7-1-1982

Comparison of Childbearing Practices of Anglos, Cuban-Americans, and Latin Americans (Dialogue #5)

Luis Escovar
Florida International University, Department of Psychology

Peggy L. Escovar
Grant Center Hospital

"COMPARISON OF CHILDREARING PRACTICES OF ANGLOS, CUBAN-AMERICANS, AND LATIN AMERICANS"

Dialogues # 5

July 1982

By: Dr. Luis Escovar
Assistant Professor
Department of Psychology

Peggy L. Escovar
Grant Center Hospital

PREFACE

This paper is a preliminary report on a more comprehensive research project being conducted by Professor Luis A. Escovar of Florida International University's Department of Psychology and Peggy L. Escovar of the Grant Center Hospital. It was originally presented at a public forum during the Fall Semester 1981. Support for the research has been provided by the Latin American and Caribbean Center and by a Faculty Development Award from the Office of the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences at the University.

Mark B. Rosenberg
Director
Latin American and
Caribbean Center

Comparison of Childrearing Practices of Anglos, Cuban-Americans, and Latin Americans*

The major goal of this study was to compare perceived childrearing practices among three cultural groups--American Anglos, Cuban-Americans, and Latin Americans.[1] The childrearing practices of Americans have been extensively documented (Bronfenbrenner, 1961; Sears, Maccoby & Levin, 1957). The image which emerges in these studies is that of a permissive, affectionate parent who relies more on "psychological" techniques of discipline than on direct methods such as physical punishment. There are several multivariate comparisons of childrearing practices of American parents and those of parents from other cultural groups (Deveraux, Bronfenbrenner, & Suci, 1962; Deveraux, Bronfenbrenner & Rodgers, 1969; Holtzman, Diaz-Guerrero, & Swartz, 1975; Minturn & Lambert, 1964).

Childrearing patterns of Hispanic and Latin American groups have not been extensively studied (Durrett, O'Bryant & Pennebaker, 1975). The few studies that do exist generally portray the Hispanic family as one where warmth and affection are readily dispensed to the child, obedience is emphasized at the expense of self-reliance, and physical punishment is overtly threatened but inconsistently used (Escovar & Escovar, Note 1). Furthermore, besides a paucity of multivariate comparative studies, other disquieting omissions are evident in the literature. First, perhaps because they constitute conveniently accessible populations, most existing crosscultural childrearing studies have

---

*The authors gratefully thank Miguél Salas Sánchez, Universidad de los Andes, Bogotá, Colombia; Eleonora Vivas de Muñoz, Universidad Simón Bolívar; Carlos Muñoz and Maritza Montero, Universidad Central de Venezuela, Caracas, Venezuela, for their assistance in data collection.

compared Anglos with Mexican-Americans and Mexicans. The absence of studies involving other Hispanic-American groups make it difficult to estimate the extent to which the obtained results are descriptive of Hispanics in general or Mexicans and Mexican-Americans in particular.

Second, most crosscultural research has focused on the mother-child dyad, for the most part ignoring the role of the father in childrearing. Although this bias is also characteristic of monocultural research (Walters & Stinnett 1971), it is particularly troubling when studying Hispanic and Latin American groups. Casual clinical observation usually reveals a greater involvement by the father in childrearing matters in those groups.

Finally, there have been few efforts to systematize the use of instruments or procedures so that subsequent studies can build on the findings of previous ones. There are two notable exceptions in this regard. One is the Austin-Mexico City Project which utilized an overlapping longitudinal multivariate design which made it possible to study developmental trends and interactions longitudinally as well as cross-sectionally (Holtzman, Diaz-Guerrero, and Swartz, 1975). The other is the series of studies by Kagan and his colleagues (Kagan, 1974; Kagan & Carlson, 1975; Kagan & Madsen, 1971, 1972; Madsen, 1971; Madsen & Kagan, 1973; and Madsen & Shapira, 1970).

The current study will address the noted problems by employing a multivariate comparative design; second, by comparing Anglo-Americans to Hispanic and Latin American groups other than Mexican-Americans and Mexicans; third, by also examining the role of the father in childrearing; and finally, by using instruments that have been used in previous cross-cultural research. Childrearing practices are compared on sixteen parent practices variables, clustered under six general dimensions: Support, Achievement, Protectiveness, Punishment, Consistency, and Contingency (see Table 1). The variables in the first four

dimensions are measured by Bronfenbrenner's Parent Practices Questionnaire as modified by McDonald (1971) and have been used successfully in crossnational research (Deveraux, et al. 1962, 1969). The variables in the last two dimensions have been identified as important determinants of childrearing and are measured by questionnaires developed by Scheck (1969) and Yates (1974) respectively.

Crosscultural studies on childrearing practices provide a basis from which hypotheses can be generated about differences between Hispanics, Latins and Anglos on those variables. However, since most of those studies have used Mexican-Americans or Mexicans as subjects the nature of the hypotheses advanced here is tentative at best.

The results of previous research suggest that within the Supporting dimension Latin-American and Cuban-American parents would be perceived as being more nurturant than Anglo parents. Mexicans have been found to rank second highest on the warmth of mother scale when compared to five other cultures (Minturn & Lambert, 1964). This finding was significantly higher than for Anglo mothers. Rohner (1975) has documented a relationship between time spent as the sole caretaker of children and rejection. That is, mothers who do not share child care responsibilities with anyone, especially a grandparent are more likely to reject their child. Hispanic and Latin mothers can rely on extended family relationships for some of their childrearing responsibilities. This less intensive involvement seems to foster a relationship where cuddling, fondling and demonstrations of love occur more frequently (Whiting, 1961).

Also regarding the Supporting dimension, it was expected that Anglo parents would be perceived by their children as more inclined to give help and thus as scoring higher on instrumental companionship than Cuban-American or Latin parents. Steward and Steward (1973) studied the types of early learning environments that

mothers from three cultural groups--Anglos, Mexican-Americans, and Chinese-Americans--create for their children as a response to their requests for help. In general, request for help from a child elicited the least amount of feedback from the Mexican-American mothers.

The anthropological literature indicates that Americans value personal achievement, activity, work, independence (Williams, 1960), initiative, individualism, and self-reliance (Ghei, 1966; Hsu, 1961). It is logical to assume that American parents will try to inculcate those values in their children. Thus, one would expect them to be more demanding, less protecting, and to use more achievement pressure than parents from cultures that may not share the same values. Evidence from crosscultural research suggests that in Hispanic and Latin families, great emphasis is placed on obedience and less on self-reliance. Rosen (1962) found that Brazilian mothers expected later ages for sons to display independence in areas such as making friends and deciding how to spend money. According to Durrett et al. (1975) Mexican-Americans place less emphasis on responsibility for own behavior than comparable groups of Anglos and Blacks. Mexican American parents were also found to be more protective and fathers were found to be less achievement oriented. These results support an earlier finding among Puerto Ricans (Cahill, 1967) documenting less emphasis on responsibility for own behavior.

The literature also suggests that Cuban-Americans and Latin-American parents would be perceived as more protective than Anglo parents. Mexican-American parents, as compared to Anglos, tend to encourage dependence on the family by the child and obedience to family authority. Mexican-Americans less often allow friends in the house, require children to play close to home, worry when their children are not at home, and allow children to make fewer small decisions as to

what to wear and when to go to bed (Rusmore & Kinmeyer, 1976). Minturn and Lambert (1964) report that Anglos frequently maintain substantially more distant relationships with family members and differ significantly from Mexicans on many variables related to autonomy. Anglo mothers insist that their children stand up for themselves and rarely intervene to help children settle disputes.

In the Punishing dimension previous research indicates support for the idea that, when compared to Cuban Americans and Latin Americans, Anglo parents would be perceived as using less physical punishment and as relying more on the use of "psychological" techniques such as affective punishment or deprivation of privileges. In general, studies that have compared childrearing practices of American parents with those of parents from other groups indicate that American parents usually have less controlling and authoritarian attitudes (Deveraux, et al., 1962, 1969; Walters & Stinnett, 1971). Minturn and Lambert (1964) found that Anglo parents were the lowest in the use of physical punishment when compared to six other cultures. They tended to rely more on verbal reprimand and logic in disciplinary matters. On the other hand the Mexican sample was the highest in the use of physical punishment and hostility. The Mexican and Mexican-American family structure is an authoritarian one where obedience is stressed and individual assertiveness is punished (Diaz-Guerrero, 1955; Minturn & Lambert, 1964; Ramirez, 1967). Mexican-American mothers have been found to be strict and discouraging of disagreement within the family (Rusmore & Kinmeyer, 1976).

Crosscultural research that has studied consistency of parental behavior and the use of contingent reinforcement has compared Anglos, Mexican-Americans and Mexicans. In achievement situations Anglo mothers discriminate better

between their child's success and failure and make reinforcement contingently. On the other hand, Mexican mothers use more noncontingent reinforcement and tend not to discriminate between success and failure (Madsen & Kagan, 1973). In learning situations Mexican-American mothers give more non-contingent and confusing reinforcement (Steward & Steward, 1973). In fact, Mexican-American bilingual mothers used contingent reinforcement only as negative feedback to their children's accepting responses. On the basis of the results of the Madsen and Kagan (1973) and Steward and Steward (1973) studies it was expected that Anglo parents in this study would be perceived as being both more consistent in their behavior and as using reinforcement and punishment contingently more so than Cuban-American and Latin American parents.

Childrearing practices are affected by factors which can mask or confound the effects of cultural ones. Prominent among those factors are socioeconomic status, sex, and acculturation. Mothers from low socioeconomic backgrounds use more negative feedback, make more irrational demands on the child, and are more intrusive (Bee, Van Egeren, Streissguth, Nyman, & Leckie, 1969; Hess & Shipman, 1965). They also more often employ noncontingent, chaotic or confusing reinforcement patterns (Bresnahan & Blum, 1971; Bresnahan, Ivey & Shapiro, 1969; Hess & Shipman, 1965). The effects of social class on parental attitudes and behaviors are more pronounced at the lower class levels and decrease with increasing socioeconomic status (Bronfenbremer, 1961). In comparative crosscultural research it is important to distinguish between variations in childrearing practices that are due to socioeconomic status and variations which are due primarily to cultural differences (Kohn 1963; Geismar & Gerhart, 1968). One way of ensuring that variations due to social class are accounted for is to obtain representative samples stratified by social class so that intragroup comparisons become possible.

When stratified sampling is unfeasible the effects of social class can be controlled for by the use of statistical techniques. In this study social class was controlled for by way of this second procedure.

There are no known studies comparing perceptions of parent practices for mothers versus fathers across different hispanic cultural groups. The non-cultural literature on differences in parental influence according to sex shows some consistent findings. First, boys appear to be more susceptible than girls to parental influence particularly at an early age (Medinus, 1967). Second, the same-sex child parent seems to exert more power toward the same-sex child and have more influence on the development of responsibility and leadership on that child (Bronfenbrenner, 1961; Emmerich, 1962). Third, girls tend to be overprotected and boys tend to be subjected to a more stern discipline by parents of both sexes (Bronfenbrenner, 1961). Finally, mothers tend to be more permissive towards boys and fathers towards girls with mothers being more intolerant of their daughters comfort seeking behavior (Rothbart & Maccoby, 1966). Since all of the reported findings are based on monocultural research, no efforts were made in this study to develop hypotheses about perceived parental behavior according to sex of the parent.

The issue of acculturation emerges in crosscultural research when comparisons are made between a cultural group residing in its country of origin, an immigrant group and a host country group. The linear acculturation gradient hypothesis (Peck, Manaster, Borick, Angelini, Diaz-Guerrero, & Kubo, 1976) predicts an intermediate status for the immigrant group lying somewhere between the country of origin group and the host country group. It also predicts the gradual movement of the immigrant group towards the norms, and practices of the host country group. Evidence for the validity of this hypothesis has

been provided by Arkoff (1959), Berrien (1966) and McMichael and Grinder (1964) in their work with Japanese-Americans. Further support is provided by LeVine (1977) who views childrearing as cultural adaptation. According to him, patterns of child care evolve as adaptations to environmental features that parents perceive as barriers to their childrearing efforts. Thus, this adaptive feature of child-rearing patterns reveals environmental contingencies which are then assimilated into cultural traditions. LeVine's argument suggests that immigrant parents who want their children to "make it" in the host culture will modify their childrearing practices to make them compatible with those of the host culture. Of course, not all practices will be changed and the question of interest in comparative crosscultural research involving immigrant groups in which practices are changed to resemble those of the host country group and which remain unchanged. A tentative hypothesis can be advanced concerning the pattern of adaptive changes. It is logical to presume that parents will change childrearing practices along those dimensions which are perceived as important to give their children a competitive edge in the host culture.

METHOD

Subjects

Subjects were 445 college students from three different cultural groups. A Latin American sample consisted of 76 male and 88 female students from universities in Colombia and Venezuela. A Cuban-American sample had 40 males and 87 females who resided in the United States, 75% of the Cuban-American subjects had been born in Cuba and immigrated at an early age to this country.[2] An Anglo sample consisted of 59 male and 95 female students who classified themselves as "white - not of hispanic origin" in the questionnaire. All of the subjects in the Anglo and Cuban American samples were students at a large

State University in Southern Florida. Preliminary analyses revealed no differences between the Colombian and Venezuelan sub-samples so for the purposes of this study those two groups were combined.

Hollinshead Index of Social Position was used to classify subjects according to social class. No significant differences in social class were found between cultural groups, X^2 (6) = 7.47, p = .28. Females were over-represented in the sample constituting 61% of the total number of subjects, X^2 (2) = 6.71, p = .03. Latin American subjects tended to be significantly younger, on the average (M = 21 yrs. 5 mo.) than Anglos (M = 25 yrs. 11 mo.) and Hispanic (M = 23 yrs. 8 mo.).

Instruments and Procedure

All subjects were administed a Mother and Father version of the following questionnaires: 1. The Perceived Parenting Questionnaire as modified by McDonald (1971); 2. Scheck's (1969) Measure of Inconsistent Parental Discipline; 3. Measure of Parental Disagreement on Expectations of the Child; and 4. A modified version of Yates (1974) Rewards and Punishment Questionnaire. Subjects were also asked to answer a series of questions about demographic and structural characteristics of their families.

The four questionnaires measured sixteen parent practices variables. Table 1 shows those sixteen variables grouped in terms of four of the broader dimensions that were used by Deveraux, et al. (1969). Two new dimensions were added in this study to include those variables which measured perceived consistency of parent practices and perceived use of reward and punishment by parents. The consistency of expectation variable has been included under the Consistency dimension in Table 1 rather than under the Support dimension as in Bronfenbrenner's original work because it more logically fits the definition of that dimension. Table 1

contains for each variable the items used to index it and reliability estimates for both mother and father versions. On the questionnaire itself, the items were presented in two versions--Mother and Father--with the Mother version always appearing first. Within each version the items for the Perceived Parenting Questionnaire always appeared first; followed by the items for the other three scales in a separate section. All items appeared in a random order within each one of those sections and there was no reference to the variables they were used to measure. All subjects answered the demographic section of the questionnaire before answering any of the parent-practices section.

Students in the Latin American sample were administered the questionnaire while they waited between classes at their universities. Students in the Anglo and Cuban-American samples answered the questionnaire in class. Subjects received no remuneration for their participation.

The entire questionnaire was translated to Spanish and pilot tested with Spanish-speaking US and foreign students. Both back translations (Brislin, 1980) and consensus techniques were used to arrive at a translation for each item that was adequate for the two different types of Spanish-speaking populations in the study.

A retrospective questionnaire procedure was used because of its ease of administration and the convenience it provides in data collection. Moreover, this procedure has been found to yield valid results not subject to the usual social desirability problems that plague direct queries to parents (Lambert, Hamers & Frasure-Smith, 1979; Lefcourt, 1972). It is also more convenient than other equally valid procedures which have been recommended (Rothbart & Maccoby, 1966).

RESULTS

A 2 x 3 multivariate analysis of covariance (Clyde, 1969), using raw scores on the 32 parent practices variables (16 for the Mother and 16 for the Father version) as dependent variables was conducted to determine the existence of sex and cultural group differences. Hollingshead's index of social position was used a a covariate. Multivariate tests of significance, using Wilk's lambda criterion, indicated a significant main effect due to sex, $F\ (32,407) = 2.65$, $p < .001$, but no significant Sex X Cultural group interaction, $F\ (64,814) = .87$, $p = .75$.

An examination of the univariate F tests for the main effects of sex indicated that females perceived their mothers as using more Instrumental Companionship, $F\ (1,438) = 4.61$, $p < .03$, more Protectiveness, $F\ (1,438) = 3.94$, $p < .05$, and more Affective Punishment, $F\ (1,438) = 4.95$, $p < .03$; whereas males perceived their mothers as using more Achievement Pressure, $F\ (1,438) = 4.24$, $p < .04$. Females also perceived their fathers as using more Instrumental Companionship, $F\ (1,438) = 4.18$, $p < .04$, and more Protectiveness, $F\ (1,438) = 4.95$, $p < .03$. Males, on the other hand, perceived their fathers as using more Physical Punishment, $F\ (1,438) = 10.93$, $p < .001$, more Deprivation of Privileges, $F\ (1,438) = 18.66$, $p < .001$, and more Scolding, $F\ (1,438) = 6.04$, $p < .01$.

The multivariate analysis of variance also yielded a significant main effect for cultural group, $F\ (64, 814) = 4.41$, $p < .001$. The pattern and direction of the univariate F tests on the parent practices variables gave strong indication of the existence of distinctive childrearing practices in the three cultural groups. Sixteen of the 32 univariate F tests were significant at the .01 level, and 37 of the 96 post hoc comparisons of means for each group were significant at the .05 level. Table 2 presents the means, standard deviations, and univariate F ratios for all 32 parent practices variables. It also presents the post hoc comparisons between means using the Least Significant Differences method (Kirk, 1968).

The most notable finding in Table 2 is the high level of perceived similarity of mother childrearing practices between the Anglo and Cuban-American groups. In 9 of the 16 mother variables there were no differences between Anglos and Cuban-Americans but these two groups at the same time did differ significantly from Latins. That kind of pattern does not emerge from an examination of the univariate tests for the father variables. The results of the comparisons of the cultural groups can be summarized as follows: First, Latin Americans when compared to both Anglos and Cuban-Americans perceived their mothers as being less consistent in their expectations, as using less physical and affective punishment, as not using deprivation of privileges as much, as disagreeing with their spouses less, and as being more systematic in the use of contingent reinforcement and punishment and less prone to use non-contingent reinforcement and punishment. Second, Anglos perceive their mothers as using significantly less Achievement Pressure than Cuban-Americans or Latins. Third, the only variable in which all three groups differ significantly from each other is on the perceived Protectiveness of the mother with Cuban-Americans perceiving their mother as the most protective. Finally, the pattern of differences between cultural groups for the father variables is not as distinctive as that found for the mother variables. In this regard there are only three notable findings. First, Latin Americans perceive that their fathers disagree less with their spouses than Anglo and Cuban-American fathers. Second, Latins perceive their fathers as using more contingent reward and punishment and less non-contingent reward and punishment than Anglos. Finally, Anglos perceive their fathers as using significantly more physical punishment than Latin and Cuban-Americans.

In a second phase of the analysis a multiple discriminant analysis (Cooley & Lohnes, 1971) was conducted using cultural group membership as a criterion

variable and the 32 perceived parent practices variables as predictors. This analysis was conducted in order to determine which parent practices variables would be most useful in differentiating between the cultural groups. It yielded two significant discriminant functions; and a measure of overall group differentiation, Wilk's lambda, indicated that both functions significantly discriminated between cultural groups ($p < .001$). Groups centroids are plotted in Figure 1.

The probability of the partial F ratio for inclusion in the equation for all variables was maintained constant at .05. The probability for exclusion was also maintained at .05. A total of ten Mother variables and five Father variables had significant discriminant function coefficients in both functions. A variable with a significant discriminant function coefficient was considered to "load" on a function if the coefficient was above .25 and if it did not also load on the other function. Examination of variable loadings according to those criteria reveal that the first function, which accounted for 78% of the between-group variance, was a bipolar dimension defined on the positive end by four maternal behavior variables, Consistency of Expectations (.41), Principled Discipline (.29), Physical Punishment (.28), and Deprivation of Privileges (.25) and two paternal variables, Physical Punishment (.50) and Parental Disagreement (.47); and defined on the negative end by two maternal variables, Contingent Reward (-.32) and Contingent Punishment (-.33), and one paternal variable, Affective Punishment (-.34). This dimension which appears to reflect a somewhat despotic, uncompromising, and cold disciplinary attitude has been labelled Punitive Discipline Orientation (of both Mother and Father) and appears as the abcissa in Figure 1. As can be seen in that figure, this first function differentiates between Hispanics and Anglos together and Latins, who scored very low on it.

The second significant function, which accounted for 22% of the between-group variance, had only maternal behavior variables loading significantly on it. On the positive end this function is defined by Protectiveness (.52) and Achievement Pressure (.43). On the negative end it is defined by Instrumental Companionship (-.51). This dimension, which appears as the ordinate in Figure 1, reflects a protective, achievement oriented mother and, thus, has been labelled as such. It differentiates between all three cultural groups with Cuban-Americans attaining the highest scores on it and Anglos the lowest.

Table 3 shows that the two obtained functions discriminate well between pairs of the three cultural groups. All the differences between each possible pair of groups are significant beyond the .001 level.

DISCUSSION

The current study presents data on differences in perceived parent practices between Anglos, Cuban-Americans, and Latin Americans. A multivariat analysis of covariance was used to determine group differences for sixteen parent practices variables for mother and father while controlling for the effects of social class. A discriminant analysis was utilized to identify the most useful dimensions differentiating between the three groups. The overall results provide some support for previous findings in the literature but indicate that most of the results obtained when comparing American Anglos, Mexican-Americans, and Mexicans are not generalizable to other Hispanic or Latin American groups. This lack of generalizability is more evident in four of the six general dimensions of childrearing practices studied, namely Support, Achievement, Punishment, and Contingency.

In the Punishment and Achievement dimensions two of the most consistent findings in the childrearing literature, namely that American parents use more achievement pressure and less physical punishment than parents of other cultural groups, did not receive support in this study. Specifically with regard to punishment opposite results were obtained. These findings were particularly true of the way mothers were perceived. Moreover the results of the discriminant analysis indicates that when Anglo parents are compared to Cuban-American and Latin parents the former are perceived as uncompromising, cold disciplinarians who are wont to using physical punishment. In this regard an inconsistency in the disciplinary behavior of Mexican-American parents noted by LeVine and Bartz (1979) acquires some relevance. They indicated that Mexican-American parents report high, strict standards of parental discipline while at the same time reporting less use of controlling behavior than Blacks or Anglos. Thus, Mexican-American parents maintain discipline with the threat of physical punishment but children are allowed to do as they wish and are rarely actually disciplined. In fact, Mexican-American parents report less need to actually discipline and cite a lower tolerance for "giving in" (Bartz & LeVine, 1978). The results of this study suggest that Anglo parents are perceived as using more physical punishment probably because their threats more consistently result in actual physical punishment; whereas Hispanic and Latin parents may make more use of threats but are less likely to follow them with actual punishment, thus, appearing to use less physical punishment. Other results in the punishment dimension indicate that Latin mothers are perceived as being far less punitive than their Cuban American and Anglo counterparts, using less affective punishment, less physical punishment and less deprivation of privileges as disciplinary mechanisms. The results for the Father Variables in this dimension are not

as definitive with the exception of Anglo fathers who are perceived as using the highest amount of physical punishment.

In the Achievement dimension Anglo mothers were perceived as significantly lowest of three groups in the use of achievement pressure. Cuban-American fathers in turn were perceived as significantly higher than the other two groups in this variable. Furthermore, for both mother and father the general trend was for Cuban-Americans and Latins to perceive their parents as using more achievement pressure than Anglos. These findings certainly contradict what is expected on the basis of anthropological evidence which depicts the American culture as achievement oriented.

The results obtained in the Contingency dimension are interesting in that they fail to support evidence from previous research comparing Anglo, Mexican-American, and Mexican parents (Kagan & Ender, 1975; Steward & Steward, 1973). Both Latin American mothers and fathers are perceived as using rewards and punishment contingently significantly more than their Cuban-American and Anglo counterparts. Cuban-American parents are perceived as using more contingent reinforcement than Anglo parents but the differences are not statistically significant. One possible explanation for these results is Deveraux's et al. (1969) argument that American parents tend to use more "internalizing" childrearing techniques. If that is the case, then American parents would be more subtle in setting up contingencies for the child and these, in turn, would not be as readily perceived. On the other hand, Latin American parents bring up their children within a cultural context where obedience to parental authority is emphasized (Diaz-Guerrero, 1955; Minturn & Lambert, 1964; Ramirez, 1967). Thus, their attempts at manipulating environmental contingencies would be more overt and more readily perceived by the child. Furthermore, it could be argued that Latin American and

Hispanic parents are more interested in the exercise of parental authority, so as to maintain their position within the household, than in the actual manipulation of contingencies. This conjecture, of course, awaits further confirmation.

In the Support dimension, contrary to expectations, no differences were found between the three groups indicating that, with the effects of social class held constant and regardless of sex, all subjects tended to perceive both their mothers and fathers as equally supportive in all three cultural groups. Lack of any cultural differences can be just as important as the existence of significant differences. The results of this study indicate that none of the three variables in the Support dimension, namely nurturance, principled discipline, and instrumental companionship, differentiate cultural group membership. One possible explanation for these results is that the Support dimension is a useful one in distinguishing between normal and maladjusted groups (cf. Siegelman 1965, 1966) but not useful is distinguishing between well adjusted members of different cultural groups.

The results of this study also provide indirect support for LeVine's (1977) notion of childrearing as cultural adaptation and for the linear acculturation gradient hypothesis (Peck, et al., 1976). Cuban-American mothers resemble Anglo mothers in their childrearing practices more than they resemble Latin mothers. This finding indicates an adoption of American customs by those mothers. It appears that although Cuban-American women acculturate at a lower rate as far as their personal behavior is concerned (Szapocznik, Scopetta, Kurtines, & Aranalde, 1978), they do tend to adopt those childrearing patterns which they believe will help their children be more successful in the host culture. Notably Cuban-American mothers use the same disciplinary mechanism (i.e., affective punishment, deprivation of privileges, and physical punishment) as Anglo mothers. Interestingly Cuban-

American mothers are perceived as being the most protective and using the highest level of achievement pressure. It is understandable that immigrant mothers would want to be protective of their children in a new, possibly hostile, environment, but at the same time would want to "push" them to achieve within the environment. The pattern of results for Cuban-American fathers is not as definitive as that of the mothers. There are fewer significant differences between the cultural groups in the father variables. This finding would seem to suggest that the role of the father could be more homogeneous across cultures, being less active in the day-to-day details of childrearing but acting as a sort of "balance wheel" (Deveraux, et al., 1969) regulating overall family functioning.

Footnotes

1. In this study for the sake of convenience persons of Hispanic origin now residing in the United States are called Hispanic-Americans or designated by their country of origin hyphenated Americans. Hispanics residing in their country of origin in Latin America are called Latin Americans.
2. Data were collected before the 1980 Mariel boatlift which brought tens of thousands of young Cubans to the Miami area.

REFERENCES

Arkoff, A. Need patterns in two generations of Japanese Americans in Hawaii. Journal of Social Psychology, 1959, 50, 75-79.

Ausubel, D. P., Baltrazar, E. E., Rosenthal, I., Blackman, L. S., Schpoont, S. H., & Welkowitz, J. Perceived parents attitudes as determinants of children's ego structure. Child Development, 1954, 25, 173-184.

Bandura, A. Principles of Behavior Modification. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1969.

Bartz, D. W. & Levine, E. S. Child-rearing by Black Parents: A description and comparison to Anglo and Chicano parents. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1978, 40, 709-719.

Bee, H. L., Van Egeren, L. F., Streissguths, A. P., Nyman, B. A., & Leckie, M. S. Social class differences in maternal teaching strategies and speech patterns. Developmental Psychology, 1969, 1, 726-734.

Berrien, F. K. Japanese and American values. International Journal of Psychology, 1966, 1, 129-141.

Bresnahan, J. L. & Blum, W. L. Chaotic reinforcement: A socio-economic leveler. Developmental Psychology, 1971, 4, 89-92.

Bresnahan, J. L., Ivey, S. L., & Shapiro, M. M. Developmentally defined obviousness in concept formation tasks. Developmental Psychology, 1969, 1, 383-388.

Brislin, R. W. Translation and content analysis of oral and written material. Triandis, H. C. & Berry, J. W. Handbook of Cross-Cultural Psychology (Volume 2). Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1980.

Bronfenbrenner, U. The changing American child - A speculative analysis. Journal of Social Issues, 1961, 17, 6-18.

Cahill, I. D. Child-rearing practices in lower socio-economic ethnic groups. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1967, 27, 3139A.

Cooley, W. W. & Lohnes, P. R. Multivariate Data Analysis. New York: Wiley, 1971.

Clyde, D. J. Multivariate analysis of variance on large computers. Miami, Florida: Clyde Computing Service, 1969.

Deveraux, E. C., Bronfenbrenner, U., & Suci, G. Patterns of parent behavior in the United States of America and the Federal Republic of Germany: A crossnational comparison. International Social Science Journal, 1962, 14, 488-506.

Deveraux, E. C., Bronfenbrenner, U., & Rodgers, R. Child-rearing in England and the United States: A cross-national comparison. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1969, 31, 257-270.

Diaz-Guerrero, R. Neurosis and the Mexican family structure. American Journal of Psychiatry, 1955, 112, 411-417.

Durrett, M. A., O'Bryant, S., & Pennebaker, J. W. Child-rearing reports of White, Black, and Mexican-American families. Developmental Psychology, 1975, 11, 871.

Emmerick, W. Variations in parents' parent role as a function of sex and the child's sex and age. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly of Development and Behavior, 1962, 8, 3-11.

Geismar, L. L. & Gerhart, U. G. Social class, ethnicity, and family functioning: Exploring some issues raised by the Moynihan report. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1968, 30 480-487.

Ghei, S. N. A crosscultural study of need profiles. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1966, 3, 580-585.

Hess, R. D. & Shipman, V. C. Early experience and the socialization of cognitive modes in children. Child Development, 1965, 36, 869-886.

Holtzman, W. H., Diaz-Guerrero, R., & Swartz, J. D. Personality development in two cultures: A crosscultural longitudinal study of school children in Mexico and the United States. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1975.

Hsu, F. L. K. Psychological Anthropology. New York: Dorsey Press, 1961.

Kagan, S. Field dependence and conformity of rural Mexican and urban Anglo-American children. Child Development, 1974, 45, 765-771.

Kagan, S. & Carlson, H. Development of adaptive assertiveness in Mexican and United States children. Developmental Psychology, 1975, 11.

Kagan, S. & Ender, P. B. Maternal response to success and failure of Anglo-American, Mexican-American and Mexican children. Child Development, 1975, 46, 452-458.

Kagan, S. & Madsen, M. C. Cooperation and competition of Mexican, Mexican-American, and Anglo-American children of two ages under four instructional sets. Developmental Psychology, 1971, 5, 32-39.

Kohn, M. L. Social class and parent-child relationships: An interpretation. American Journal of Sociology, 1963, 68, 471-480.

Lambert, W. E., Hamers, J. F. & Frasure-Smith, N. Childrearing Values. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1979.

Lefcourt, H. M. Recent developments in the study of locus of control. In Progress in Experimental Personality Research, 1972, 6, 1-39.

Levine, E. S. & Bartz, K. W. Comparative child-rearing attitudes among Chicano, Anglo, and Black parents. Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 1979, 1, 165-178.

Le Vine, R. A. Child-rearing as Cultural Adaptation. In P. H. Leiderman, S. R. Tulkin, A. Rosenfeld (Eds.) Culture and Infancy - Variations in the Human Experience. New York: Academic Press, Inc., 1977.

Mac Donald, A. P. Internal-external locus of control: Parental antecedents. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1971, 37, 141-147.

Madsen, M. C. Developmental and cross-cultural differences in the cooperative and competitive behavior of young children. Journal of Crosscultural Psychology, 1971, 2, 365-371.

Madsen, M. C. & Kagan, S. Mother-directed achievement of children in two cultures. Journal of Cross-cultural Psychology, 1973, 4, 221-228.

Madsen, M. C. & Shapira, A. Cooperative and competitive behavior of urban Afro-American, Anglo-American, Mexican-American, and Mexican village children. Developmental Psychology, 1970, 3, 16-20.

Mahoney, M. Cognition and Behavior Modification. Cambridge, Mass.: Ballinger Publishing Co., 1974.

Mc Michael, R. E. & Grinder, R. E. Guilt and resistance to temptation in Japanese and White Americans. Journal of Social Psychology, 1964, 64, 217-223.

Minturn, L. & Lambert, W. Mothers of Six Cultures: Antecedents of Child-rearing. New York: Wiley, 1964.

Peck, R. F., Manaster, G. J., Borick, G., Angelini, A. L., Diaz-Guerrero, R., & Kubo, S. A test of the universality of an "acculturation gradient" in three culture-triads. In Riegel & Meacham (Eds.) The Developing Individual in a Changing World. (Vol. 1). Den Haag: Mouton, 1976.

Ramirez, M. Identification with Mexican family values and authoritarianism in Mexican-Americans. Journal of Social Psychology, 1967, 73, 3-11.

Rohner, R. P. They love me, they love me not: A world-wide study of the effects of parental acceptance and rejection. New Haven, Connecticut: HRAF Press, 1975.

Rosen, B. C. Socialization and achievement motivation in Brazil. American Sociological Review, 1962, 27, 612-624.

Rothbart, M. K. & Maccoby, E. E. Parents differential reactions to sons and daughters. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1966, 4, 237-243.

Rusmore, J. T. & Kinmeyer, S. L. Family attitudes among Mexican-American and Anglo-American parents in San Jose, California. Paper presented at the 56th annual meeting of the Western Psychological Association in Los Angeles, California, 1976.

Sears, R. R., Maccoby, E., Levin, H. Patterns of Childrearing. Evanston, Ill.: Row, Peterson & Co., 1957.

Siegelman, M. College students personality correlates of early parent-child relationships. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1965, 29, 558-564.

Siegelman, M. Loving and punishing parental behavior and introversion tendencies in sons. Child Development, 1966, 37, 985-992.

Scheck, D. C. Perceptions of parent-child relations and the development of internal or external orientations in male adolescents. (Doctoral dissertation, Purdue University, 1969). University Microfilms International No. 69-17, 254.

Steward, M. & Steward, S. The observation of Anglo-, Mexican-, and Chinese-American mothers teaching their young sons. Child Development, 1973, 44, 329-337.

Szapocznik, J., Scopetta, M. A., Kurtines, W. M.,Aranalde, M. A. Theory and Measurement of Acculturation. Interamerican Journal of Psychology, 1978, 12, 113-130.

Walters, J. & Stinnett, N. Parent-child relationships: A decade review of research. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1971, 33, 70-111.

Whiting, J. W. Socialization process and personality. In F. L. Hsu (Ed.), Psychological Anthropology: Approaches to Culture and Personality. Homewood, Ill.: Dorsey Press, 1961.

Williams, R. M. American Society. A Sociological Interpretation. (2nd Edition). New York: Knopf, 1960.

Yates, R. H. Locus of control as a function of perceived contingency of parental rewards and punishments. (Masters thesis, North Texas State University, 1974). University Microfilms International No. M-6672.

A P P E N D I X

Parent Practice Dimensions and Variables, Item Wordings, and Reliability Estimates

TABLE 1

Dimensions and Variables		Item Wording [a]	Reliability Estimates [b] Mother	Father
I.	Supportive			
	1. Nurturance	1. She made me feel that she was there when I needed her.	.80	.84
		2. She comforted me and helped me when I had troubles.		
	2. Principled Discipline	3. When she wanted me to do something she explained why	.74	.80
		4. When she punished me she explained why.		
	3. Instrumental Companionship	5. She helped me with my school work when I didn't understand something.	.70	.74
		6. She taught me things that I wanted to learn.		
II.	Achievement			
	4. Achievement Pressure	7. She insisted that I get particularly good marks in school.	.66	.67
		8. She kept after me to do better than other children.		
III.	Protectiveness	9. She worried about my being able to take care of myself.	.30	.30
		10. She wouldn't let me go places because something might happen to me.		
IV.	Punishment			
	6. Affective Punishment	11. If I did something she didn't like, she would act cold and unfriendly.	.60	.60
		12. When I did something she didn't like, she acted hurt and disappointed.		
		13. She punished me by trying to make me feel guilty and ashamed.		
	7. Deprivation of Privileges	14. She punished me by not allowing me to be with my friends.	.59	.74
		15. She punished me by not letting me use my favorite things for a while.		

Dimensions and Variables		Item Wording	Reliability Estimates: Mother	Father
8. Scolding	16.	She scolded and yelled at me.	.73	.72
	17.	She nagged me.		
9. Physical Punishment	18.	She slapped me.	.62	.77
	19.	She spanked me.		
V. Consistency				
10. Consistency of Expectation	20.	When I did something she didn't like, I knew exactly what to expect of her.	.64	.67
	21.	I knew what she expected of me, and how she wanted me to behave.		
11. Parental Disagreement	22.	My mother expressed disapproval of certain of my actions which my father thought were all right.	.83	.87
	23.	My mother often would not allow me to do certain things which my father would allow me to do.		
	24.	My mother occasionally told me to do a task in a way which was just the opposite of how my father told me to do it.		
	25.	My mother was almost never able to agree with my father on when I should be punished and rewarded for what I did.		
	26.	Occasionally my mother told me things that were just the opposite of what my father told me.		
	27.	My mother was generally in agreement with my father about things they expected me to do.		
12. Inconsistent Discipline	28.	My mother sometimes was too strict and sometimes too lenient.	.68	.70
	29.	She sometimes carried out threatened punishment and sometimes did not.		
	30.	She hardly ever reacted in a predictable manner when I did something wrong.		
	31.	She sometimes gave me a warning before punishing me and sometimes did not.		
	32.	My mother rarely kept the promises that she made to me.		
	33.	I always knew how she was going to react when I asked a special favor.		
	34.	She would react to my behavior in ways which were usually hard to predict.		

Dimensions and Variables		Item Wording	Reliability Estimates Mother	Father
	35.	She never made it clear to me whether she really meant what she said when she told me what I could and couldn't do.		
VI. Contingency				
13. Contingent Reward	36.	She praised me when I behaved well, but never did so when I didn't deserve it.	.56	.72
	37.	My mother rewarded me when I behaved well, but never did so when I didn't deserve it.		
14. Non-contingent Reward	38.	She praised me when I behaved well, but also frequently did so when I didn't deserve it.	.72	.79
	39.	She rewarded me when I behaved well, but also frequently rewarded me when I didn't deserve it.		
15. Contingent Punishment	40.	She scolded me when I misbehaved, but never did so when I didn't deserve it.	.53	.67
	41.	She punished me when I misbehaved but never did so when I didn't deserve it.		
16. Non-contingent Punishment	42.	She scolded me when I misbehaved, but also frequently did so when I didn't deserve it.	.81	.89
	43.	She punished me when I misbehaved, but also frequently punished me when I didn't deserve it.		

a Each item was rated on a 5 point scale. For the Perceived Parenting Questionnaire the response alternatives were: 1=Never, 2=Hardly Ever, 3=Sometimes, 4=Frequently, 5= Almost Always. For the other scales the responses alternatives were as follows: 1=Very False, 2=False, 3=Neither true nor false, 4=True, 5=Very True. The wording presented here is that of the Mother version, pronouns were changed to a masculine form for the Father version of the questionnaire.

b Spearman-Brown estimates of internal consistency (prophecy based on split-half correlations) were used for all two-item variables. For the other variables Chronbach's alpha was used

TABLE 2

Means, Standard Deviations, Univariate F Ratios, and LSD for Mother and Father Variables for Three Cultural Groups

	Mother Variables	Anglos M	Anglos SD	Cuban-Americans M	Cuban-Americans SD	Latins M	Latins SD	F^1	p	Least Significant Difference (p≤.05) 1 vs. 2	1 vs. 3	2 vs.3
1.	Nurturance	8.10	1.99	8.44	1.87	7.99	1.94	1.99	n.s.	--	--	--
2.	Principled Discipline	6.85	2.09	6.79	2.26	6.70	2.06	0.24	n.s.	--	--	--
3.	Instrumental Companionship	6.64	2.05	6.67	2.22	7.04	1.98	1.73	n.s.	--	--	--
4.	Achievement Pressure	6.45	2.11	7.61	1.99	7.31	1.99	12.49	.001	*	*	--
5.	Protective-ness	6.25	1.84	7.27	1.73	6.71	1.51	11.58	.001	*	*	*

	Mother Variables	Anglos M	Anglos SD	Cuban-Americans M	Cuban-Americans SD	Latins M	Latins SD	F[1]	p	Least Significant Difference (ps.05) 1 vs. 2	1 vs. 3	2 vs. 3
6.	Affective Punishment	8.41	2.92	8.44	2.55	7.77	2.50	3.16	.043	--	*	*
7.	Deprivation of Privileges	4.81	1.87	4.72	1.80	4.13	1.80	6.58	.002	--	*	*
8.	Scolding	6.17	1.73	5.96	1.87	5.69	1.84	2.79	n.s.	--	--	--
9.	Physical Punishment	4.45	1.67	4.28	1.65	3.56	1.49	13.71	.001	--	*	*
10.	Consistency of Expectation	8.21	1.45	8.27	1.56	7.69	1.65	5.58	.002	--	*	*
11.	Parental Disagreement	16.03	4.48	15.20	4.83	13.74	4.60	10.01	.001	--	*	*
12.	Inconsistent Discipline	21.61	4.06	21.24	4.74	21.54	3.93	0.24	n.s.	--	--	--

Mother Variables	Anglos M	Anglos SD	Cuban-Americans M	Cuban-Americans SD	Latins M	Latins SD	F[1]	p	Least Significant Difference (p≤.05) 1 vs. 2	1 vs. 3	2 vs. 3
13. Contingent Reward	6.05	1.54	6.35	1.55	6.90	1.55	12.08	.001	--	*	*
14. Non-contingent Reward	5.25	1.84	5.22	1.58	4.68	1.55	5.75	.003	--	*	*
15. Contingent Punishment	6.67	1.73	6.77	1.79	7.40	1.46	9.19	.001	--	*	*
16. Non-contingent Punishment	4.70	1.96	4.67	1.83	4.19	1.51	4.37	.013	--	*	*

(1) df (2, 438)

TABLE 2 (con't)

Means, Standard Deviations, Univariate F Ratios, and LSD for Mother and Father Variables for Three Cultural Groups

	Father Variables	Anglos M	Anglos SD	Cuban-Americans M	Cuban-Americans SD	Latins M	Latins SD	F[1]	p	Least Significant Difference (p≤.05) 1 vs. 2	1 vs. 3	2 vs. 3
1.	Nurturance	6.39	2.25	6.89	2.50	6.46	2.48	1.95	n.s.	--	--	--
2.	Principled Discipline	6.37	2.09	6.57	2.20	6.55	2.23	0.56	n.s.	--	--	--
3.	Instrumental Companion-ship	6.33	2.13	6.38	2.24	6.34	2.19	0.15	n.s.	--	--	--
4.	Achievement Pressure	6.35	2.25	7.08	2.24	6.64	1.98	4.65	.010	*	--	--
5.	Protec-tiveness	5.77	1.71	6.52	1.91	6.32	1.56	7.28	.001	*	*	--

	Father Variables	Anglos M	Anglos SD	Cuban-Americans M	Cuban-Americans SD	Latins M	Latins SD	F[1]	p	Least Significant Difference (ps.05) 1 vs. 2	1 vs. 3	2 vs. 3
6.	Affective Punishment	7.19	2.39	7.53	2.82	7.51	2.50	0.18	n.s.	--	--	--
7.	Deprivation of Privileges	4.77	2.07	4.42	1.99	4.13	2.00	4.16	.016	--	*	--
8.	Scolding	5.05	1.86	4.64	1.82	4.77	2.02	1.83	n.s.	--	--	--
9.	Physical Punishment	4.53	2.00	3.66	1.72	3.33	1.70	18.61	.001	*	*	--
10.	Consistency of Expectation	7.44	1.89	7.76	1.66	7.35	1.75	1.88	n.s.	--	--	--
11.	Parental Disagreement	16.32	5.02	15.58	4.99	13.99	5.02	9.02	.001	--	*	*
12.	Inconsistent Discipline	21.38	4.59	20.48	4.95	21.27	4.02	1.56	n.s.	--	--	--

Father Variables	Anglos M	Anglos SD	Cuban-Americans M	Cuban-Americans SD	Latins M	Latins SD	F[1]	p	Least Significant Difference (ps.05) 1 vs. 2	1 vs. 3	2 vs. 3
13. Contingent Reward	6.04	1.65	6.15	1.81	6.78	1.74	8.29	.001	--	*	*
14. Non-contingent Reward	5.13	1.78	5.25	1.90	4.54	1.49	7.49	.001	--	*	*
15. Contingent Punishment	6.33	1.71	6.71	1.85	7.04	1.66	6.61	.001	--	*	--
16. Non-contingent Punishment	4.93	2.08	4.64	1.84	4.33	1.92	3.82	.023	--	*	--

(1) df (2, 438)

TABLE 3

F Ratios* and p Values of
Differences Between Cultural Groups

	Anglos		Latin Americans	
	F	p	F	p
Latin Americans	13.271	<.001		
Cuban Americans	4.772	<.001	7.540	<.001

*Each F statistic has 15 and 428 degrees of freedom.