

PARENTING STYLES AND CHILD OUTCOMES IN PUERTO RICAN FAMILIES*

ESTILOS DE PARENTALIDAD Y CONDUCTA EN NIÑOS EN FAMILIAS PUERTORRIQUEÑAS

Recibido: 11 de mayo de 2018 | Aceptado: 30 de marzo de 2019

Jeisianne **Rosario Colón**¹, Melanie M. **Domenech Rodríguez**¹, Renée V. **Gallher**¹

¹ Utah State University, Logan, United States of America.

RESUMEN

El propósito de este estudio fue evaluar los estilos de parentalidad de padres y madres puertorriqueños y entender su relación a la conducta de sus hijos e hijas. Participaron 51 familias con niños y niñas entre las edades de 6 y 11 años. Se codificaron tres dimensiones de parentalidad (i.e., calidez, exigencia, autonomía otorgada) con la Escala de Observación del Estilo Parental (Parenting Style Observation Rating Scale). Utilizamos el Child Behavior Checklist para evaluar problemas de conducta en niños y niñas. En general, los cuidadores recibieron puntuaciones altas en calidez, exigencia, y autonomía otorgada. Encontramos una correlación negativa entre exigencia solidaria y problemas internalizantes, externalizantes, y totales. La mayoría de la muestra fue categorizada como autoritativa (68.6%), mientras 23.5% fue categorizada como fría. El estilo de parentalidad autoritativo estuvo asociado significativamente con niveles más bajos de problemas de conducta en todos los ámbitos en comparación a familias categorizadas como frías o permisivas. Discutimos las limitaciones del estudio, las implicaciones de los resultados, y direcciones para futuros estudios en relación a estilos de parentalidad para familias puertorriqueñas viviendo en Puerto Rico.

PALABRAS CLAVE: Estilos de parentalidad, observaciones conductuales, padres puertorriqueños.

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to evaluate observed parenting styles among Puerto Rican parents and understand the relationship between those styles and child outcomes. Participants included 51 families with a child between the ages of 6 and 11. Three parenting dimensions (i.e., warmth, demandingness, autonomy granting) were coded with the Parenting Style Observation Rating Scale. We used the Child Behavior Checklist to assess child behavioral problems. Overall, parents received high ratings on warmth, demandingness, and autonomy granting. Supportive demandingness was negatively associated with internalizing, externalizing, and total child problems. The majority of the sample was categorized as authoritative (68.6%), while 23.5% was categorized as cold. Authoritative parenting was significantly associated with lower child problems across the board in comparison to families categorized as cold or permissive. Limitations of the current study were considered. We discussed implications of the results and directions for future research in regard to Puerto Rican parenting for families living in Puerto Rico.

KEYWORDS: Parenting, parenting styles, behavioral observation, Puerto Rican parents.

* This manuscript is based on the master's thesis project of the first author. Our collective gratitude to Jean Antonio García Periche for his invaluable assistance with coding videos. This project was possible due to funding from the Utah State University Research Catalyst Grant to the second author and to the generosity of Dr. Guillermo Bernal in hosting the second author's sabbatical at the Institute for Psychological Research at the University of Puerto Rico. Many thanks to Nydia Ortiz-Pons for her collaboration in attaining participants in Ponce.

In 1966, Diana Baumrind established the framework for studying parenting styles. She identified three parenting styles: authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive. Baumrind's parenting theory has been extensively researched with White American middle-class families based on these parenting typologies. The parenting typologies are derived from three dimensions: warmth, demandingness, and autonomy granting. Authoritative parents are regarded as high on warmth, demandingness, and autonomy granting. Authoritarian parents are characterized by being low in warmth and autonomy granting, and high on demandingness. Permissive parents are characterized by high levels of warmth and autonomy granting, and low levels of demandingness. Maccoby and Martin's (1983) research further explored parenting styles, adding a fourth style, neglectful parenting, which is characterized by low levels of warmth, demandingness, and autonomy granting.

Research has consistently associated parenting styles with child outcomes. Authoritative parenting has been correlated with overall positive outcomes (Bolkan, Sano, De Costa, Acock, & Day, 2010; Kawabata, Alink, Tseng, van IJzendoorn, & Crick, 2011; McDermott, Somers, Ceresnie, Stephen, & Partridge, 2014), while authoritarian, permissive, and neglectful parenting have been associated with negative outcomes (Hoeve et al., 2009; Leeman et al., 2014; Luyckx et al., 2011; Schroeder, Bulanda, Giordano, & Cernkovich, 2010; Varvil-Weld, Crowley, Turrisi, Greenberg, & Mallet, 2014). However, the bulk of this literature is based on analyses of White American family samples (Baumrind, 1966; 1972; Leeman et al., 2014; McDermott et al., 2014; Piotrowski, Lapierre, & Linebarger, 2013).

Researchers have defined parenting styles based only on two of the three dimensions established in Baumrind's framework (Hoeve, Dubas, Gerris, van der Laan, & Smeenk, 2011; Ratner, 2014; White, Zeiders, Gonzales, Tein, & Roosa, 2013), which

yielded the four parenting styles currently used. However, when all three parenting dimensions are used to formulate parenting style descriptions, it yields eight different types of parenting styles (Domenech Rodríguez, Donovick, & Crowley, 2009). In an exploration of parenting styles in a sample of Latino families in the U.S., the authors used all three dimensions, and found parents could be sorted into eight parenting styles: authoritative, authoritarian, permissive, neglectful, protective, cold, affiliative, and neglectful II (Domenech Rodríguez et al., 2009). These findings suggest that there might be more parenting styles than currently used.

The current literature does not adequately address the suitability of Baumrind's parenting styles with Latino parents. Authoritativeness has been associated with overall positive outcomes for children within White American families. On the other hand, Latino parents have been considered more authoritarian (Calzada, Huang, Anicama, Fernández, & Brotman, 2012; Falicov, 1998; Filkestein, Donenberg, & Martinovich, 2001; García-Preto, 1996; Henry, Morris, & Harrist, 2015), which has been associated with negative outcomes. This difference has been attributed to cultural differences. However, a more recent study has shown some variability in terms of child outcomes dependent on ethnicity (e.g., Mexican American and Dominican American; Kim, et al., 2018). Conversely, other researchers have not found Latino parents to be authoritarian (Carlo, White, Strei, Knight, & Zeiders, 2018; Davis, Carlo, & Knight, 2015; Domenech Rodríguez et al., 2009; Jabaghourian, Sorkhabi, Quach, & Strage, 2014).

Some researchers have found that the four parenting styles do not accurately describe Latino parenting when taking into account cultural values and differences. Domenech Rodríguez et al. (2009) studied parenting styles in a predominantly Mexican sample. Results showed that Mexican parents were better described as protective, a parenting

style characterized by high levels of warmth and demandingness, and low levels of autonomy granting. Another study by Lowe and Dotterer (2013) looked at parental monitoring and warmth in relationship to academic outcomes in ethnic minority adolescents. Results showed that moderate parental monitoring within a context of a warm environment increased school motivation, school engagement, and self-esteem. In a more recent study, a family systems framework was used to examine family profiles in Latino families. Results were consistent with previous research showing a new family parenting style where the majority of the sample (34%) engaged in high warmth and demandingness but with a focus on moderate to high parental authority and/or strictness (i.e., autonomy granting); which was related to lower depressive symptoms and higher self-esteem (Bámaca-Colbert et al., 2018). However, the majority of the research with Latino parents in the U.S. has been conducted with Mexican or Mexican-American samples (Bámaca-Colbert et al., 2018; Dumka, Gonzales, Bonds, & Millsap, 2009; Leidy, Guerra, & Toro, 2012; Varela et al., 2004). More research is needed with Latino samples from other regions to further assess the applicability of the current parenting styles to Latino families.

Puerto Rico is immersed in a unique cultural background. As a U.S. territory, after being a U.S. colony for more than a century, it is a blend of White American and Latino culture. Part of its diversity stems from the differences in national origin, mixed racial background (i.e., Spanish, African, Taíno), historical time depth, and the way they come into contact with mainstream White American society (Ramos, 2005). In 1898, the United States colonized Puerto Rico bringing economic, cultural, and political changes. During the first decades of colonization, the U.S. put in motion a plan, mostly targeting the education system, for Puerto Ricans to learn about U.S. American culture and the English language (Dominguez Miguela, 2001). Puerto Ricans became U.S. citizens in 1917 and

were subsequently eligible to be drafted into the United States military. As a result of the military recruitment, thousands of Puerto Ricans emigrated to the U.S.

The clash between the cultures created a cultural ambivalence in Puerto Ricans. During the 1940s and 50s, many working-class Puerto Ricans also emigrated to the U.S., as part of a government initiative to control the overpopulation on the island and help the economy. This event accelerated the acculturation process between both cultures. By 1973, 40% of the Puerto Rican population had immigrated to the U.S. mainland (Pérez y González, 2000). Puerto Ricans emigrated to the U.S. in search of better jobs and/or quality of life. When the financial or workforce situation improved on the island, many Puerto Ricans returned thus perpetuating a cycle of migration between the U.S. mainland and the island that created a constant interchange between cultures (Concepción, 2008). This circular migration is prevalent today.

As a result of the U.S. citizenship, Puerto Ricans present a unique cultural context that separates them from other Latino subgroups. Puerto Ricans have the flexibility to come and go from the U.S. without regard for immigration laws, which is an always-present factor for other Latinos. This constant contact with the U.S. creates a distinct situation for Puerto Rican families, given the vast differences between both cultures, such as gender roles, language, family structure, values, and traditions.

The research on island Puerto Rican families is very limited. From the existing research with Puerto Rican families, samples are circumscribed to Puerto Rican mother-child dyads living in the U.S. Negrón-Rodríguez (2004) found that Puerto Rican mothers often shared decisions with their children about discipline and independence. Translated into the three dimensions currently used in the parenting styles literature, Latino parents might be high on warmth and demandingness, but low on autonomy

granting. Guilamo-Ramos et al. (2007) found similar results when studying parenting practices among Dominican and Puerto Rican mothers and their adolescents (44 Dominicans, 19 Puerto Rican pairs). Latino mothers expressed the need to monitor their adolescents' activities closely by being consistent, firm, and correcting misbehavior, which tied to their value of *respeto*. Mutual reciprocity in decision-making was also important, where autonomy granting was increased as age increased, but still in the context of parental rules. This study suggests that Latino parents may exhibit lower autonomy granting levels than White American families during the early years of development of their children, although it increases as age increases. This combination is not represented in the four parenting styles currently used. The current study aimed to contribute to fill this gap by assessing family parenting styles in island Puerto Rican families.

The current study took into account all three parenting dimensions. In addition, the effects of child sex were incorporated throughout the study. Specifically, we answered the following research questions: (a) What are the levels of each parenting dimension among Puerto Rican families? (b) What percentage of Puerto Rican parents fit into each family parenting style resulting from all possible combinations of the three parenting dimensions? (c) Do parenting dimensions predict child outcomes (i.e., internalizing and externalizing behaviors)? and (d) Do family parenting styles predict child outcomes (i.e., internalizing and externalizing behaviors)? Prior to answering these questions, and because the observational scale had not been used with Puerto Rican families, we conducted a factor analysis to examine the scale structure.

METHOD

Design

This study uses a correlational design through an extent data set, originally collected by

Domenech Rodríguez, Franceschi Rivera, Sella Nieves, and Félix Fermín (2013). Parents completed self-report questionnaires and structured observational data. Parent-child interactions were videotaped. The original study coded the videos according to parenting practices (e.g., monitoring/supervision). For the present study, interactions were coded to categorize parenting styles. Parenting styles were derived from codes for each of the three parenting dimensions. It is important to note that when the label parenting styles is used, it encompasses the behavior of both parents, given that the coding was conducted using a global score for the family interaction (Aspland & Gardner, 2003; Furr & Funder, 2007).

Participants

Domenech Rodríguez et al. (2013) recruited 55 families in Puerto Rico, primarily from San Juan and Ponce. Inclusion criteria for this convenience sample were: (a) family with a child between the ages of 6 and 11, (b) two parents currently in the home, (c) absence of severe child conduct problems, or (d) developmental problems. Initially, 105 families were recruited; however, 30 families were excluded, primarily because they did not meet the family structure criteria for inclusion. It is important to note that opposite sex partnerships were not required for inclusion. Of remaining families, 75 met inclusion criteria and 55 completed the study. The families participated in a one-time data collection session where the parents completed the questionnaires and were video recorded while engaging in structured behavioral tasks with their child.

For the present study interactions were coded for 51 families; four families were excluded due to problems with the videos (poor lighting, sound). Parents completed self-report questionnaires and engaged in observational tasks during a period of 33 min. Families were comprised of both parents and a child between the ages of 6 and 11. Mothers ranged in age from 23 to 50 years ($M = 36.41$, $SD = 7.57$), fathers from 22 to 56 years ($M =$

39.23, *SD* = 8.01), and children from 6 to 11 (*M* = 7.84, *SD* = 1.70). Most mothers and fathers had an undergraduate degree or higher level of education. Most mothers,

fathers, and children were born in Puerto Rico. See tables 1 and 2 for demographic characteristics of parents and children.

TABLE 1.
Parents' characteristics.

	Mothers		Fathers	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Age of parent	36.41	7.569	39.23	8.006
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Level of education				
High school education or less	5	10	9	17.7
Some college	7	14	10	19.6
College graduate	28	56	22	43.1
Post-graduate	8	16	6	11.8
Other	2	4	3	5.9
Country of origin				
Puerto Rico	41	80.4	43	84.3
Dominican Republic	3	5.9	3	5.9
Cuba	1	2.0	3	5.9
Other	4	8.2	--	--
Did not respond	2	3.9	2	3.9

TABLE 2.
Children characteristics (*N* = 51).

	<i>n</i>	%
Sex of child		
Boy	33	64.7
Girl	18	35.3
Country of Origin		
Puerto Rico	48	94.1
Dominican Republic	1	2.0
Not available	2	3.9
Age of children		
6 years	17	6
7 years	8	22
8 years	9	16
9 years	8	22
10 years	4	26
11 years	5	8
Child lives with		
Biological parents (intact family)	36	70.6
Stepparent and biological parent	15	29.4

Procedure

The study was approved by the Comité Institucional de Protección de Seres Humanos en Investigación at the University of Puerto Rico, and the Institutional Review Board at Utah State University prior to the

beginning of the study. Recruitment was conducted in schools, community workshops, flyers, newspaper columns (Domenech Rodríguez, Franceschi Rivera, & Sella Nieves, 2010; Félix Fermín, Franceschi Rivera, & Domenech Rodríguez, 2011; Sella Nieves & Domenech Rodríguez, 2011), and

word-of-mouth. Participants were screened for inclusion when they called and expressed interest in participating in the study. Appointments were made with participants that met inclusion criteria. The data were collected in three different settings: Institute for Psychological Research Community Clinic at the University of Puerto Rico, Río Piedras, Ponce School of Medicine Community Clinic, or at the participant's homes, depending on the family's availability and preference. Before data collection started, the evaluators obtained informed consent from the parents, and assent from the child. Then parents were taken to a private room to fill out the questionnaires, followed by the Family Interaction Tasks (FITs; Domenech Rodríguez et al., 2013).

The FITs were divided into two phases. Phase A lasted approximately 7 min, in which the evaluator met only with the parents in the observation room and explained two of the tasks: the guessing game and the puzzle game, and practiced each task with them. This phase was not videotaped. Phase B, which had a duration of approximately 33 min, was videotaped. In Phase B, the child was brought into the observation room, where all seven tasks were performed (i.e., puzzle, guessing game, problem selection and solution, family activity, recess/discipline, and supervision). For their participation, each parent received \$25 and an invitation to participate in a free parenting workshop. The child received a small item such as pencils, notebooks, or miniature games.

Measures

The original study (Domenech Rodríguez et al., 2013) used a variety of self-report measures. This study used the demographic questionnaire (e.g., age, sex, level of education, national origin) and the Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL; Achenbach & Rescorla, 2001) as the child outcomes measure. Parents completed the demographic questionnaire together, but reported individually on the CBCL. All

measures were administered in Spanish and can be found in Rosario Colón (2016).

Child outcomes. The CBCL (Achenbach & Rescorla, 2001), for children 6-18 years of age, is a 112-item self-report measure on which the child is rated on various emotional and behavioral problems within the past 6 months. The CBCL uses a Likert-type scale that ranges from 0 (*not true (as far as you know)*) to 2 (*very true or often true*), which measures degree of agreement with each item. The CBCL provides three scores or indexes: internalizing (e.g., anxious, depressive), externalizing (e.g., aggressive, noncompliant), and total problem behaviors. The CBCL has been validated with Puerto Rican samples (Rubio-Stipec, Bird, Canino, & Gould, 1990), showing high levels of internal consistency for boys and girls, with alphas ranging from .89 to .94. High concurrent validity was also found. Results indicate the CBCL is a good measure of maladjustment for Puerto Rican children.

Observational data. The present study utilized the Parenting Style Observation Rating Scale (P-SOS; Davis, 2006), which is a quantitative standardized coding system used to measure parent behaviors during parent-child interactions. This coding system was developed by Davis (2006) based on the four parenting styles (i.e., authoritative, authoritarian, permissive, and neglectful) and the three parenting dimensions (i.e., warmth, demandingness, and autonomy granting). The final scale has 17 items for warmth and 8 for autonomy granting. The demandingness scale has 17 items, divided into two scales, 9 items measuring supportive demandingness and 8 items measuring non-supportive demandingness. For the purpose of the four theoretically derived parenting styles typologies, demandingness was measured using the supportive demandingness scale only. The scale is rated on a scale of 1 (*very untrue*) to 5 (*very true*). If an item is not observed during the observation time frame, then it is scored at the mid-point of the scale (3 = *not clear*). Davis (2006) validated the P-

SOS with a sample of 50 Mexican families. All dimension scales showed adequate to excellent reliability. The scales obtained a Cronbach's alpha of .75 for the demandingness scale; .76 for the warmth scale; and .92 for the autonomy granting scale. In the current study, the P-SOS was used to rate parent behaviors jointly, producing one score per family.

RESULTS

Factor analysis was used to determine the fit of the items from the P-SOS with the theoretically created parenting dimensions. Once scale scores were derived, descriptive statistics were calculated to analyze parenting dimensions. Frequency distribution tables revealed a number of items with no variability

(i.e., every family received a score of 5). Because items with zero variability preclude assessment of the factor structure of the scales, reduce reliability, and limit overall variability in the scale scores, items that showed no variability were excluded from further analysis. Using the remaining items, separate Principal Components Factor Analyses were conducted for each of the subscales using Varimax rotation. Varimax rotation was selected with the goal of maximizing independence among any separate factors that emerged from the scale items. The orthogonal method of extraction yielded theoretically meaningful and unique scales within each domain. The final scale items with factor loadings are found in Table 3.

TABLE 3.
Factor Loading for factor analysis with varimax rotation of the parenting dimensions.

New Subscale	Items	M	SD	Factor Load
Warmth	1. Parent makes the child feel better when something is wrong	3.82	1.01	.448
	5. Parent and child have warm moments together	4.71	0.58	.776
	6. Parent uses terms of endearment with their child	3.18	1.84	.477
	9. Parent gives comfort and understanding when child is upset	3.63	1.00	.415
	10. Parent physically expresses affection (e.g., hugging, kissing, holding)	3.55	1.78	.797
Emotion-regulation	12. Parent is easy going and is relaxed with the child	4.67	0.84	.780
	13. Parent shows patience with the child	4.65	0.91	.844
	15. Parent expresses disagreement with child in harsh/rough manner (RS)	4.90	0.46	.851
	16. Parent yells or shouts when child misbehaves (RS)	4.98	0.14	.873
Autonomy Granting	2. Parent asks child's opinion about decisions that will affect the child	4.90	0.46	.839
	3. Parent listens to the child's point of view even when parent disagrees with the child.	4.02	0.97	.512
	5. Parent takes into account child's preferences when making family plans	4.80	0.53	.836
	7. Parent encourages child to freely express himself/herself even when disagreeing with parents.	3.67	0.97	.605
Demandingness Supportive	1. Parent clearly states rules to be followed	4.59	1.00	.791
	3. Parent sets and enforce rules	4.59	0.90	.818
	4. Parent provides instructions to the child for appropriate behavior	4.86	0.49	.909
	7. Parent seems in good control of child in session	4.69	0.97	.800
	9. Parent has high expectations of child's behavior	4.80	0.45	.820
Non-supportive demandingness	4. Parent is overly strict	1.14	0.49	.870
	5. Parent is controlling of the child	1.53	1.12	.743
	7. Parent is overly rigid regarding the following of rules	1.24	0.65	.866
	8. Parent has the attitude that all rules are non-negotiable	1.55	1.71	.406

Warmth. The warmth scale was originally composed of 17 items. Bivariate correlations showed that several items in the subscales were negatively correlated. Four of the 17

items demonstrated zero variability in ratings, and were deleted from subsequent analyses. The remaining 13 items were entered into the factor analysis. The factor analysis of the

warmth subscale yielded five factors with eigenvalues greater than one. However, upon examination, only the first two factors yielded theoretically meaningful usable scales with independently loading items. The first two factors had eigenvalues greater than two. Subsequent factors had no more than one or two items that did not cross load with the first two factors. The two factors were labeled as the warmth and emotion regulation subscales. The final scale reliability was .627 for warmth and .864 for emotional regulation.

Autonomy granting. The autonomy granting scale was originally composed of eight items. All had some variability in ratings and were entered into the factor analysis. The factor analysis of the autonomy granting subscale yielded three factors with eigenvalues greater than one. Upon examination only one factor, from the non-rotated component matrix, yielded a usable scale with independently loading items. Subsequent factors had no more than one or two items that did not crossload with the first factor. This 4-item factor had an eigenvalue of 2.12, and is used as the autonomy granting subscale. Cronbach's alpha for this reduced scale was .681.

Supportive demandingness. The supportive demandingness scale was originally composed of nine items. All had some variability in ratings and were entered into the factor analysis. The factor analysis of the supportive demandingness subscale yielded four factors. Upon examination only one factor yielded a usable scale with independently loading items (eigenvalue = 3.70). This factor yielded five items for the supportive demandingness subscale.

Cronbach's alpha for this reduced scale was .890.

Non-supportive demandingness. The non-supportive demandingness scale was originally composed of eight items. Of those, one had zero variability in ratings. The remaining seven items were entered into the factor analysis. The factor analysis of the non-supportive demandingness subscale yielded three factors. Upon examination, only one factor yielded a usable scale with independently loading items. The first factor yielded an eigenvalue of 2.32. The final 4-item scale reliability was .720.

Pearson correlations were calculated to examine the relationship between the main parenting dimensions. Results showed no statistically significant correlations ($p > .05$) between any of the main parenting dimensions derived from the previous literature (i.e., warmth, autonomy granting, and supportive demandingness). There was a negative correlation between emotion-regulation and non-supportive demandingness, $r(49) = -.51, p < .01$.

Parenting dimensions

Research question 1 was: what are the levels of each parenting dimension among Puerto Rican families? Parenting dimensions were examined by analyzing means and standard deviations of each parenting dimension (i.e., warmth, emotion-regulation, supportive demandingness, non-supportive demandingness, and autonomy granting). The majority of the current sample scored high on the theoretical dimensions: warmth, demandingness, and autonomy granting (see Table 4).

TABLE 4.
Parenting dimension subscales descriptive statistics ($N = 51$).

Scales	M	SD	Range	Skew	Kurtosis
Warmth	3.78	0.79	2.00 – 5.00	-.613	-1.023
Emotion-regulation	4.80	0.51	2.25 – 5.00	-10.294	20.317
Autonomy Granting	4.35	0.53	2.50 - 2.00	-1.730	1.681
Demandingness Supportive	4.71	0.63	2.00 - 5.00	-9.129	14.530
Non-supportive demandingness	1.36	0.62	1.00 - 3.25	5.111	2.965

Parenting styles

Research question 2 was: what percentage of Puerto Rican parents fit into each family parenting style resulting from all possible combinations of the three parenting dimensions? Parenting styles were derived in two ways: via traditional categorization based on theoretical combinations of high and low scores on the three parenting dimensions observed in the larger literature, and by cluster analysis using all five parenting dimensions observed in this sample.

Traditional categorization of parenting styles. Each family parenting style was comprised of high or low scores for each of three parenting dimensions derived from the parenting styles literature. Parents scoring

3.01 or higher were considered as high in a given dimension and parents who scored below 3.01 were considered low in the respective dimension. The following family parenting styles categories were created based on the theoretical model of Baumrind (1966) and Maccoby and Martin (1983): authoritative, authoritarian, permissive, and neglectful. Additional categories were created based on the remaining possible combinations of low warmth, and high demandingness and autonomy granting (i.e., cold), and high warmth and demandingness, but low autonomy granting (i.e., protective; Domenech Rodríguez et al., 2009). Results showed the majority of the current sample as authoritative, followed by a cold parenting style. Few parents were categorized as permissive and protective (see Table 5).

TABLE 5.
Parenting styles among Puerto Rican parents (N = 51).

Parenting Style	%	N	Warmth	Demandingness	Autonomy granting
Authoritative	68.62	35	High	High	High
Authoritarian	0.00	0	Low	High	Low
Permissive	5.88	3	High	Low	High
Neglectful	0.00	0	Low	Low	Low
Protective	1.96	1	High	High	Low
Cold	23.52	12	Low	High	High
Affiliative	0.00	0	High	Low	Low
Neglectful II	0.00	0	Low	Low	High

Cluster analysis. A cluster analysis was conducted to examine data-driven clusters of family parenting styles. A cluster analysis uses distance scores to create classes or categories that are separate from each other, minimizing overlap between categories. This allows the dimension scores to be divided into strictly scores-based categories. However, a cluster analysis does not account for the latent dimensions that underlie the scores or a model fit for the scores. The use of both data analyses (i.e., mean scores in the Likert-type scale and cluster analysis) provides different approaches to the data in which the theoretically based analysis provides information on the latent constructs while the cluster analysis provides solely data-based results.

A two-step cluster analysis was conducted using the five subscale scores. The log-likelihood distance was used to measure clusters' proximity. Results yielded two distinct clusters. The first cluster was high on warmth ($M = 3.96, SD = .694$), emotion regulation ($M = 4.97, SD = .102$), autonomy granting ($M = 4.30, SD = .557$), and supportive demandingness ($M = 4.66, SD = .710$), and low on non-supportive demandingness ($M = 1.09, SD = .240$). The second cluster was lower on warmth ($M = 3.17, SD = .822$) and emotion-regulation ($M = 4.25, SD = .839$), and higher on autonomy granting ($M = 4.50, SD = .440$), supportive demandingness ($M = 4.85, SD = .243$), and non-supportive demandingness ($M = 2.25, SD = .648$).

Because of the pattern of higher scoring in the three main parenting dimensions derived from theoretical categories, cluster 1 was designated as representing an authoritative family parenting style and cluster 2 was designated as a cold family parenting style. Of the current sample, 76.5% were categorized as authoritative and 23.5% as cold family parenting styles. Significant differences were found ($p < .5$) between the two clusters, with families in cluster 1 scoring higher on warmth and emotion regulation, and lower in non-supportive demandingness than families in cluster 2. Twenty-nine families were categorized as authoritative and six families were categorized as cold using both approaches. Fifteen families were categorized differently across the two approaches.

Parenting and child outcomes

Parenting dimensions. Research question 3 was: do parenting dimensions predict child outcomes (i.e., internalizing and externalizing behaviors)? We found significant correlations between supportive demandingness and mothers' CBCL internalizing, externalizing, and total scores (see Table 6). Similarly, significant correlations were found between supportive demandingness and fathers' CBCL internalizing, externalizing, and total scores. This suggests that higher levels of supportive demandingness are associated with lower levels of internalizing, externalizing, and total child symptoms.

TABLE 6.

Correlations between parenting dimensions and child outcomes ($N = 51$).

	Mothers: CBCL			Fathers: CBCL		
	Inter.	Ext.	Total	Inter.	Ext.	Total
Warmth	-.006	-.124	-.044	.018	-.121	-.062
Emotion-regulation	.150	.229	1.99	.168	.238	.261
Autonomy granting	-.182	-.179	-.206	-.069	-.209	-.177
Supportive demandingness	-.377**	-.284*	-.340*	-.400**	-.426**	-.452**
Non-supportive demandingness	-.084	-.051	-.016	-.016	.002	-.057

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$

Parenting styles and child outcomes. Research question 4 was: do family parenting styles predict child outcomes (i.e., internalizing and externalizing behaviors)? One-way ANOVA analysis showed significant mean differences among theoretically derived authoritative ($n = 35$), cold ($n = 12$), and permissive ($n = 3$) parent dyads on mothers' CBCL scores for internalizing, $F(2, 46) = 4.33$, $p = .019$, externalizing, $F(2, 46) = 3.21$, $p = .050$, and total symptoms, $F(2, 46) = 3.73$, $p = .031$. Fathers' CBCL scores for internalizing, $F(2, 46) = 4.55$, $p = .016$, externalizing, $F(2, 46) = 7.30$, $p = .002$, and total symptoms, $F(2, 46) = 7.22$, $p = .002$ were also significant. Tukey HSD post-hoc analyses were conducted on all possible pairwise contrasts. A significant pairwise difference ($p < .05$) was found between the authoritative and permissive parent dyads for mothers' CBCL internalizing scores, with permissive families

showing higher means than authoritative families. A significant difference for mothers' CBCL internalizing scores was also found for cold and permissive parent dyads, with permissive families showing higher means than cold families. Significant pairwise differences were found between the authoritative and permissive parent dyads in relationship to mothers' CBCL total scores; with permissive dyads showing higher means than authoritative dyads.

For fathers' CBCL internalizing scores, significant differences were found between the permissive and authoritative families, with permissive parent dyads showing higher means than authoritative parent dyads. A mean difference was also found between permissive and cold families, with permissive dyads showing higher means than cold dyads. The means for fathers' CBCL externalizing

scores were significantly different between the permissive and authoritative family parenting styles and between permissive and cold family parenting styles. Higher means were found for permissive parent dyads in comparison to authoritative and cold parent dyads. Lastly, main significant differences were found for fathers' CBCL total scores and the permissive and authoritative family parenting styles, and between permissive and cold family parenting styles. The same trend as in fathers' internalizing and externalizing scores was found, where permissive families showed higher means than authoritative and cold families. All other pairwise comparisons were non-significant ($p > .05$). Independent samples t tests were conducted to examine differences between the family parenting clusters on child outcomes. No significant mean differences were found ($p > .05$).

Parenting and child sex

Independent samples t tests showed no differences between families with boys and families with girls for any of the parenting dimensions: warmth, $t(49) = .430$, $p = .101$; emotion regulation, $t(49) = 1.852$, $p = .070$; autonomy granting, $t(49) = -.674$, $p = .503$; supportive demandingness, $t(49) = -1.061$, $p = .294$; and non-supportive demandingness, $t(49) = -.692$, $p = .492$. Chi-square analysis was used to assess the association between child sex and data driven parenting style clusters. Parenting styles clusters did not differ by child sex, $X^2(2, N = 51) = .415$, $p = .813$. Because there were so few families in two of the parenting styles created from the theoretical model, the assumptions of chi-square were not met and no comparisons across child sex were made. No differences were found between boys and girls for internalizing, $t(48) = -.701$, $p = .487$, externalizing, $t(48) = .071$, $p = .944$, or total CBCL T scores, $t(48) = -.347$, $p = .730$ for mothers, nor for fathers' internalizing, $t(48) = -.981$, $p = .331$, externalizing, $t(48) = -.633$, $p = .529$, or total CBCL T scores, $t(48) = -.715$, $p = .478$.

DISCUSSION

This study aimed to further the literature regarding family parenting styles and child outcomes in Latino families, specifically within the Puerto Rican population. Results showed that the majority of the families exhibited high levels of warmth, demandingness, and autonomy granting, which has been traditionally categorized as an authoritative parenting style. This finding suggests that Puerto Rican families' parenting style may be consistent with White American families. However, this might be interpreted within the context of Puerto Rico's historical background. Given Puerto Rico's status as a U.S. territory and its historical pattern of circular migration, acculturation processes might be at play that have not been thoroughly explored (Capielo Rosario, Lance, Delgado-Romero, & Domenech Rodríguez, 2018; Concepción, 2008; Pérez y González, 2000).

Higher levels of supportive demandingness were associated with lower child behavioral symptoms. This finding may point to a protective factor for Latino families, not a risk factor as past research had described, when understood within an authoritarian parenting framework. Puerto Rican families may incorporate their values of *familismo* and *respeto* through their expectations of their children behaviors and the amount of monitoring of said behaviors. *Familismo* is associated with cohesion while *respeto* is associated with parental authority (i.e., deference to authority; Calzada et al., 2012). High levels of warmth can be explained as a way to maintain family cohesion while *respeto* can be explained as a way to establish a structure for family dynamics while also communicating clear expectations of child behavior. When children adhere to the cultural, social, and/or familial norms while also having clear expectations for behavior, it might be associated to positive child outcomes (Bámaca-Colbert et al., 2018; Guilamo-Ramos et al., 2007; Kim et al., 2018).

There is very limited information regarding the cold parenting style, which was the second largest family parenting style group within this sample. However, it is important to interpret these results in light of the low variability within the sample. Parents in our sample exhibited high levels of warmth. Families categorized within the cold family parenting style were categorized that way relative to the rest of the sample. Finally, a small group of families were categorized as permissive. This small percentage is consistent with published findings (Calzada & Eyberg, 2002; Domenech Rodríguez et al., 2009; White et al., 2013). Lastly, one family within the current sample was categorized as protective. This finding is inconsistent with previous research within Latino samples (Bámaca-Colberg et al., 2018; Kim et al., 2018; Domenech Rodríguez et al., 2009), although this research was conducted with predominantly Mexican American samples.

There were significant differences between the authoritative, cold, and permissive family parenting styles for mothers and fathers' CBCL internalizing and total scores. Authoritative parents reported the lowest levels of CBCL internalizing and total symptoms (and externalizing symptoms only for fathers) than cold or permissive parenting dyads, with permissive families reporting the highest levels of child symptoms than any other. Also, no significant main differences were found between child sex and any of the remaining parenting variables. Further research is needed in order to have a clearer picture of normative family parenting styles in Puerto Rican families and determine the clinical significance of the current findings.

The study has limitations. First, observational methods have advantages and disadvantages. Although using behavioral observations presents the benefit of being free of self-report bias by the parents, this method is subjected to researcher bias and the participants might feel the pressure to behave in specific ways due to the laboratory setting and rule-specific activities (Shadish, Cook, &

Campbell, 2002). Second, the sample was a one of convenience, which limits the generalizability of the findings. In addition, the current study was conducted with children 6 to 11 years old, which limits generalizability in terms of age ranges (Becerra & Castillo, 2011; Davidson & Cardemil, 2009). Likewise, socioeconomic status (SES) was not included as a variable in the current study. SES might be an influencing factor in relationship to parenting styles and child outcomes. Future research might want to include this variable as a possible mediator. Finally, we did not track where families were located. The recruitment in San Juan and Ponce provided families from different geographical areas and there may have been significant differences between the two. Future research with Puerto Rican families should take into account geographical variability within the island.

A number of analytic issues are also relevant. The coding scheme (i.e., P-SOS) used only includes a sample of behaviors believed to provide a picture of the underlying processes under study (Lindahl, 2001) rather than being all-encompassing. In our sample, the items assessed yielded very little variability, with almost all families near the top of the scale, which constrained our analytic options. Using a more sensitive measure for Puerto Rican samples might be more effective in capturing the variability within the sample. In addition, our choice of factor analytic strategy influenced the structure of the final scales used to assess the parenting dimensions.

Notwithstanding the limitations of the current study, the parenting framework currently used by the mainstream literature did not accurately conceptualize Puerto Rican parenting. Two family parenting styles (i.e., cold and protective) emerged that are not portrayed in Baumrind's (1966) original typology, which suggests that further research is needed in order to accurately capture parenting within the Puerto Rican population. The findings presented in this research have potential implications within the parenting

research. For example, acculturation measures could be included in parenting research with Puerto Rican parents living on the island. It may be that the high prevalence of authoritative families might be an influence of acculturation processes due to their unique cultural and political context, in which Puerto Ricans are in constant contact with the mainstream White American culture. In addition, further research is needed in regards to cold parenting, its prevalence, and relationship to child outcomes. Furthermore, the current study could be replicated with different samples, such as single parent families, Puerto Rican families with children with specific internalizing or externalizing behavioral problems, and/or with adolescent samples.

The current findings also suggest that an emphasis on supportive demandingness that stems from a Latino cultural context might be beneficial when implementing parenting interventions. In addition, given the low variability of the current sample, qualitative studies could help inform research on normative parenting behaviors within the Puerto Rican population. This information could be used to develop a more sensitive measure that could help improve its accuracy in order to capture the variability within the sample. Additionally, individual parental coding might be helpful in order to discern differences in parenting styles based on parental sex. Based on the current findings, it would also be beneficial for clinicians working with Latino populations to be aware of the conflicting findings in the literature and use it to navigate clinical situations with caution. Overall, additional research is needed regarding Latino parenting styles and its relationship to child outcomes. The current literature has conflicting findings and further research is needed in order to be able to determine which parenting style better conceptualizes Latino parenting behaviors, also considering the diversity within Latino subgroups.

Compliance with Standards of Research Ethics

Financing: This project was possible due to funding from the Utah State University Research Catalyst Grant to the second author and to the generosity of Dr. Guillermo Bernal in hosting the second author's sabbatical at the Institute for Psychological Research at the University of Puerto Rico.

Conflict of interests: There are no conflicts of interest on the part of the authors.

Approval of the Institutional Board for the Protection of Human Participants in Research: This research was approved by the Comité Institucional de Protección de Seres Humanos en la Investigación at the University of Puerto Rico [Protocol #0910-182] and the Institutional Review Board at Utah State University [Protocol #4061] prior to the beginning of the study

Informed Consent or Assent: Parents provided informed consent and children provided verbal assent to participate.

REFERENCES

- Achenbach, T. M., & Rescorla, L. A. (2001). *Manual for the ASEBA School-Age Forms & Profiles*. Burlington, VT: University of Vermont, Research Center for Children, Youth, & Families.
- Aspland, H., & Gardner, F. (2003). Observational measures of parent-child interaction: An introductory review. *Child and Adolescent Mental Health, 8*, 136-143. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1475-3588.00061>
- Bámaca-Colbert, M. Y., Gonzales-Backen, M., Henry, C. S., Kim, P. S., Roblyer, M. Z., Plunkett, S. W., & Sands, T. (2018). Family profiles of cohesion and parenting practices and Latino youth adjustment. *Family Process, 57*, 719-736.
- Baumrind, D. (1966). Effects of authoritative parental control on child behavior. *Child*

- Development*, 37, 887–907. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1126611x>
- Baumrind, D. (1972). The development of instrumental competence through socialization. *Minnesota Symposia on Child Psychology*, 7, 3–46.
- Becerra, D., & Castillo, J. (2011). Culturally protective parenting practices against substance use among adolescents in Mexico. *Journal of Substance Use*, 16, 136–149. <http://doi.org/10.3109/14659891.2010.518199>
- Bolkan, C., Sano, Y., De Costa, J., Acock, A. C., & Day, R. D. (2010). Early adolescents' perceptions of mothers' and fathers' parenting styles and problem behavior. *Marriage & Family Review*, 46, 563–579. <http://doi.org/10.1080/01494929.2010.543040>
- Calzada, E. J., & Eyberg, S. M. (2002). Self-reported parenting practices in Dominican and Puerto Rican mothers of young children. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology*, 31, 354–363. <https://doi.org/10.1207/153744202760082612>
- Calzada, E. J., Huang, K. Y., Anicama, C., Fernandez, Y., & Brotman, L. M. (2012). Test of a cultural framework of parenting with Latinx families of young children. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 18, 285–296. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0028694>
- Capielo Rosario, C., Lance, C. E., Delgado-Romero, E. A., & Domenech Rodríguez, M. M. (2018). Acculturated and acultura'os: Testing bidimensional acculturation across central Florida and island Puerto Ricans. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.1037/cdp0000221>
- Carlo, G., White, R., Streit, C., Knight, G. P., & Zeiders, K. H. (2018). Longitudinal relations among parenting styles, prosocial behaviors, and academic outcomes in US Mexican adolescents. *Child Development*, 89, 577–592. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12761>
- Concepción, R. (2008). *Puerto Rican migration, settlement patterns, and assimilation in the Orlando MSA* (Unpublished master's thesis). University of North Carolina, Charlotte, NC.
- Davidson, T. M., & Cardemil, E. V. (2009). Parent-child communication and parental involvement in Latino adolescents. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, 29, 99–121. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0272431608324480>
- Davis, A. N., Carlo, G., & Knight, G. P. (2015). Perceived maternal parenting styles, cultural values, and prosocial tendencies among Mexican American youth. *The Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 176, 235–252. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00221325.2015.1044494>
- Davis, M. R. (2006). *Predicting child outcomes from parenting styles of Spanish-speaking Latino parents* (Unpublished master's thesis). Utah State University, Logan.
- Domenech Rodríguez, M. M., Donovan, M. R., & Crowley, S. L. (2009). Parenting styles in a cultural context: Observations of “protective parenting” in first-generation Latinos. *Family Process*, 48, 195–210. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1545-5300.2009.01277.x>
- Domenech Rodríguez, M., Franceschi Rivera, N., & Sella Nieves, Z. (2010, November 13). Tomando el control de la montaña rusa familiar [Taking control of the Family roller coaster]. *El Vocero*, 24.
- Domenech Rodríguez, M. M., Franceschi Rivera, N., Sella Nieves, Z., & Félix Fermín, J. (2013). Parenting in Puerto Rican families: Mothers and father's self-reported practices. *Interamerican Journal of Psychology*, 47, 299–312.
- Domínguez Miguela, A. (2001). El legado de 1898 en Puerto Rico: Confrontación y ambivalencia cultural. In J. E. Cruz Cabrera & C. Flys Junquera (Eds.), *El nuevo horizonte: España-Estados*

- Unidos: El legado de 1848 y 1898 frente al nuevo milenio* (pp. 225-238). España: Universidad de Alcalá.
- Dumka, L. E., Gonzales, N. A., Bonds, D. D., & Millsap, R. E. (2009). Academic success of Mexican origin adolescent boys and girls: The role of mothers' and fathers' parenting and cultural orientation. *Sex Roles, 60*, 588–599. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-008-9518-z>
- Falicov, C. J. (1998). *Latino families in therapy: A guide to multicultural practice*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Félix-Fermín, J., Franceschi Rivera, N., & Domenech Rodríguez, M. (2011). Halando en equipo la sogra de los problemas familiares [Approaching the problem solving tug of war as a family team]. *El Vocero*.
- Finkelstein, J. A. S., Donenberg, G. R., & Martinovich, Z. (2001). Maternal control and adolescent depression: Ethnic differences among clinically referred girls. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 30*, 155-171. <https://doi.org/10.1023/a:1010341724157>
- Furr, R. M., & Funder, D. C. (2007). Behavioral observation. In R. W. Robins, R. C. Fraley, & R. F. Krueger (Eds.), *Handbook of research methods in personality psychology* (pp. 273-291). New York, NY: The Guilford Press.
- García-Preto, N. (1996). *Ethnicity and family therapy (2nd ed.)*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Guilamo-Ramos, V., Dittus, P., Jaccard, J., Johansson, M., Bouris, A., & Acosta, N. (2007). Parenting practices among Dominican and Puerto Rican mothers. *Social Work, 52*, 17–30. <https://doi.org/10.1093/sw/52.1.17>
- Henry, C. S., Morris, A. S., & Harrist, A. W. (2015). Family resilience: Moving into the third wave. *Family Relations, 64*, 22–43. <https://doi.org/10.1111/fare.12106>.
- Hoeve, M., Dubas, J. S., Eichelsheim, V. I., van der Laan, P. H., Smeenk, W., & Gerris, J. R. M. (2009). The relationship between parenting and delinquency: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 37*, 749–775. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s10802-009-9310-8>
- Hoeve, M., Dubas, J. S., Gerris, J. R. M., van der Laan, P. H., & Smeenk, W. (2011). Maternal and paternal parenting styles: Unique and combined links to adolescent and early adult delinquency. *Journal of Adolescence, 34*, 813–827. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2011.02.004>
- Jabaghourian, J. J., Sorkhabi, N., Quach, W., & Strage, A. (2014). Parenting styles and practices of Latino parents and Latino fifth graders' academic, cognitive, social, and behavioral outcomes. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 36*, 175-194. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0739986314523289>
- Kawabata, Y., Alink, L. R. A., Tseng, W.L., van IJzendoorn, M. H., & Crick, N. R. (2011). Maternal and paternal parenting styles associated with relational aggression in children and adolescents: A conceptual analysis and meta-analytic review. *Developmental Review, 31*, 240–278. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.dr.2011.08.001>
- Kim, Y., Calzada, E. J., Barajas-Gonzalez, R. G., Huang, K.-Y., Brotman, L. M., Castro, A., & Pichardo, C. (2018). The role of authoritative and authoritarian parenting in the early academic achievement of Latino students. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 110*, 119–132. <https://doi.org/10.1037/edu0000192>
- Leeman, R. F., Patock-Peckham, J. A., Hoff, R. A., Krishnan-Sarin, S., Steinberg, M. A., Rugle, L. J., & Potenza, M. N. (2014). Perceived parental permissiveness toward gambling and risky behaviors in adolescents. *Journal of Behavioral Addictions, 3*, 115–123. <http://doi.org/10.1556/JBA.3.2014.012>
- Leidy, M. S., Guerra, N. G., & Toro, R. I. (2012). Positive parenting, family cohesion, and child social competence

- among immigrant Latino families. *Journal of Latina/o Psychology*, 1(S), 3–13. <http://doi.org/10.1037/2168-1678.1.S.3>
- Lindahl, K. M. (2001). Methodological issues in family observational research. In P. K. Kerig & K. M. Lindahl (Eds.), *Family observational coding systems: Resources for systemic research* (pp. 23–32). Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Lowe, K., & Dotterer, A. M. (2013). Parental monitoring, parental warmth, and minority youths' academic outcomes: Exploring the integrative model of parenting. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 42, 1413–1425. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-013-9934-4>
- Luyckx, K., Tildesley, E. A., Soenens, B., Andrews, J. A., Hampson, S. E., Peterson, M., & Duriez, B. (2011). Parenting and trajectories of children's maladaptive behaviors: A 12-year prospective community study. *Journal of Clinical Child & Adolescent Psychology*, 40, 468–478. <http://doi.org/10.1080/15374416.2011.563470>
- Maccoby, E. E., & Martin, J. A. (1983). Socialization within the context of the family: Parent-child interaction. In P. H. Mussen & E. M. Hetherington (Eds.), *Handbook of child psychology: Socialization, personality and social development* (pp. 1–101). New York: Wiley.
- McDermott, P. S., Somers, C. L., Ceresnie, A. R., Hillman, S. B., & Partridge, R. T. (2014). Maternal and paternal parenting style patterns and adolescent emotional and behavioral outcomes. *Marriage & Family Review*, 50, 342–359. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01494929.2013.879557>
- Negrón-Rodríguez, L. K. (2004). Puerto Rican abusive and non-abusive mothers' beliefs about appropriate and inappropriate child discipline. *Journal of Ethnic and Cultural Diversity in Social Work*, 12, 65–90. https://doi.org/10.1300/j051v12n04_04
- Pérez y González, M. E. (2000). *Puerto Ricans in the United States*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Piotrowski, J. T., Lapiere, M. A., & Linebarger, D. L. (2013). Investigating correlates of self-regulation in early childhood with a representative sample of English-speaking American families. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 22, 423–436. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-012-9595-z>
- Ramos, B. M. (2005). Acculturation and depression among Puerto Ricans in the mainland. *Social Work Research*, 29, 95–105. <https://doi.org/10.1093/swr/29.2.95>
- Ratner, K. (2014). The role of parenting and attachment in identity style development. *University of Central Florida Undergraduate Research Journal*, 7(1), 15–26.
- Rosario-Colón, J. (2016). *Parenting styles and child outcomes in Puerto Rican families*. (Unpublished master's thesis). Utah State University, Logan.
- Rubio-Stipek, M., Bird, H., Canino, G., & Gould, M. (1990). The internal consistency and concurrent validity of a Spanish translation of the Child Behavior Checklist. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 18, 393–406. <https://doi.org/10.1007/bf00917642>
- Schroeder, R. D., Bulanda, R. E., Giordano, P. C., & Cernkovich, S. A. (2010). Parenting and adult criminality: An examination of direct and indirect effects by race. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 25, 64–98. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0743558409354215>
- Sella Nieves, Z., & Domenech Rodríguez, M. M. (2011, March 15). Entre la espada y la pared: Encontrando soluciones familiares ante el acoso escolar [Between a rock and hard place: Finding solutions in the family to school bullying]. *El Vocero*, 27.

- Shadish, W. R., Cook, T. D., & Campbell, D. T. (2002). *Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for generalized causal inference*. Wadsworth Cengage learning.
- Varela, R. E., Vernberg, E. M., Sánchez-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. <http://doi.org/10.1037/0893-3200.18.4.651>
- Varvil-Weld, L., Crowley, D. M., Turrisi, R., Greenberg, M. T., & Mallett, K. A. (2014). Hurting, helping, or neutral? The effects of parental permissiveness toward adolescent drinking on college student alcohol use and problems. *Prevention Science*, *15*, 716–724. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s11121-013-0430-6>
- White, R. M. B., Zeiders, K. H., Gonzáles, N. A., Tein, J. Y., & Roosa, M. W. (2013). Cultural values, U.S. neighborhood danger, and Mexican American parents' parenting. *Journal of Family Psychology*, *27*, 365–375. <http://doi.org/10.1037/a0032888>