desirability bias. The original validity studies on the APQ did not include social desirability measures. Or, it may be that given the scale's limited number of items, it is difficult to consistently reach acceptable high alphas across different samples, particularly for the corporal punishment scale, which only contained three items.

The current sample of Spanish-speaking Latino families primarily of Mexican origin reported common parenting practices that are mainly consistent with previous studies with other Latino families. The SIL model conceptualizes Latino culture as part of the context that surrounds the parent and child relationship. SIL hypothesizes that contextual factors such as culture impact parenting practices. This study provided evidence that the use of the APQ with theoretical underpinnings of the SIL model can be applied to Latino families to further understand Latino child socialization.

The investigation of self-reported parenting practices on the APQ and their relationship with child outcomes on the CBCL revealed that none of the self-reported parenting practices for mothers and/or fathers predicted internalizing behavior problems. It is possible that this finding is related to a measurement issue, wherein the APQ is based on a theoretical model of observed parenting practices related to externalizing behavioral problems. On the other hand, mothers' and fathers' parental involvement, positive parenting, and poor monitoring predicted externalizing behavioral problems. These findings are consistent with the literature on White majority families (Bank, Marlowe, Reid, Patterson, & Weinrott, 1991; Chamberlain & Reid, 1991; Forgatch, 1991; Patterson, Chamberlain, & Reid, 1982). Fathers' parental involvement, positive parenting, and poor supervision predicted total child behavioral problems.

In summary, these findings have important implications for prevention and intervention efforts with Latino families. It seems likely that the SIL model and the use of self-reported parenting practices on the APQ can be applied to the understanding of parenting among Latino parents of primarily Mexican origin. Thus, clinical interventions that incorporate and encourage parental involvement, positive parenting skills, and monitoring may be beneficial and useful in decreasing overall behavioral problems among Latino children.

Exploring preferred discipline methods among first-generation Latino families may be beneficial to researchers and clinicians. Time-out and selectively ignoring misbehavior have been found to be effective methods of discipline among majority White families (Patterson, Dishion, & Bank, 1984; Wells & Rankin, 1988); yet, over 80% of the current sample reported to not use time-out as a method of discipline. This finding may represent a potential opportunity for a new tool in intervention and prevention efforts. It may be possible that parents have not learned how to use time-out, have never tried using time-out, or may have learned an incorrect way. Further exploration is needed to clarify if there is a cultural misalignment between Latino parenting and the use of time-out. Then again, it may be that the use of time-out is a parenting construct adapted from White Western culture and may not be an appropriate form of discipline for Latino parents.

Limitations to the current study should be noted. First, the data included in the current study are based on self-report surveys. Even though this method is useful and feasible, it may be subject to social desirability bias and may not provide an accurate picture of parenting practices (Varela, Vernberg, Sanchez-Sosa, Riveros, Mitchell, & Mashunkashey, 2004). Secondly, since the data was analyzed for each parent separately, limitations may exist. For example, it may be possible that weaknesses in one parent's parenting practices were strengths in the other's, together leading to positive child outcomes. Thus analyzing data from parents separately would not capture this dynamic parenting process. Thirdly, caution must be taken when evaluating the study's findings, given that the APQ was based on parenting constructs originally developed with majority Western culture notions of parenting. It may be possible that the APQ did not include important aspects of Latino parenting. It would be beneficial for future studies to examine Latino parenting behaviors at multiple levels

of specificity (e.g., styles, dimensions, practices) and their relation to child outcomes. Qualitative and observational methods may be fruitful in increasing scientific knowledge regarding the socialization processes of Latino parenting and their relation to child outcomes. Longitudinal and experimental studies are needed to clarify the developmental trajectory of Latino parenting and its implications for child development.

Overall, basic reliability results suggest that the Spanish version of the APQ is acceptable for use with first generation Spanish-speaking Latino parents. In the current sample of Spanish-speaking, first generation, Latino families of primarily Mexican origin several themes emerge concerning common parenting practices. The first theme highlights positive parenting practices. Over 80% of parents reported to endorse positive parenting practices such as parental involvement and positive reinforcement for appropriate behavior. The second theme points out that Latino parents do not report using harsh discipline parenting practices. Over 80% of the current sample endorsed not using corporal punishment. The third theme reveals that Latino parents tend to be protective. Over 80% of the current sample reported engaging in high levels of monitoring and supervision with their children. In addition, our findings indicate that mothers' and fathers' scores on the APQ (parental involvement, positive parenting, and monitoring) predicted child behavior problems, a finding that is consistent with the SIL model of parenting. Therefore, it seems likely that the SIL model which incorporates core parenting practices such as positive parenting practices, involvement, monitoring/supervision, and limit setting would be applicable to Latino families.

In sum, the current study's sample of fist generation Spanish-speaking Latino parents of primarily Mexican origin reported common parenting practices including engaging in high levels of parental involvement, positive parenting skills, and monitoring. Parents' self-report of child behavioral problems were below the clinical range, perhaps indicating that Latino common parenting practices may be a protective factor for prevention of future child behavioral problems.

References

Achenbach, T. M. & Rescorla, L. A. (2000). *Manual for the ASEBA Preschool Forms & Profiles*. Burlington, VT: University of Vermont, Research Center for Children, and Youth.

Albores-Gallo, L., Lara-Muñoz, C., Esperón-Vargas, C., Cárdenas, J., Pérez, A., & Villaneuva, G. (2005). Validity and reliability of the CBCL 6-18. Includes DHS scales. *Actas Esp Psiquiatry*, 35, 393-399.

Bank, L., Marlowe, J. H., Reid, J. B., Patterson, G. R., & Weinrott, M. R. (1991). A comparative evaluation of parent training interventions for families of chronic delinquents. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 19*, 15-33.

Bernal, G., & Bellido, C., & Bonilla, J. (1995). Ecological validity and cultural sensitivity for outcome research: Issues for the cultural adaptation and development of psychological treatment with Hispanics. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 23,* 67-82.

Bronstein, M. H. & Cote, L. R. (2003). Culture and parenting cognitions in acculturating cultures: Two patterns of prediction and structural coherence. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 34*, 350-373.

Calzada, E. J. & Eyberg, S. (2002). Self-reported parenting practices in Dominican and Puerto Rican mothers of young children. *Journal of Clinical and Child Adolescent Psychology, 31,* 354-363.

Carlson, V. J. & Harwood, R. L. (2003). Attachment, culture, and the caregiving system: The cultural patterning of everyday experiences among Anglo and Puerto Rican mother-infant pairs. *Infant Mental Health Journal, 24*, 53-73.

Chamberlain, P. & Reid, J. B. (1991). Using a specialized foster care community treatment model for children and adolescents leaving the state mental hospital. *Journal of Community Psychology, 19,* 266-276.

Cuellar, I., Arnold, B., & Maldonado, R. (1995). Acculturation Rating Scale for Mexican Americans-II: A revision of the original ARSMA scale. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 17,* 275-304.

Dadds, M. R., Maujean, A., & Fraser, J. (2003). Parenting and conduct problems in children: Australian data and psychometric properties of the Alabama Parenting Questionnaire. *Australian Psychologist, 38,* 238-241.

Dharale, H. S., Bhagat, V., & Tacar, P. (2005). A comparative study of behavior problems between adopted and non adopted children in India. *Journal of Child and Adolescent Mental Health*, 17, 27-32.

Dishion, T. J., Patterson, G. P., & Kavanagh, K.A. (1992). An experimental test of the coercion model: Linking theory, measurement, and intervention. In J. McCord, & R. Trembley (Eds.), *The Interaction of Theory and Practice: Experimental Studies of Interventions* (pp. 253-282). New York: Guilford Press.

Domenech Rodríguez, M. (2004, July). *Use of "consejos" as a problem-solving tool in Spanish-speaking Latino families*. Poster presented at the Summer Institute of the Family Research Consortium, San Juan, Puerto Rico.

Domenech Rodríguez, M., Davis, M. R., Rodríguez, J., & Bates, S. C. (2006). Observed parenting practices of first-generation Latino families. *Journal of Community Psychology, 34, 133-148.*

Domenech Rodríguez, M., Donovick, M., & Crowley, S. (in press). Parenting styles in a cultural context: Observations of "protective parenting" in first generation Latinos. *Family Process*.

Domenech Rodríguez, M., Rodriguez, J. & Davis, M.R. (2006). Recruitment of first generation Latinos in a rural community: The essential nature of personal contact. *Family Process*, 45, 87-100.

Domenech Rodríguez & Villatoro, J. (2004, October). *Mexicans' parenting practices and child outcomes: Comparison between parents residing in Mexico and the US*. Paper presented at the national conference of the National Hispanic Science Network on Drug Abuse, San Antonio, TX.

Domenech Rodríguez, M. & Wieling, E. (2004). Developing culturally appropriate evidence based treatments for interventions with ethnic minority populations. In M. Rastogi & E. Wieling (Eds.), *Voices of Color: First Person Accounts of Ethnic Minority Therapists* (pp. 313-333). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Escovar, P. & Lazarus, P. J. (1982). Cross-cultural child-rearing practices: Implications for school psychologists. *School Psychology International, 3*, 143-148.

Finkelstein, J. S., Donenberg, G. R., & Martinovich, Z. (2001). Maternal control and adolescent depression: Ethnic differences among clinically referred girls. *Journal of Youth & Adolescence, 30,* 155-171.

Forgatch, M. S. (1991). The clinical science vortex: Developing a theory for antisocial behavior. In D. Pepler (Ed.), *The Development and Treatment of Childhood Aggression* (pp. 291-315). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Forgatch, M. S. & Martinez, C. (1999). Parent management training: A program linking basic research and practical application. *Tidsskrift for Norsk Psykologforening*, *36*, 923-937.

Fracasso, M. P., Busch-Rossnagel, N. A., & Fisher, C. B. (1994). The relation between maternal behavior and acculturation to the qualities of attachment in Hispanic infants living in New York City. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 16,* 143-154.

Garcia-Coll, C. T. (1990). Developmental outcome of minority infants: A process-oriented look into our beginnings. *Child Development, 61*, 270-289.

Gutierrez, J., Sameroff, A. J., & Karrer, B. M. (1988). Acculturation and SES effects on Mexican-American parents' concepts of development. *Child Development, 59,* 250-255.

Harachi, T. W., Catalano, R. F. & Hawkins, J. D. (1997). Effective recruitment for parenting programs within ethnic minority communities. *Child and Adolescent Social Work Journal, 14*, 23-29.

Harwood, R. L. (1992). The influence of culturally derived values on Anglo and Puerto Rican mothers' perceptions of attachment behavior. *Child Development, 63,* 822-839.

Harwood, R. L., Scholmerich, A., Schulze, P. A., & Gonzalez, Z. (1999). Cultural differences in maternal beliefs and behaviors: A study of middle-class Anglo and Puerto Rican mother-infant pairs in four everyday situations. *Child Development, 70,* 1005-1016.

Hawes, D. J. & Dadds, M. R. (2006). Assessing parenting practices through parent-report and direct observation during parent-training. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, *15*, 555-568.

Hill, N. E., Bush, K. R., & Roosa, M. W. (2003). Parenting and family socialization strategies and children's mental health: Low income Mexican-American and Euro-American mothers and children. *Child Development, 74,* 189-204.

Kazdin, A. E. & Weisz, J. R. (1998). Identifying and developing empirically supported child and adolescent treatments. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 66,* 19-36.

Knight, G. P., Virdin, L. M., & Roosa, M. (1994). Socialization and family correlates of mental health outcomes among Hispanic and Anglo American children: Consideration of cross ethnic scalar equivalence. *Child Development, 65,* 212-224.

Laosa, L. (1980). Maternal teaching strategies in Chicano and Anglo-American families: The influence of culture and education on maternal behavior. *Child Development, 65,* 212-224.

Lau, A. (2006). Parent management training: Evidence outcomes, and issues. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 36, 1349-1356.

Lew, B., Forgatch, M. R, Patterson, G. R., & Fetrow, R. A. (1993). Parenting practices of single mothers: Mediators of negative contextual factors. *Journal of Marriage & the Family*, *55,* 371- 415.

Marin, G. & Marin, B. V. (1991). *Research with Hispanic Populations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publishing.

Patterson, G. R. (1982). *A Social Learning Approach to Family Intervention* (vol. 3). Eugene, OR: Castalia Publishing.

Patterson, G. R., Chamberlain, P. C., & Reid, J. B. (1982). A comparative evaluation of a parent training program. *Behavior Therapy, 13,* 638-650.

Patterson, G. R., Dishion, T. J., & Bank, L. (1984). Family interaction: A process model for deviancy training. *Aggressive Behavior, 10,* 253-267.

Reid, J. B., Patterson, G. R., & Synder, J. (2002). *Antisocial Behavior in Children and Adolescents: A Developmental Analysis and Model for Intervention*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Schwartz, S. J., Zamboanga, B. L., & Jarvis, L. H. (2007). Ethnic identity and acculturation in Hispanic early adolescents: Mediated relationships to academic grades, prosocial behaviors, and externalizing symptoms. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, *13*, 364-373.

Shelton, K. K., Frick, P. J., & Wooten, J. (1996). Assessment of parenting practices in families of elementary school-age children. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology, 25,* 317-329.

Staples, R. & Miranda, A. (1980). Racial and cultural variations among American families: A decennial review of the literature on minority families. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 42,* 887-903.

Stromshak, E. A., Bierman, K. L., McMahon, R. J., & Lengua, L. J. (2000). Parenting practices and child disruptive behavior problems in early elementary school. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology, 29,* 17-27.

Takeuchi, D. T., Alegria, M., Jackson, J. S., & Williams, D. R., (2007). Immigration and mental health: Diverse find-

ings in Asian Black and Latino populations. *American Journal of Public Health*, 97, 11-112.

Varela, R. E., Vernberg, E. M., Sanchez-Sosa, J. J., Riveros, A., Mitchell, M., & Mashunkashey, J. (2004). Parenting style of Mexican, Mexican American, and Caucasian-non-Hispanic families: Social context and cultural influences. *Journal of Family Psychology, 18,* 651-657.

Williams, S. K. (2003). *Paternal Attachment and Involvement: Relationships to Children's Behavior.* (Doctoral dissertation, The Florida State University). Abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences & Engineering, 64(2-B), 987.

Wells, L. E. & Rankin, J. H. (1998). Direct parental control and delinquency. *Criminology, 26,* 263-285.

Zayas, L. H. (1992). Childrearing, social stress and child abuse: Clinical considerations with Hispanic families. *Journal of Social Distress & the Homeless, 1,* 291-309.

Appendix

Alabama Parenting Questionnaire - Spanish Version

	Item
1	Tiene una plática (conversación) amigable con su hijo.
2	Le dice a su hijo cuando él o ella está haciendo un buen trabajo con algo.
3	Amenaza a su hijo con que lo va a castigar, pero no lo castiga.
4	Se presta de voluntario para ayudar con actividades en las que su hijo está involucrado (como deportes, niños escucha, grupos de niños de la iglesia).
5	Premia o le da cosas extras a su hijo por obedecerlo o por portarse bien.
6	Su hijo no le deja recado o no le deja saber a donde va.
7	Juega juegos divertidos o hace otras cosas divertidas con su hijo.
8	Su hijo le convence de que no lo castigue después de que ha hecho algo malo o incorrecto.
9	Le pregunta a su hijo acerca de como estuvo su día en la escuela.
10	Su hijo se queda fuera de la casa en las noches pasada la hora de regresar a casa.
11	Ayuda a su hijo con sus tareas escolares.
12	Se siente que el lograr que su hijo le obedezca es más problema del que desea enfrentar.
13	Halaga a su hijo cuando hace algo bien.
14	Le pregunta a su hijo cuales son sus planes para el próximo día.
15	Lleva a su niño en auto a una actividad especial.
16	Halaga a su hijo si se porta bien.
17	Su hijo sale con amigos que usted no conoce.
18	Le da abrazos o besos a su hijo cuando hace algo bien hecho.
19	Su hijo sale sin tener hora fija para regresar.
20	Habla con su hijo acerca de sus amigos.
21	Su hijo está fuera de la casa al llegar la noche, sin compañía de un adulto.
22	Le quita castigos a su hijo antes de tiempo (o sea, lo deja salir más temprano de lo que originalmente dijo).
23	Su hijo ayuda a planear actividades familiares.
24	Usted se pone tan ocupado que se le olvida donde está su hijo o qué está haciendo.
25	Su hijo no recibe castigo cuando hace algo malo o incorrecto.
26	Asiste a reuniones de la asociación de padres y maestros (PTA), conferencias de padres, u otras reuniones en la escuela de su hijo.
27	Usted le dice a su hijo que le gusta cuando él o ella ayuda en la casa.
28	Usted no chequea que su hijo haya llegado a casa cuando se supone que llegue.
29	Usted no le dice a su hijo a donde va.
30	Su hijo llega a casa de la escuela más de una hora después de lo que usted espera.
31	El castigo que le da a su hijo depende de su estado de ánimo.
32	Su hijo está en la casa sin supervisión de un adulto.
33	Le da nalgadas con la mano a su hijo cuando ha hecho algo malo o incorrecto.
34	Ignora a su hijo cuando se está portando mal.
35	Le da cachetadas a su hijo cuando ha hecho algo malo o incorrecto.
36	Le quita privilegios o dinero a su hijo como castigo.
37	Manda a su hijo a su cuarto como castigo.
38	Le pega a su hijo con un cinto (cinturón, correa), u otro objeto cuando él o ella ha hecho algo malo o incorrecto.
39	Le grita a su hijo cuando él o ella ha hecho algo malo o incorrecto.
40	Calmadamente le explica a su hijo por que su comportamiento está mal cuando él o ella se porta mal.
41	Usa el "tiempo fuera" (se sienta o para en la esquina) como un castigo.
42	Le da a su hijo quehaceres adicionales como castigo.