RESEARCH REPORT

Raising the Future

Parenting Practices among Immigrant Mothers

Julia Gelatt *H. Elizabeth Peters* *Heather Koball* *William Monson*

June 2015

URBAN INSTITUTE · ELEVATE · THE · DEBATE

ABOUT THE URBAN INSTITUTE

The nonprofit Urban Institute is dedicated to elevating the debate on social and economic policy. For nearly five decades, Urban scholars have conducted research and offered evidence-based solutions that improve lives and strengthen communities across a rapidly urbanizing world. Their objective research helps expand opportunities for all, reduce hardship among the most vulnerable, and strengthen the effectiveness of the public sector.

Contents

Acknowledgments

This research was funded by the Annie E. Casey Foundation. We thank them for their support but acknowledge that the findings and conclusions presented in this report are of the authors alone, and do not necessarily reflect the opinions of the Foundation. We are grateful to them and to all our funders, who make it possible for Urban to advance its mission. Funders do not, however, determine our research findings or the insights and recommendations of our experts. The views expressed should not be attributed to the Urban Institute, its trustees, or its other funders.

The research team would also like to acknowledge the research support of Sandra Huerta and Eleanor Pratt, Heather Sandstrom's comments on an earlier draft of this report, and the expert editorial and publications assistance of Ashleigh Rich.

Executive Summary

Children of immigrants form a growing share of all children in the United States, and therefore a growing share of future students, workers, parents, and community members. But many children of immigrants face challenges related to their parents' social and economic integration into the United States, including lower average educational attainment, income, and English proficiency, and higher average rates of poverty and material hardship. Despite some common experiences, immigrant families are diverse in national origin and socioeconomic status, and the challenges their children face vary. To understand how children of immigrants are truly faring and the supports they need and challenges they face, it is important to look at their families, neighborhoods, schools, and broader communities. In this paper, we focus on family influences; specifically, on differences in parenting practices among immigrant mothers with different national origins.

Prior literature has generally concluded that immigrant parents display more controlling parenting styles and show lower levels of emotional support to children. But although these studies account for differences in parental education and family income in examining these associations, few account for the full range of differences in socioeconomic status, employment conditions, physical and mental health, social support, and material hardship between foreign-born and US-born parents, and between parents with different national origins. Since immigrant parents often face very different contexts than US-born parents, we expect that a full consideration of differences in contexts will help explain some of the parenting differences observed between these groups.

We employ data from a large nationally representative birth cohort of US children called the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study, Birth Cohort (ECLS-B) to look at the contexts—socioeconomic status, material hardship, employment, social support, and health—in which immigrant parents are situated. We use data from the third wave of the ECLS-B, when the children were in preschool, collected between fall 2005 and spring 2006. We look at differences between US-born and all foreign-born mothers, and then look at differences by mothers' place of birth: Mexico, other Latin American countries, China, other Asian countries, and all other countries. We then examine differences in parenting among all these groups. In doing so, we explore four measures of parenting—two observed and coded by researchers, and two based on mothers' self-reports. Finally, we explore whether differences in contexts mediate the parenting differences our analyses reveal.

We find that the socioeconomic status of families with preschool-aged children varies strongly by place of birth. Mothers from Latin America are generally more disadvantaged than US-born mothers in

terms of educational attainment, income, and material hardship, whereas mothers from Asia are generally more advantaged than US-born mothers in these respects. Immigrant families from all origins are more likely than US-native families to consist of two-parent families and to take children to religious services regularly.

Our analysis of differences in parenting practices by parents' place of birth shows, in broad strokes, that foreign-born mothers demonstrate less emotional and cognitive supportiveness as rated by researchers, and report lower rates of household routines and less use of physical punishment than US-born mothers. Differences are larger for mothers born in Mexico and other Latin American countries than for those born in China and other Asian countries.

When we add controls for family contexts—family structure and socioeconomic status, material hardship, employment experiences, mother's well-being, and social support—we find that these factors explain some, but not all, of the differences in parenting practices between Mexican- and Latin American–born mothers relative to US-born white mothers, as well as some of the differences between Mexican-born mothers and US-born Hispanic mothers. On the other hand, after adding our controls we observe greater differences between Asian-born mothers and US-born white mothers and between Chinese-born mothers and US-born Asian mothers. That is, controlling for differences for generally less advantaged Mexican- and Latin American-born mothers makes their parenting look more like that of US-born white mothers, but doing so for relatively more advantaged Chinese- and other Asian-born mothers makes their parenting look more different from that of US-born mothers.

Introduction

About one-quarter of all children in the United States have at least one immigrant parent, and this share is growing (Urban Institute 2013). On average, children of immigrants are less advantaged than their peers with US-born parents along many indicators, including household poverty, behavioral problems, enrollment in early childhood education, parents' educational attainment, and parents' English proficiency (Tienda and Haskins 2011; Urban Institute 2013). But immigrants are not a homogeneous group, and average rates mask large disparities in children of immigrants' well-being and in the educational attainment, English proficiency, and family income of parents of different national origins. For example, 51 percent of immigrants from East Asia have a college degree or higher, and their median household income is about $87,800. In comparison, only 9 percent of immigrants from Central America have a college degree or higher, and their median household income is about $40,900 (US Census Bureau 2013). These large differences in socioeconomic status—and the differences they bring in the neighborhoods, schools, work, and other contexts within which immigrant families live—all have strong implications for young children of immigrants' well-being and educational and economic trajectories. In this paper we focus on parenting practices within families and how those practices are associated with the contexts in which immigrant parents live.

Prior research has highlighted higher levels of controlling parenting and lower levels of responsiveness and emotional supportiveness among immigrant parents than US-born parents (Driscoll, Russell, and Crockett 2008; Glick, Bates, and Yabiku 2009; Glick et al. 2012; Ispa et al. 2004). However, most analyses of parenting in immigrant families do not fully account for the context in which immigrant parents operate. Immigrant parents who arrive in the United States as adults are often managing cultural and language barriers that complicate interactions with broader society, and many are coping with separation from friends and family who remained in the home country.

Controlling for demographic and socioeconomic characteristics, most immigrant parents report lower levels of social support than US-born parents (Turney and Kao 2009). Immigrant families with low educational attainment or low wages may suffer from poverty, unstable housing, residence in unsafe neighborhoods, or lack of steady access to sufficient food—experiences often summarized as "material hardship." Among undocumented immigrant parents, these factors may be additionally complicated by the fear and insecurity of residing in the United States without authorization and, in some cases, by the residual effects of traumatic border crossings (Ornelas and Perreira 2011). Though many foreign-born parents arrive in the United States with a college or graduate education, transferrable skills, and a job offer from a good employer, they are also disproportionately likely to work low-skill, low-wage jobs

compared with US-born parents. Those who lack legal status and work authorization are particularly likely to have jobs with low pay and poor working conditions. Their neighborhoods are also likely to be less safe and their housing to have more structural problems than those of legal immigrants or US natives (Hall and Greenman 2013). Because of these social and economic factors, immigrant parents, particularly undocumented immigrant parents, may have higher rates of mental health problems.

In this paper, we first review the literature on parenting differences between US-born and foreign-born mothers and among immigrant mothers from different parts of the world. We then highlight research on the relationship between various family and contextual characteristics and parenting practices. Next, we use data from the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study, Birth Cohort (ECLS-B), to investigate the economic, social, family, neighborhood, work, and health contexts in which immigrant parents operate. We examine parenting differences between foreign-born and US-born mothers and between foreign-born mothers from different countries and regions, focusing particularly on Mexican, Chinese, other Hispanic, and other Asian immigrant families. Finally, we examine the extent to which differences in contexts mediate observed differences in parenting among these groups. Specifically, we ask,

1. How do the contexts in which immigrant parents operate differ from those experienced by US-born parents? How do contexts vary among parents from different parts of the world?
2. How do parenting practices differ between immigrant parents from different parts of the world compared with US-born parents? How do US-born and foreign-born parents compare when looking at just Asian parents or just Hispanic parents?
3. To what extent do the different contexts experienced by immigrants mediate any associations we observe between parents' place of birth and parenting practices?

Background

Why Does Parenting Matter?

Prior research has linked parenting practices to several dimensions of children's well-being, including cognitive skills, social competence, and problem behaviors. Correlational studies of observational data, studies of siblings adopted by different parents—who form a natural experiment—and randomized controlled evaluations of parenting programs have all established links between parenting and child well-being. In broad strokes, these studies find that parents' displays of warmth and affection, monitoring of children's activities, and consistent but not harsh discipline are tied to improved academic performance and fewer behavioral problems (Brooks-Gunn and Markman 2005; Kotchick and Forehand 2002).

Specific effects of parenting on child well-being do not, however, seem to be universal. Notable differences by immigrant and racial or ethnic background have emerged in the research, for reasons that are not yet well established. Researchers speculate that some parenting behaviors may have less effect on child well-being when they are normative within a certain racial or ethnic group (Cabrera et al. 2006). For example, though spanking is generally associated with negative child outcomes (Gershoff 2002), some research has shown that the correlation between spanking and problem behaviors is weaker for black children, who are more likely to be spanked, than for otherwise similar white children (Brooks-Gunn and Markman 2005). Maternal intrusiveness and physical control have been linked to negative social and academic functioning for white children in the United States, but not for Hispanic children in the United States or for children in Israel. Similarly, in Chinese and Chinese American families, high control has been associated with neutral or positive outcomes for children (Cabrera et al. 2006; Ispa et al. 2004). In a Canadian sample, higher levels of parental harshness (hostile behavior or use of physical punishment) have been associated with greater teacher-reported child aggression among white children, but with lower aggression among South Asian Canadian children (Ho, Bluestein, and Jenkins 2008).

How Is Parenting Defined and Measured?

Researchers have focused on various parenting styles and practices in analyzing how parenting differs across populations and how it shapes child well-being. Studies generally measure parenting through a combination of direct questions about parents' behavior and observation of parent-child interactions during the course of an interview, or during execution of assigned tasks created for assessing parenting. Brooks-Gunn and Markman (2005) categorize a variety of parenting measures into seven domains: nurturance, discipline, teaching, language, monitoring, management, and materials.

Nurturance, which is also often discussed as "warmth," refers to parents' expressions of affection and care—physical affection, praise, and terms of endearment. Discipline is often rated in levels of harshness based on reported or observed yelling, spanking, or other physical punishment. Teaching refers to parents' strategies for assisting children with tasks or encouraging them to learn. Language is often measured in terms of the total number of words that parents use with young children, how frequently parents read to children, or how parents talk to children, including asking questions and expanding beyond the immediate conversation topic. Monitoring refers to whether parents are mindful of children's activities so as to intervene when needed. Management refers to scheduling and structuring of children's activities and ensuring that their basic needs are met. Materials refers to the presence of learning materials, such as books and developmentally appropriate toys, in the home (Brooks-Gunn and Markman 2005).

Measures of parenting are often criticized for measuring all parents against parenting styles commonly demonstrated by middle-class white American families. Some parenting behaviors that are observed disproportionately in minority racial and ethnic groups in the United States may be different from those observed in the majority group, but this does not mean that they are harmful for children. Further, some parenting behaviors that support child well-being may not be picked up by commonly used parenting measures if they are not common among the majority group (Brooks-Gunn and Markman 2005). For example, Chao (1994) notes that Chinese immigrant parents rank highly on "authoritarian" parenting measures (capturing parenting that requires unquestioning obedience of children) that are usually shown to be negative for children. But, she argues, these measures pick up only portions of a balanced Chinese parenting style that emphasizes high concern for and involvement with children in combination with strict training in proper behavior and high achievement. Studies that measure parenting by training interviewers or research staff to observe and code parent-child interactions may be susceptible to implicit cultural biases held by observers. Relying on both

researcher-coded parenting measures and parent-reported measures, as we do here, can help researchers assess the presence of cultural biases in coding (Chan et al. 2010).

Parenting ultimately matters to the extent that it affects child well-being; thus, this report represents the first step in a two-part research agenda. Here, we detail differences in parenting practices among parents with different origins. As the second step, we hope to examine how these different practices affect children's social and cognitive development.

How Does Parenting Differ by Place of Birth?

Research to date shows strong differences in the parenting of US-born parents and foreign-born parents. For example, adolescents with foreign-born parents rated their mothers as more controlling than those with US-born parents (Driscoll, Russell, and Crockett 2008). Immigrant parents also report higher levels of parenting aggravation than US-born parents, across national origin groups (Yu and Singh 2012). A study of Chinese immigrant mothers showed higher levels of parental control and authoritarian (but not authoritative) parenting than US-born white mothers, as well as greater emphasis on training children on proper behaviors and academic performance (Chao 1994). (Authoritarian parenting requires unquestioning obedience of children, whereas authoritative parenting expects mature behavior and encourages two-way communication.) On the other hand, foreign-born Hispanic parents report spanking children less than US-born Hispanic parents, and less acculturated Hispanic parents report spanking children less than white parents (Lee and Altschul 2015; MacKenzie et al. 2012). Meanwhile, black immigrants report rates of spanking that are similar to or lower than those reported by US-born white parents and US-born black parents (Berlin et al. 2009; Jackson 2012;).

A limited set of studies has explored differences in parenting practices by country of origin (Cabrera et al. 2006). Data on parents of Puerto Rican, Mexican, and Salvadoran origin in the United States showed that while all three groups displayed high levels of nurturance, Puerto Rican parents demonstrated significantly higher nurturance and consistency in parent-child interactions than those with Mexican and Salvadoran origins. However, they did not differ on responsiveness, nonrestrictive attitudes, or anger management (Figueroa-Moseley et al. 2006).

Comparisons of parents with Cuban origins, parents with Puerto Rican origins, parents born in Mexico, and Mexican American parents showed that children experienced greater cognitive stimulation in the homes of Cuban-origin and Mexican American parents than in those of Mexican-born parents, and greater emotional support in the homes of Cuban-origin parents than in those of Mexican-born

parents (Schmitz 2005). Prior analysis of the nine-month sample in the ECLS-B shows that Mexican-born mothers exhibit lower levels of supportive parenting (as rated by researchers) than other Latin American mothers (Cabrera et al. 2006).

What Explains Differences in Parenting by Place of Birth?

One important line of inquiry in research on parenting in immigrant families focuses on parenting differences by levels of acculturation. This research is concerned with testing whether the parenting styles and practices of immigrant parents become more similar to those of US-born parents after longer residence in the United States. Acculturation may be measured through English proficiency, duration of US residence, or immigrant generation. These studies sometimes analyze how differences in acculturation explain differences in parenting within the same national-origin group and sometimes analyze differences between immigrant groups.

Using the second wave of the ECLS-B, Glick and colleagues show some differences in observer-reported parenting by mothers' age at migration. They find that mothers who arrived in the United States between the ages of 13 and 21 are associated with the lowest levels of interviewer-coded parental responsiveness, relative to those who entered the United States earlier or later in life (Glick, Bates, and Yabiku 2009; Glick et al. 2012). Another study found that among Mexican American families, greater acculturation (measured with an acculturation scale of Mexican versus Anglo orientation) was associated with less hostile parenting (Parke et al. 2004). And data from the Early Head Start Research and Evaluation project show that less acculturated Mexican immigrant parents—those with fewer years in the United States and who speak English less often—use more intrusive parenting techniques than more acculturated Mexican-born parents. However, these data also show that intrusive parenting affects children's outcomes less in new immigrant families than in more acculturated immigrant families (Ispa et al. 2004). The authors hypothesize that intrusiveness is more normative and is accompanied by neutral or positive feelings in collectivist cultures (in which they include Mexican culture), though it is accompanied by negative feelings in individualist cultures (in which they include the United States).

Cabrera and colleagues' (2006) study of differences in parenting between Mexican- and Latin American–born parents found that differences were mediated by Mexican American parents' younger average age and lower acculturation (measured in terms of English proficiency) than other Latin American parents. In fact, they found that English proficiency was more highly associated with mothers' parenting practices than country of origin. Many of these studies focus specifically on Latin American immigrant origins, while our study focuses on both Latin American and Asian immigrant families.

How Do Family Characteristics and Contexts Affect Parenting?

Only a few studies have investigated factors that mediate associations between parents' place of birth or level of acculturation and parenting practices. Potential mediating factors include differences in socioeconomic status, family structure, material hardship, maternal well-being, social support, and work lives. A few of the studies mentioned above control for parents' education, household income or poverty, family structure, age, and child gender, and find significant differences in parenting net of these factors (Cabrera et al. 2006; Glick, Bates, and Yabiku 2009; Glick et al. 2012; Ispa et al. 2004; Schmitz 2005). However, because most of these studies were focused on how parenting mediates relationships between immigrant origins and child well-being, rather than on parenting as an outcome, most did not explore a richer set of mediators—such as material hardship, work experience, and social support—as we do here. We expect to find that parental employment conditions, material hardship, parental depression, and social support account for some of the differences observed between immigrant and US-born parents and between immigrant parents from different parts of the world. In this section, we review the evidence tying family characteristics and contexts to parenting styles and practices.

Socioeconomic Status

One of the best-established relationships in the literature is that parenting practices are strongly correlated with income and educational attainment. Elder and colleagues' classic research on the topic, based on data from families in Oakland, California, who experienced the Great Depression, found that financial strain was associated with parental stress and depression, harsher discipline, and children's behavioral and socioemotional problems (Elder 1998; Elder, Nguyen, and Caspi 1985). These findings were replicated among families who experienced financial loss during a farm crisis in the 1980s in the US Midwest (Elder and Conger 2000).

More recent research has continued to demonstrate that family economic circumstances affect parenting. Parenting has been shown to be a key mediator between low household income and children's poorer academic performance and increased behavioral problems. Low household income is associated with lower investments in cognitively stimulating materials and activities, less warm parenting, and more punitive parenting—affecting children's cognitive achievement and externalizing behavioral problems, net of other household and child characteristics (Guo and Harris 2000; Mistry et al. 2002; Yeung, Linver, and Brooks-Gunn 2002). One of the most consistent findings is that parents

with a higher socioeconomic status talk with young children and engage in back-and-forth conversation more than those with a lower socioeconomic status (Lareau 2011). The extent to which parents speak to children has been shown, in turn, to be correlated with the size of young children's vocabularies at school entry (Brooks-Gunn and Markman 2005).

Material Hardship

Material hardship is a key mediator between income and parenting practices. Specifically, greater material hardship—food insecurity, residential instability, inadequate access to medical care, and financial troubles—is associated with greater parental stress and decreased positive parenting behavior (Gershoff et al. 2007). The characteristics of families' neighborhoods are also correlated with parenting practices. Some research has found that after controlling for family structure, family income, and maternal education, residence in high-poverty neighborhoods is associated with a less supportive home environment and lower displays of maternal warmth, but not with lower learning stimulation in the home (Klebanov, Brooks-Gunn, and Duncan 1994). Other research similarly found neighborhood variation in parenting but was unable to determine which neighborhood characteristics were responsible for the differences (Tendulkar et al. 2010). Strict parenting, with higher parental control, greater monitoring, and higher expectations of obedience may, in some cases, be a result of trying to protect children while living in a dangerous environment (Ceballo and McLoyd 2002; Furstenberg 1993; Kotchick and Forehand 2002; Leventhal and Brooks-Gunn 2000).

Family Composition

Family structure shows some associations with parenting, though this literature is inconsistent. On the one hand, evidence from the 1990s suggests that single parents and stepparents provide less encouragement and assistance with school work than parents in two-parent families (Astone and McLanahan 1991; McLanahan and Sandefur 1997). On the other hand, a longitudinal analysis of how changes in family structure affect parenting suggests that family structure does not shape parenting; rather, other parental characteristics shape both family structure and parenting practices (Gibson-Davis 2008). Other evidence suggests that parenting quality may matter more than the number of parents in the household. Having two supportive parents was shown to be correlated with higher cognitive test scores than having one supportive parent, but having one supportive parent was better

than having no supportive parents, whatever the number of parents in the household overall (Ryan, Martin, and Brooks-Gunn 2006).

Parents' Work Lives

Parents' (particularly mothers') work lives also affect their parenting practices. Number of hours spent at work, type of occupation (and level of autonomy within that occupation), and work schedules have all been linked to parenting practices. Although Bianchi (2000) shows continuity in the amount of time that mothers spend with children over a period of mothers' rapid increase in labor force participation, other researchers have found that longer hours at work may leave less time for high-quality parental interactions and educational activities such as reading to children (Augustine 2013). Researchers have focused particularly on whether maternal employment during a child's first year affects parenting behaviors. Maternal employment of more than 30 hours a week during a child's first year is associated with less responsive parenting behavior by age three; this finding partially explains the negative association observed between maternal employment in children's first years of life and children's cognitive scores (Brooks-Gunn, Han, and Waldfogel 2002). On the other hand, employed low-income mothers have been shown to display lower depression and lower parenting stress than unemployed low-income mothers (Jackson, Bentler, and Franke 2008).

Work in more autonomous, higher-status occupations has been tied to more positive parenting practices than work in low-status jobs, which is associated with more parenting stress (Augustine 2013; Yoshikawa 2011). Working nonstandard work schedules, including work in evenings or on weekends, is likewise generally associated with greater parental stress and worse child outcomes than working standard schedules (Augustine 2013; Grzywacz et al. 2011), though not all studies find that nonstandard schedules affect parenting (Hsueh and Yoshikawa 2007).

Mental Health

Research has shown that maternal depression affects the quality of mother-child interactions (National Institute of Child Health and Human Development Early Child Care Research Network 1999). Maternal depression has been shown to be correlated with less frequent time spent on developmental activities, such as reading to or playing with children (Frech and Kimbro 2011), as well as with harsher disciplinary practices, less positive relationships with children, and less time spent on reading activities (Kiernan and Huerta 2008; Parke et al. 2004). And mothers' mental health may be affected by socioeconomic status,

financial strain, or neighborhood conditions (Kotchick and Forehand 2002; Mistry et al. 2002; Parke et al. 2004). One study of low-income, mostly African American mothers in inner-city communities demonstrated that crime victimization and life stressors were associated with poorer mental health, which was in turn associated with lower knowledge of children's activities (i.e., lower monitoring) (Borre and Kliewer 2014).

Social Support

Levels of support from friends and family have been shown to affect parenting practices. For example, instrumental social support (assistance with child care, transportation, and necessary purchases) was shown to lower maternal depression, which in turn boosted mothers' involved, supportive parenting (Jackson, Bentler, and Franke 2008). Another study found that higher perceived social support lowered parents' punitive behavior in low-income families, and that receipt of support lowered unsupportive parenting behavior across the income spectrum (Hashima and Amato 1994). Larger social support networks are correlated with mothers' higher responsiveness to infants (Burchinal, Follmer, and Bryant 1996), and religious attendance, which can be viewed as one form of social support, has also been linked to lower parenting stress and greater parental satisfaction (Hill et al. 2008).

Spousal social support is also important: better relationship quality in two-parent families is associated with higher engagement in cognitively stimulating parenting activities (Carlson et al. 2011). And support from a spouse can reduce the negative association between depression and parenting behavior (Simons et al. 1993).

Hypotheses

Based on prior literature on immigrant family well-being, parenting in immigrant families, and the role of socioeconomic status and contextual factors in shaping parenting styles and practices, we expect to find the following:

1. On average, immigrant families will experience more negative contexts than families with US-born parents, including lower income, higher material hardship, poorer neighborhoods and more residential instability, lower-quality jobs, poorer maternal mental health, and less social support.

2. However, we expect these factors to vary strongly by place of birth, with Asian immigrant families showing higher earnings and maternal education, better job quality, and lower material hardship than Hispanic immigrant families. Prior evidence does not give reason to expect systematic differences in levels of maternal physical health and social support in different immigrant groups. Because of the greater stress, marginality, and fears of deportation experienced by unauthorized immigrants in the United States, we expect to observe lower maternal mental health among immigrant groups that have high rates of undocumented status, such as those from Mexico, compared with groups with higher rates of legal status and US citizenship, such as those from various parts of Asia.
3. Based on prior literature demonstrating higher levels of controlling or authoritarian parenting among immigrant parents than US-born parents, and among more recent immigrant versus immigrants who have spent more time in the United States, we expect to find that, in raw associations, immigrant mothers of all origins show lower emotional support, lower cognitive stimulation, and lower use of household routines than US-born mothers. Based on mixed findings in the literature, we expect similar or lower rates of use of physical punishment among foreign-born mothers than among US-born mothers of similar racial and ethnic backgrounds or US-born white mothers.
4. We expect that the differences in income, family structure, material hardship, physical and mental health, and social support among immigrant and US-born families will mediate much of the observed differences in parenting between these groups.

Data and Methods

Data

For our analysis, we use the Early Child Longitudinal Study, Birth Cohort (ECLS-B), a nationally representative study that captures a cohort of children born in 2001. Families were first surveyed when children were nine months old, and were surveyed again at two years old, preschool age, and kindergarten age. We use data from the third wave of the study, when the children were in preschool, collected between fall 2005 and spring 2006. The age of children in the preschool sample ranged from 3 years and 8 months to 5 years and 5 months. The original ECLS-B sample was about 13,900,[1] with a 74 percent response rate at the nine-month interview. Of the original sample, about 8,900 (64 percent) completed the preschool-age parent interview. This represents 91 percent of families who completed an interview when children were two years old (Snow et al. 2007).

In addition to containing a rich set of measures of parenting practices and family circumstances and characteristics, the ECLS-B oversampled certain ethnic groups—Native American, Chinese, and Asian/Pacific Islander.[2] As a result, we are able to look at parenting separately among Chinese families, rather than grouping them into a single "Asian" category. To measure parenting, we use variables from the ECLS-B parent/guardian interview and from videotaped observations of parent-child interactions during a structured activity called the two-bag task, explained on the following page. We only selected cases where the mother or mother figure, rather than the father or other adult, participated in the parent interview and two-bag task. The parent interviews were conducted in English and Spanish; interpreters were used to interview families who spoke other languages. Parent-child interactions during the two-bag task were only coded for parents who interacted with their children in English or Spanish. The two-bag task was completed in another language in the case of nearly 200 children. Of these, almost 100 cases would have been excluded anyway for technical problems. The remaining cases (roughly 100) were not coded only because a language other than English or Spanish was used (Snow et al. 2009). We describe below how this restriction affects our samples by place of birth.

We draw our analytic sample by first randomly dropping one twin observation per household to achieve a parent-level analytic sample. We further limit the sample by eliminating any children whose mothers[3] were not the respondent for the parent/guardian survey, and by dropping children missing race or ethnicity and place-of-birth information, leaving an analytic sample of approximately 8,000. This

number includes about 7,000 mothers born in the United States, 500 born in Mexico, 200 born elsewhere in Latin America, 350 born in China, 550 born in other parts of Asia, and 300 born in another foreign country.

In addition to the parent/guardian survey, we use variables from the two-bag task, during which parents were given two bags, one containing the children's book *Corduroy*, and the second containing Play-Doh and cookie cutters. Parents interacted with children, using items from each bag in succession for a total of 10 minutes while the interaction was captured on DVD. Interactions were then coded based on a coding scheme developed for the Early Head Start Research and Evaluation project (Love et al. 2002). Not all families surveyed participated in the two-bag task; among those who did participate, about 400 recordings were deemed unusable for technical problems and, as already mentioned, about 100 were not coded because the language of interaction was one other than English or Spanish. Thus, our analytic sample for two-bag task measures is about 6,850. Although the great majority of Asian immigrant mothers completed the parent interview in English, some chose to interact with their children in their native language during the two-bag task. Between technical problems and language issues, about half of our Chinese-born sample did not have scores on the two-bag task, compared with about one-third of other Asian-born mothers, 10 percent of Mexican-born mothers, 15 percent of Latin American–born mothers, and one-quarter of mothers born in other parts of the world. As a result, the data from the two-bag task measures represent an English-proficient subsample of non-Hispanic foreign-born mothers (i.e., mothers born in China, other Asian countries, and other parts of the world). These mothers also show lower ages at migration—and, for Chinese and other Asian-born mothers, higher educational attainment—than the overall sample of non-Hispanic foreign-born mothers.

Measures

Dependent Variables

We analyze four parenting measures, including a mix of observer-coded measures and parent self-reported measures. The first two—emotional supportiveness and cognitive stimulation—come from the two-bag task. Trained members of the ECLS-B research team observed videos from the two-bag task and noted the types of interactions that occurred between parent and child. The researchers then summarized parents' levels of cognitive stimulation effort and emotional supportiveness using a seven-point Likert-type rating scale originally developed for the Early Head Start Research and Evaluation

project (Fauth, Brady-Smith, and Brooks-Gunn 2003). In particular, the emotional supportiveness variable focuses on parents' emotional availability and affective presence during the task, and the cognitive development measure reflects parents' efforts to enhance their children's perceptual, cognitive, and language development (Snow et al. 2007).

Our two other parenting measures, which are self-reported in the parent survey, capture use of physical punishment and whether the parent has established household routines. The physical punishment scale combines answers from one question about how often the parent spanked the child in the past week and from one that asked how parents would respond if a child "got so angry that [he or she] threw a tantrum, yelled, or hit [the parent]." We follow the approach of Raver, Gershoff, and Aber (2007) in constructing a scale ranging from zero to six, with a higher score indicating greater use of physical punishment or other harsh forms of discipline (for simplicity, we refer to this as "physical punishment" throughout the report).[4]

Our household-routines scale combines answers about the number of days per week the family eats dinner together, the number of days the meal is served at a regular time, and whether the family has rules about children's diet, bedtime, chores, and TV watching. We create binary measures of a regular family dinner (if the family usually eats together at least five days a week) and of a regular dinnertime (if the meal is usually served at a regular time five days a week). We then sum these two binary measures with the four binary measures abut household rules to create our six-point routines scale. Chronbach's alpha for the six-item scale is 0.52.

Race or Ethnicity and Place of Birth

Box 1 provides an overview of the race, ethnicity, and place-of-birth categories we used for this analysis. We classify the race of US-born mothers and the place of birth of foreign-born mothers based on the race and Hispanic origin (if any) reported on their child's birth certificate in 2001. Birth certificates record the race of mothers and fathers.[5] We classify non-Hispanic US-born mothers as white, black, Native American, or Asian. We classify all US-born mothers with a Hispanic origin as Hispanic, regardless of their race.

For foreign-born mothers, we use information from the birth certificate race and Hispanic-origin measures to create five place-of-birth categories: Mexico, other Latin America, China, other Asia, and all other places (including Canada, Europe, Africa, and Australia). The most common identifiable origins

of mothers born in other Asian countries are India, the Philippines, Vietnam, and Korea. Most mothers born in other parts of Latin America are from Central or South America rather than the Caribbean.

BOX 1

Race, Ethnicity, and Place-of-Birth Categories

We use the following race and ethnicity categories for US-born mothers:

- White
- Black
- Native American
- Asian (including Pacific Islander)
- Hispanic (any race)

We use the following place-of-birth categories for foreign-born mothers:

- Mexico
- Other Latin America (including the Caribbean)
- China
- Other Asia (including Pacific Islands)
- All other (including Africa, Australia, Canada, Europe, and all other places not listed)

Note: The ethnic backgrounds of the US-born Hispanic and especially US-born Asian groups do not necessarily align with countries of origin represented by their foreign-born counterparts. See the discussion of limitations on page 32 for more detail.

Demographic Context

The literature suggests that parenting styles differ by such socioeconomic characteristics as education, income, and family structure. Prior research also shows that parenting is affected by the age of the parent and differs by age of the child. We control for the mother's highest attained level of education, recoded as less than high school, high school, some college, or a bachelor's degree or higher. We also include a binary measure of family structure that captures whether the child lives in a single-parent, parent-and-stepparent, or other family arrangement, versus a two-parent family. Additional control

variables include whether the child is female, the child's age (in years), whether the family lives in an urban or rural area, number of siblings, mother's age, and household income.

To capture household income, the ECLS-B asked parents to report the total income of all people in the household over the past year within 13 income categories, and instructed them to consider salaries, other earnings, interest, and retirement income. We created a continuous household income measure by assigning individuals the dollar amount at the midpoint of their household income category.[6]

For foreign-born mothers, we also capture age at migration to the United States (this variable is coded as an interaction between being a foreign-born mother and the age at which foreign-born mothers came to live in the United States).[7] To account for features of the ECLS-B sampling design, we control for whether the child had a very low or low birth weight and for whether the child is part of a twin pair.

Employment

Our employment variables capture the working environment of the parents and any effect this might have on their parenting practices. We include a measure for whether the mother is employed and, if so, whether she is employed part-time or full-time. If a mother's partner lives in the household, we also capture whether that partner is employed. We also capture whether a mother's work schedule falls outside traditional work hours, defined as 6 a.m. to 6 p.m.

Health and Social Support

We expect that maternal health and social support affect parenting practices, and explain some of the expected differences in parenting by mothers' place of birth. We measure in binary form whether the mother reported her health as fair or poor versus good, very good, or excellent, and include a binary measure for whether the mother reported being depressed. Parental depression was measured in the preschool wave through the Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale (CES-D). We code this variable as instructed in the CES-D documentation to categorize mothers as nondepressed, mildly depressed, moderately depressed, or severely depressed. In our analysis, we create a binary variable indicating that mothers are moderately or severely depressed versus mildly depressed or nondepressed.

We also include two measures of social support: whether the mother takes the child to religious services at least a few times a month and, for those with partners, the quality of the relationship. This relationship-quality scale averages responses to 10 questions drawn from the Dyadic Adjustment Scale (Spanier 2015) and 6 questions drawn from the Conflict Tactics Scale (Straus et al. 1996). The Dyadic Adjustment Scale asks about the frequency, on a four-point scale, of arguing over chores, kids, money, love, sex, religion, leisure time, drinking, in-laws, or other women or men. We reverse-coded the measures so that a higher score indicates less conflict. The Conflict Tactics Scale captures behavior during arguments on a four-point scale: specifically, how often the respondent and her partner keep opinions to themselves, discuss disagreements calmly, argue heatedly or shout, hit or throw things, reach a compromise, and criticize each other. Higher scores indicate greater use of calm discussion or compromise versus shouting, hitting or throwing, criticizing, or suppressing opinions. We took the mean of the Dyadic Adjustment Scale measures and the Conflict Tactics Scale measures to create the relationship-quality scale. A higher number on the scale of 1 to 4 indicates higher agreement and less use of negative tactics during conflict. Chronbach's alpha for this scale is 0.84.

Material Hardship

In addition to income, we include other measures that capture, with more nuance, the degree to which a family is struggling from a lack of basic goods, since such economic stress has been tied to different parenting practices. We include two binary measures of material hardship in our models: family food insecurity and whether the mother considers her neighborhood fairly or very unsafe versus fairly or very safe. The food insecurity measure uses the Adult Food Security Scale, coded by the ECLS-B research team. The scale is based on parent responses to 18 food security questions, coded in accordance with US Department of Agriculture Food and Nutrition Service standard methods. We use the adult food insecurity scale, rather than child food insecurity scale, based on recommendations by the ECLS-B research team that among households with young children, the adult food insecurity measure is a more accurate measure of household food insecurity than measures that capture child-only or child and adult food insecurity (Snow et al. 2009).

Analysis

Not counting the two-bag task measures, about 9 percent of mothers were missing information on at least one variable. The highest rates of missing data came from the measures of depression and

relationship quality, which were captured through an audio computer-assisted self-interview. Not all respondents answered these questions because this interview was not administered during the approximately 100 interviews that were conducted via interpreter (for languages other than English or Spanish) or during telephone interviews (Snow et al. 2007). We imputed missing data on all independent variables using Stata 13's mi impute chained command, then dropped cases that were missing our dependent variables. In the models looking at emotional supportiveness and cognitive stimulation, we drop the roughly 1,150 cases in our analytic sample that did not participate in the two-bag task, leaving a sample of about 6,850. In models looking at the self-reported parenting measures, we drop the slightly fewer than 50 cases missing data on one or more of these outcomes, leaving a sample that rounds to about 8,000.

We use this larger sample to first present descriptive statistics, weighted up to a nationally representative sample using the weights included for the preschool-wave parent interview. We use ordinary least-squares regression to explore the relationship between parent origins and parenting for the observational outcomes derived from the two-bag task, and ordered logistic regression to explore the relationship between parent origins and parenting for the self-reported parenting measures. In each model, we first control for place of birth for foreign-born mothers and race or ethnicity for US-born mothers. Then we add our control variables and mediators for material hardship, employment, mothers' physical and mental health, and social support. Finally, we add age of migration for foreign-born mothers. We begin our analysis using our full sample, and then conduct subgroup analyses after restricting the sample to only Hispanic mothers (including US-born Hispanic mothers, regardless of their country of heritage, Mexican-born mothers, and mothers born in other parts of Latin America) and only Asian mothers (US-born Asian mothers, regardless of their country of heritage, Chinese-born mothers, and mothers born in other parts of Asia). Note that the ethnic backgrounds of the US-born Asian sample do not directly align with the countries of origin of the foreign-born Asian sample in the ECLS-B. See the discussion of limitations on page 32 for more detail.

Results

Family Characteristics and Contexts by Place of Birth

The socioeconomic status of families in the United States with preschool-aged children varies strongly by place of birth. Mothers from Mexico and other parts of Latin America are generally less advantaged than US-born mothers in terms of educational attainment, income, and material hardship, and mothers from Asia are generally more advantaged in these respects. Mexican-born mothers have the lowest educational attainment of all foreign-born groups we examine: 56 percent do not have a high school degree. They are followed by mothers from other Latin American countries, 32 percent of whom have no high school degree. Conversely, 72 percent of mothers born in China and 48 percent of mothers from other Asian countries have a bachelor's degree or higher—much higher than the 28 percent of US-born mothers with a bachelor's degree. By comparison, only 7 percent of Mexican-born mothers have achieved this level of education. Median household income is higher in households with Asian-born mothers than in those with US-born mothers, but is lower in households with Latin American–born mothers. Table 1 provides an overview of family characteristics and contexts by mothers' place of birth.

Immigrant families also differ from US-native families in family structure, but in this case in the direction of a more advantaged family structure. Immigrant families are significantly more likely to include two biological or adoptive parents in the same household: 83 percent of foreign-born mothers in the sample are part of a two-parent household, compared with 68 percent of US-born mothers.

Looking at mothers' well-being and social support, we see that foreign-born mothers report higher rates of fair or poor health: 13 percent compared with native born mothers' 9 percent. This difference is again driven primarily by Mexican- and other Latin American–born mothers: 18 percent rate their health as fair or poor, whereas Asian-born mothers report better health than US-born mothers overall. This finding about Mexican- and other Latin American–born mothers runs contrary to our expectations and contrary to findings in past research of an "immigrant health advantage." One caution in interpreting these different rates is that prior research has shown translation issues in self-reported health measures in Spanish. The Spanish translation used for fair health is *regular*, which may have a more positive connotation than the English *fair* (Bzostek, Goldman, and Pebley 2007).

TABLE 1

Weighted Estimates of Family Characteristics and Contexts, by Mother's Place of Birth

			Place of Birth (Foreign-Born Mothers Only)				
	US-born mother	Foreign-born mother	Mexico	Other Latin America	China	Other Asia	All other
Controls							
Highest education of mother							
Less than high school	0.11	0.36*	0.56*	0.32*	0.06*	0.12	0.10
High school diploma or GED	0.27	0.27	0.26	0.31	0.11*	0.19*	0.29
Some college	0.34	0.19*	0.11*	0.28	0.11*	0.22*	0.29
Bachelor's degree or higher	0.28	0.19*	0.07*	0.10*	0.72*	0.48*	0.32
Child is female	0.49	0.48	0.45	0.52	0.47	0.48	0.51
Single-parent or other family (ref = two parents)	0.32	0.17*	0.15*	0.25	0.02*	0.10*	0.19*
Child has a twin	0.02	0.01*	0.01	#	#	0.02	#
Child's age	4.35	4.44*	4.45*	4.45*	4.47*	4.43*	4.39
	(0.3)	(0.4)	(0.4)	(0.4)	(0.4)	(0.4)	(0.4)
Child's number of siblings (mean)	1.4	1.4	1.7*	1.2	0.9*	1.2*	1.4
(*sd*)	*(1.1)*	*(1.2)*	*(1.2)*	*(1.1)*	*(0.7)*	*(1.0)*	*(1.2)*
Mother's age (mean) (*sd*)	32.0	32.5	31.3	32.3	37.2*	34.2*	33.9*
	(6.9)	*(6.0)*	*(5.8)*	*(6.1)*	*(4.5)*	*(5.5)*	*(5.8)*
Income (median; $10,000s)	6.6	4.6*	2.7*	4.2*	12.1*	7.8*	6.7
Home language not English	0.04	0.80*	0.94*	0.87*	0.87*	0.63*	0.50*
Child's birth weight							
Normal birth weight	0.93	0.94	0.94	0.95	0.96*	0.92	0.92
Moderately low birth weight	0.06	0.05	0.05	0.04^	0.03^*	0.07^	0.06^
Very low birth weight	0.01	0.01	0.01				
Mother's age at migration (mean; foreign-born mothers only) (*sd*)	N/A	19.0 *(8.2)*	18.5 *(7.2)*	18.6 *(8.0)*	24.2 *(7.6)*	19.5 *(9.0)*	19.6 *(9.8)*
Lives in urban area	0.65	0.88*	0.85*	0.96*	0.94*	0.90*	0.87*
Material hardship							
Family food insecurity	0.09	0.11	0.16*	0.07	0.02*	0.06	0.07
Neighborhood fairly or very unsafe	0.06	0.09*	0.12*	0.11	0.02*	0.03	0.05
Employment							
Partner employed (mothers with a partner only)	0.93	0.95	0.95	0.96	0.94	0.93	0.95
Mother's employment status							
Not employed	0.38	0.50*	0.60*	0.39	0.33	0.44	0.43
Works part-time	0.21	0.14*	0.10*	0.17	0.15*	0.16*	0.20
Works full-time	0.40	0.36*	0.30*	0.44	0.53*	0.40	0.37
Nonstandard work schedule (employed mothers only)	0.26	0.24	0.26	0.23	0.11*	0.23	0.24
Mother's well-being							
Mother's health is fair or poor	0.09	0.13*	0.18*	0.18*	0.04*	0.06*	0.03*
Mother is depressed	0.19	0.18	0.18	0.17	0.20	0.20	0.16
Social support							
Overall relationship quality (mean; mothers with a partner only) (*sd*)	3.2 *(0.4)*	3.1* *(0.5)*	3.1 *(0.5)*	3.1 *(0.5)*	3.0* *(0.4)*	3.1* *(0.4)*	3.2 *(0.5)*
Takes child to religious services ≥ a few times a month	0.58	0.65*	0.69*	0.63	0.29*	0.67*	0.62

Source: Preschool wave of the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study, Birth Cohort.

* Statistically significant difference between native-born and foreign-born mothers; $p < 0.05$.

Value is masked in accordance with National Center for Education Statistics confidentiality measures.

^ Category was collapsed with adjacent category to mask small values, in accordance with confidentiality measures.

Rates of depression are similar between US-born and foreign-born mothers, and vary less among immigrants from different origins than rates of fair and poor health. Immigrant mothers are more likely to take their child to religious services than native-born mothers: 65 percent compared with 58 percent. All groups of immigrant mothers reported similar proportions of religious service attendance, except Chinese-born mothers. Only 29 percent of Chinese-born mothers reported taking their child to religious services at least once a month.

Foreign born mothers are less likely to be employed full-or part-time than US-born mothers: 50 percent compared with 61 percent. This value varies by immigrant group: 40 percent of Mexican-born mothers work, compared with 67 percent of Chinese-born mothers. Among mothers who work, a larger share of foreign-born mothers than US-born mothers work full-time. Contrary to our expectations, foreign-born mothers and US-born mothers who are employed hold jobs with nonstandard hours at similar rates. There is little variation in rates of nonstandard work hours by place of birth, with 23 to 26 percent of all employed mothers having nonstandard work hours. Chinese-born mothers are the exception; only 11 percent have nonstandard work hours.

Some aspects of material hardship vary by mothers' place of birth, while others do not. Slightly more foreign-born mothers than US-born mothers rate their neighborhoods as fairly or very unsafe. This finding is again driven by Mexican- and other Latin American–born mothers; Chinese-born mothers are less likely to report unsafe neighborhoods than US-born mothers. US-born mothers and foreign-born mothers, overall, are similar in rates of food insecurity and in rates of having moved homes since the two-year-old ECLS-B survey, but rates are again highest on both measures for Mexican-born mothers and lowest on both measures for Chinese-born mothers.

Parenting Practices by Place of Birth

How Do Parenting Practices Vary by Race or Ethnicity and Place of Birth?

Before adding controls, we look at differences in parenting practices (1) between foreign-born mothers from different regions and US-born, white, non-Hispanic mothers, and (2) by race among US-born mothers (see table 2, columns 1, 4, 7, and 10). On the observational parenting measures—emotional supportiveness and cognitive stimulation—researchers rated all foreign-born mothers and all nonwhite US-born mothers lower than US-born white mothers. The differences are largest for Mexican-born

mothers, and are also large for both Latin American–born and black US-born mothers (see table 2, columns 1 and 4). When we compare foreign-born mothers' parenting on these observational measures to that of US-born mothers of the same race or ethnicity, we find that (1) Chinese- and other Asian-born mothers look similar to US-born Asian mothers, before adding any controls, (2) Mexican-born mothers are rated significantly lower in emotional supportiveness than US-born Hispanic mothers, and (3) both Mexican-born and Latin American–born mothers are rated significantly lower in cognitive stimulation than US-born Hispanic mothers (see tables 3 and 4, columns 1 and 4).

A similar picture emerges when looking at mothers' self-reports about household routines—how often the family eats together and how often meals occur at a regular time, as well as whether the household has rules about what children eat, children's bedtime, children's chores, and what television programs children watch. Column 10 of table 2 reports odds ratios resulting from ordered logistic regression models, without controls. Taking the odds ratio minus one shows the percentage increase in the odds of moving up one category in the household-routines scale. For example, an odds ratio of 0.394 for Mexican-born mothers indicates that Mexican-born mothers have 60.6 percent lower odds of having a routines score of 3 versus 2 (or of 4 versus 3, or 2 versus 1), compared with US-born white mothers. All foreign born mothers and all nonwhite US-born mothers report lower use of household routines than US-born white mothers, again with the largest differences for Mexican-born mothers, Latin American–born mothers, and US-born black mothers relative to US-born white mothers. Mexican-born mothers report having fewer household rules and routines than US-born Hispanic mothers, and foreign-born and US-born Asian mothers report similar rates.

The story changes slightly when looking at use of physical punishment. Column 7 of table 2 shows the odds ratios for ordered logistic regression models predicting use of physical punishment. All foreign-born mothers report significantly less use of physical punishment than US-born white mothers, and this is particularly true for Mexican- and Latin American–born mothers. Among US-born mothers, Native American and especially black mothers report greater use of physical punishment than white mothers. White, Hispanic, and Asian mothers born in the United States all report similar rates of use of physical punishment. Among Asian families, Chinese-born mothers report lower rates of physical punishment than US-born Asian mothers, but the difference between US-born Asian mothers and other Asian–born mothers is not significant. Mexican- and other Latin American–born mothers report less use of physical punishment than US-born Hispanic mothers.

TABLE 2

Regressions Predicting Four Parenting Measures, Full Sample

	Emotional Supportiveness						Cognitive Stimulation					
	(1)		(2)		(3)		(4)		(5)		(6)	
	β	SE	β	SE	β	SE	β	SE	β	SE	β	SE
Mother's place of birth for foreign-born mothers (ref = US)												
Mexico	-0.810***	(0.043)	-0.538***	(0.046)	-0.396***	(0.065)	-0.918***	(0.046)	-0.599***	(0.048)	-0.273***	(0.068)
Other Latin America	-0.414***	(0.068)	-0.286***	(0.066)	-0.142^	(0.081)	-0.621***	(0.071)	-0.453***	(0.069)	-0.123	(0.084)
China	-0.192**	(0.067)	-0.434***	(0.067)	-0.252**	(0.089)	-0.206**	(0.070)	-0.490***	(0.070)	-0.075	(0.093)
Other Asia	-0.157***	(0.048)	-0.254***	(0.047)	-0.111^	(0.065)	-0.209***	(0.050)	-0.325***	(0.049)	0.003	(0.068)
All other	-0.213***	(0.062)	-0.251***	(0.060)	-0.107	(0.076)	-0.228***	(0.065)	-0.252***	(0.063)	0.078	(0.079)
Mother's race for US-born mothers (ref = white)												
Black	-0.482***	(0.031)	-0.298***	(0.034)	-0.295***	(0.034)	-0.395***	(0.033)	-0.181***	(0.035)	-0.174***	(0.035)
Native American	-0.280***	(0.047)	-0.071	(0.046)	-0.069	(0.046)	-0.282***	(0.049)	-0.070	(0.048)	-0.065	(0.048)
Hispanic	-0.262***	(0.040)	-0.106**	(0.040)	-0.104**	(0.040)	-0.187***	(0.042)	-0.015	(0.042)	-0.011	(0.041)
Asian	-0.247***	(0.068)	-0.294***	(0.066)	-0.293***	(0.066)	-0.138^	(0.071)	-0.197**	(0.069)	-0.195**	(0.069)
Controls	No		Yes		Yes		No		Yes		Yes	
Material hardship	No		Yes		Yes		No		Yes		Yes	
Employment	No		Yes		Yes		No		Yes		Yes	
Mother's well-being	No		Yes		Yes		No		Yes		Yes	
Social support	No		Yes		Yes		No		Yes		Yes	
Age at migration	No		No		Yes		No		No		Yes	
Constant	4.606***	(0.015)	4.302***	(0.152)	4.289***	(0.152)	4.378***	(0.016)	3.753***	(0.159)	3.724***	(0.159)
N	6,850		6,850		6,850		6,850		6,850		6,850	

TABLE 2 (CONTINUED)

	Physical Punishment						Routines					
	(7)		(8)		(9)		(10)		(11)		(12)	
	OR	SE	OR	SE	OR	SE	OR	SE	OR	SE	OR	SE
Mother's place of birth for foreign-born mothers (ref = US)												
Mexico	0.522***	(0.05)	0.462***	(0.04)	0.545***	(0.07)	0.394***	(0.03)	0.537***	(0.05)	0.562***	(0.07)
Other Latin America	0.525***	(0.07)	0.526***	(0.07)	0.627**	(0.10)	0.448***	(0.06)	0.556***	(0.07)	0.582***	(0.09)
China	0.643***	(0.06)	0.950	(0.10)	1.198	(0.19)	0.612***	(0.06)	0.573***	(0.06)	0.610**	(0.10)
Other Asia	0.825*	(0.07)	1.015	(0.09)	1.222	(0.15)	0.620***	(0.05)	0.557***	(0.05)	0.585***	(0.07)
All other	0.706**	(0.08)	0.798*	(0.09)	0.963	(0.14)	0.770*	(0.09)	0.738**	(0.08)	0.774^	(0.11)
Mother's race for US-born mothers (ref = white)												
Black	2.735***	(0.16)	2.244***	(0.15)	2.252***	(0.15)	0.449***	(0.03)	0.567***	(0.04)	0.567***	(0.04)
Native American	1.220*	(0.11)	0.922	(0.09)	0.925	(0.09)	0.656***	(0.06)	0.876	(0.08)	0.876	(0.08)
Hispanic	0.949	(0.07)	0.830*	(0.07)	0.831*	(0.07)	0.594***	(0.05)	0.741***	(0.06)	0.741***	(0.06)
Asian	0.942	(0.12)	1.128	(0.15)	1.129	(0.15)	0.728*	(0.09)	0.688**	(0.09)	0.688**	(0.09)
Controls	No		Yes		Yes		No		Yes		Yes	
Material hardship	No		Yes		Yes		No		Yes		Yes	
Employment	No		Yes		Yes		No		Yes		Yes	
Mother's well-being	No		Yes		Yes		No		Yes		Yes	
Social support	No		Yes		Yes		No		Yes		Yes	
Age at migration	No		No		Yes		No		No		Yes	
N	8,000		8,000		8,000		8,000		8,000		8,000	

Source: Preschool wave of the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study, Birth Cohort.

Notes: Standard errors in parentheses. Sample sizes rounded to nearest 50 in compliance with National Center for Education Statistics privacy standards.

^ p < 0.10 * p < 0.05 ** p < 0.01 *** p < 0.001

TABLE 3

Regressions Predicting Four Parenting Measures, Hispanic Sample

	Emotional Supportiveness						Cognitive Stimulation					
	(1)		(2)		(3)		(4)		(5)		(6)	
	β	SE	β	SE	β	SE	β	SE	β	SE	β	SE
Mother's place of birth (ref = US)												
Mexico	-0.547***	(0.06)	-0.450***	(0.06)	-0.365***	(0.10)	-0.731***	(0.06)	-0.560***	(0.06)	-0.295**	(0.10)
Other Latin America	-0.151^	(0.08)	-0.177*	(0.08)	-0.088	(0.11)	-0.433***	(0.08)	-0.437***	(0.08)	-0.165	(0.11)
Controls	No		Yes		Yes		No		Yes		Yes	
Material hardship	No		Yes		Yes		No		Yes		Yes	
Employment	No		Yes		Yes		No		Yes		Yes	
Mother's well-being	No		Yes		Yes		No		Yes		Yes	
Social support	No		Yes		Yes		No		Yes		Yes	
Age at migration	No		No		Yes		No		No		Yes	
Constant	4.343***	(0.04)	4.423***	(0.39)	4.399***	(0.39)	4.191***	(0.04)	4.131***	(0.39)	4.056***	(0.39)
N	1,200		1,200		1,200		1,200		1,200		1,200	
	Physical Punishment						**Routines**					
	(7)		(8)		(9)		(10)		(11)		(12)	
	OR	SE	OR	SE	OR	SE	OR	SE	OR	SE	OR	SE
Mother's place of birth (ref = US)												
Mexico	0.556***	(0.06)	0.625***	(0.08)	0.905	(0.18)	0.684***	(0.07)	0.787^	(0.10)	0.851	(0.17)
Other Latin America	0.560***	(0.08)	0.614**	(0.10)	0.912	(0.20)	0.771^	(0.11)	0.768^	(0.12)	0.834	(0.18)
Controls	No		Yes		Yes		No		Yes		Yes	
Material hardship	No		Yes		Yes		No		Yes		Yes	
Employment	No		Yes		Yes		No		Yes		Yes	
Mother's well-being	No		Yes		Yes		No		Yes		Yes	
Social support	No		Yes		Yes		No		Yes		Yes	
Age at migration	No		No		Yes		No		No		Yes	
N	1,350		1,350		1,350		1,350		1,350		1,350	

Source: Preschool wave of the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study, Birth Cohort.

Notes: Standard errors in parentheses. Sample sizes rounded to nearest 50 in compliance with National Center for Education Statistics privacy standards.

^ p < 0.10 * p < 0.05 ** p < 0.01 *** p < 0.001

TABLE 4

Regressions Predicting Four Parenting Measures, Asian Sample

	Emotional Supportiveness						Cognitive Stimulation					
	(1)		(2)		(3)		(4)		(5)		(6)	
	β	SE	β	SE	β	SE	β	SE	β	SE	β	SE
Mother's place of birth (ref = US)												
China	0.055	(0.09)	-0.072	(0.10)	0.067	(0.13)	-0.068	(0.10)	-0.317**	(0.11)	-0.005	(0.14)
Other Asia	0.090	(0.08)	0.065	(0.08)	0.178^	(0.10)	-0.071	(0.08)	-0.087	(0.08)	0.167	(0.11)
Controls	No		Yes		Yes		No		Yes		Yes	
Material hardship	No		Yes		Yes		No		Yes		Yes	
Employment	No		Yes		Yes		No		Yes		Yes	
Mother's well-being	No		Yes		Yes		No		Yes		Yes	
Social support	No		Yes		Yes		No		Yes		Yes	
Age at migration	No		No		Yes		No		No		Yes	
Constant	4.359***	(0.06)	4.550***	(0.52)	4.481***	(0.52)	4.240***	(0.07)	3.748***	(0.56)	3.593***	(0.56)
N	750		750		750		750		750		750	
	Physical Punishment						**Routines**					
	(7)		(8)		(9)		(10)		(11)		(12)	
	OR	SE	OR	SE	OR	SE	OR	SE	OR	SE	OR	SE
Mother's place of birth (ref = US)												
China	0.637**	(0.10)	0.655*	(0.12)	0.823	(0.20)	0.834	(0.13)	0.692*	(0.12)	0.754	(0.18)
Other Asia	0.856	(0.13)	0.837	(0.13)	1.009	(0.21)	0.848	(0.12)	0.816	(0.13)	0.874	(0.18)
Controls	No		Yes		Yes		No		Yes		Yes	
Material hardship	No		Yes		Yes		No		Yes		Yes	
Employment	No		Yes		Yes		No		Yes		Yes	
Mother's well-being	No		Yes		Yes		No		Yes		Yes	
Social support	No		Yes		Yes		No		Yes		Yes	
Age at migration	No		No		Yes		No		No		Yes	
N	1,100		1,100		1,100		1,100		1,100		1,100	

Source: Preschool wave of the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study, Birth Cohort.

Notes: Standard errors in parentheses. Sample sizes rounded to nearest 50 in compliance with National Center for Education Statistics privacy standards.

^ p < 0.10 * p < 0.05 ** p < 0.01 *** p < 0.001

In broad strokes, before controlling for differences in socioeconomic status or other characteristics, foreign-born mothers show less emotional and cognitive supportiveness, as rated by researchers, and report lower household routines and less use of physical punishment than US-born mothers. Differences are larger for mothers born in Mexico and other Latin American countries than for those born in China or other Asian countries, whether using white US-born mothers or coethnic US-born mothers as the reference group.

How Do Family Characteristics and Experiences Mediate Parenting Differences by Race or Ethnicity and Place of Birth?

After looking at these raw associations, we control for features related to the ECLS-B sampling design, family structure and characteristics, socioeconomic status, material hardship, employment, mothers' well-being, and social support. Appendix tables A.1, A.2, and A.3 show associations between all controls and mediators and our four parenting outcomes for the full, Hispanic-only, and Asian-only samples.

For the two observational measures of parenting and for household routines, adding in these controls and mediators reduces the differences between Mexican- and Latin American–born mothers and US-born mothers, but increases the differences between Chinese-born and other Asian-born mothers (see table 2, columns 2, 5, and 11). Still, associations between place of birth and these three parenting measures remain significant for mothers from all countries and regions.

After adding our controls and mediators to models of the fourth measure, use of physical punishment, Mexican- and Latin American–born mothers as well as mothers born in other foreign countries show significantly lower use of physical punishment than US-born white mothers. Chinese- and other Asian-born mothers, on the other hand, show use of physical punishment at rates similar to those of US-born white parents (see table 2, column 8).

Within the Hispanic-only subsample, adding our controls and mediators slightly reduces the differences between Mexican-born mothers and US-born Hispanic mothers across all four parenting measures. The controls and mediators change the coefficients the least for Latin American–born mothers (see table 3, columns 2, 5, 8, and 11). The difference between foreign-born and US-born Hispanic mothers' use of routines is no longer significant after the controls are added.

Within the Asian-only subsample, adding controls and mediators reveals lower cognitive stimulation and lower use of household routines among Chinese-born mothers than US-born Asian mothers. These relationships were not observed before the controls were added. Other measures did

not change significantly after controls and mediators were added: Chinese-born mothers show lower use of physical punishment than US-born mothers, and other Asian-born mothers appear similar to US-born Asian mothers across the four parenting measures (see table 4, columns 2, 5, 8, and 11).

Overall, we see that family structure and characteristics, socioeconomic status, material hardship, employment, mothers' well-being, and social support explain some, but certainly not all, of the differences in parenting practices between Mexican- and Latin American–born mothers and US-born white mothers. These factors also explain some of the parenting differences between Mexican-born mothers and US-born Hispanic mothers. On the other hand, controlling for these factors reveals greater differences between Asian-born mothers and US-born white mothers and between Chinese-born mothers and US-born Asian mothers. That is, adding our controls makes the parenting of generally less advantaged Mexican- and Latin American–born mothers look more like that of US-born white mothers. Conversely, adding controls makes the parenting of relatively more advantaged Chinese- and other Asian-born mothers look more different from that of US-born mothers.

How Is Age at Migration to the United States Associated with Parenting?

In line with prior research, we find that mothers who migrated to the United States at a younger age have parenting practices more similar to those of US-born mothers than those who migrated more recently. Older age at migration is associated with lower emotional supportiveness, lower cognitive stimulation, and less use of physical punishment, though its association with lower use of household routines is not significant (see appendix table A.1). Controlling for age at migration, immigrant mothers from Latin America (excluding Mexico), other parts of Asia, and other parts of the world appear similar to US-born white mothers in emotional supportiveness, and all foreign-born mothers other than those from Mexico look similar to US-born white mothers in cognitive stimulation efforts (see table 2, columns 3 and 6). Controlling for age at migration has less of an effect on differences in use of physical punishment or household routines (see table 2, columns 9 and 12).

Controlling for age at migration also mediates differences between Chinese-born mothers and US-born Asian mothers in levels of cognitive stimulation, physical punishment, and household routines. And adding this control explains Latin American–born and US-born Hispanic mothers' differences in emotional supportiveness and cognitive stimulation. Adding this control also mediates differences between Mexican- and Latin American–born mothers and US-born Hispanic mothers in use of physical punishment (see tables 3 and 4, columns 3, 6, 9, and 12).

Family Characteristics and Experiences and Parenting

Family Structure and Socioeconomic Status

Family socioeconomic status—household income and mothers' educational attainment—is strongly and fairly stably associated with parenting practices. Higher maternal education and higher income are associated with greater emotional supportiveness and cognitive stimulation. Greater educational attainment is also associated with more household routines and higher income with less use of physical punishment, although the relationship between mothers' educational attainment and physical punishment is not consistent across all education levels (see appendix table A.1). Mothers' age is also stably correlated with more emotional supportiveness and cognitive stimulation efforts and with less use of physical punishment.

On the other hand, the relationship between family structure and parenting is significant only for use of household routines, where higher use of routines is observed among families with a single parent, stepparent, or other arrangement than in those in two-parent families. Families with older children show lower emotional supportiveness, lower use of physical punishment, and more household routines than those with younger children.

Material Hardship

Though we expected to find that the greater experiences of material hardship observed among some foreign-born groups would explain some differences in parenting between foreign-born and US-born mothers, adding material hardship measures to our models generally does not affect the relationships between place of birth and parenting practices. Neighborhood safety showed no significant associations with our parenting measures, and greater food insecurity was associated with only one of the four measures: significantly higher use of physical punishment (see appendix table A.1).

Mothers' Well-Being and Social Support

Unlike material hardship, self-reported maternal health, mental health, and social support are all correlated with parenting practices. Poor self-reported physical health is associated with lower emotional supportiveness, lower cognitive stimulation, and greater use of physical punishment.

Maternal depression is associated with our two self-reported parenting measures—higher use of physical punishment and lower use of household routines—but not with the two observational measures. This finding might suggest that mothers with greater levels of depression report their own parenting in a more negative light than nondepressed mothers.

We analyzed two measures of social support: family religious attendance and relationship quality for those who live with a partner. Religious attendance is significantly associated with greater emotional support, greater cognitive stimulation efforts, and use of regular household routines. Higher relationship quality, measured for those with a partner living in the household, is not associated with the two observational parenting measures, but is associated with having household routines and rules and with less use of physical punishment. The latter association may be partly driven by the fact that both the Conflict Tactics Scale included in the relationship-quality scale and the question about physical punishment capture similar information about the respondents' approach to resolving interpersonal conflicts with family members.

Employment

Maternal employment and work schedules are associated with our four parenting measures in slightly different ways. Most notably, holding full-time employment and working a nonstandard schedule are both associated with fewer household routines, likely reflecting time conflicts between working full days or nontraditional hours and establishing a regular time for parents and children to eat dinner together. Long or nonstandard work hours may also disrupt mothers' ability to maintain household rules for children.

Discussion

As children of immigrants become a larger share of all children in the United States, it is important to understand the family, school, and community forces shaping their lives. On the family level, parenting behavior is a strong predictor of children's cognitive and socioemotional development. This study examines four measures of parenting styles and behaviors, as observed by researchers and as reported by mothers, to explore how parenting varies among immigrant groups and compared with US-born mothers. Given that immigrants in the United States often differ widely from US-born parents in their characteristics and experiences, we also examine the extent to which family characteristics and experiences of material hardship, employment, maternal health and depression, and social support account for such differences between foreign-born and US-born mothers and between immigrant mothers from different parts of the world. In addition, we investigate whether differences in the parenting of US-born and foreign-born mothers emerge within the same racial or ethnic group.

Immigrants from Mexico, Latin America, China, other Asian countries, and other parts of the world show widely varying characteristics and experiences. Mothers born in China and other Asian countries have much higher educational attainment than those born in Mexico and other Latin American countries. Households with parents born in Mexico and other Latin American countries have higher rates of food insecurity and residence in unsafe neighborhoods. And mothers born in Mexico and other Latin American countries have relatively low rates of employment compared with those born in Asian countries and in the United States. All immigrant families have high rates of two-parent families relative to families with US-born parents.

We find strong differences in parenting by place of birth, including lower supportive parenting among foreign-born mothers than US-born white mothers, among Mexican- and Latin American–born mothers than US-born Hispanic mothers, and to a lesser extent, among Chinese-born mothers than US-born Asian mothers. These differences are exhibited across both observer-coded and self-reported measures. But we also observe lower use of physical punishment among foreign-born mothers than US-born mothers. Consistent with prior findings, we show that socioeconomic status, signified by income and educational attainment, is significantly associated with parenting practices. Socioeconomic status therefore mediates associations between place of birth and parenting, decreasing differences between Mexican- and Latin American–born mothers and US-born white mothers, but widening gaps between Asian-born and US-born white mothers. Similarly, controlling for socioeconomic status mediates differences between Mexican-born mothers and US-born Hispanic mothers, but reveals stronger

differences between Latin American–born and US-born Hispanic mothers and between Chinese-born and US-born Asian mothers.

Some of our hypothesized mediators explained a small share of the parenting differences between immigrants and those born in the United States. Self-reported health, mental health, and social support are all correlated with parenting practices in the ways we hypothesized. And full-time and nonstandard work hours show negative associations with household routines. But contrary to our expectations, material hardship showed few associations with our parenting measures.

Limitations

There are a few limitations to this analysis. First, while the ECLS-B provides rich detail on immigrant families' origins, allowing separate analyses of parenting among other Asian immigrant categories such as Filipina and Indian, the sample sizes are quite small, leading to unstable estimates. As a result, we decided not to explore other Asian immigrant subgroups separately, despite the need for greater understanding of how parenting in Asian immigrant families varies by country of origin. A related limitation is the origins of the rather small US-born Asian sample: their origins differ from those of the foreign-born Asian sample, with Filipina, Hawaiian, Japanese and "other Asian" immigrants overrepresented in the US-born group relative to the foreign-born group. Therefore, our comparisons of US-born and foreign-born Asian mothers compare families with different cultural backgrounds (much more than comparisons within the Hispanic sample).

Second, both observer-coded and parent-reported parenting measures have some limitations. Observer-coded measures have been criticized for picking up coders' biases as well as real differences in parenting. Parent-reported measures are also imperfect because different cultural reference points and peer networks may lead parents from different backgrounds to report the same parenting practices in different ways. In part to mitigate this risk for self-reported measures, we focused on measures of clearly defined behaviors (such as spanking children or having dinner at a regular time), rather than on more subjective experiences of feelings toward children. Though the observer coded and self-reported measures showed some different associations with our mediators and controls, they showed fairly consistent associations with mothers' age and socioeconomic status, lending some evidence that the observer-coded and self-reported measures we use are picking up related domains.

Future Directions

Our study is cross-sectional in nature; rather than analyzing causal pathways, we focus on associations between parenting behavior and family characteristics and experiences. In future work, we plan to analyze how changes in family circumstances—such as education, employment characteristics, material hardship, and social support—are correlated with changes in parenting. That work could begin to shed light on how family experiences shape parenting practices.

We also plan to add new evidence to the research on associations between parenting practices and child development in immigrant households. Prior work has shown that some parenting practices that negatively affect child well-being in some racial and ethnic groups have no associations in other groups (Cabrera et al. 2006; Ho, Bluestein, and Jenkins 2008; Ispa et al. 2004). We have not seen studies that make these comparisons carefully, using the same high-quality data source, across immigrant families from different parts of the world. Linking parenting practices to specific aspects of child well-being is vital for determining areas for policy intervention into parenting practices among the diverse immigrant families in the United States.

Appendix. Full Versions of Regression Models Predicting Parenting Measures

TABLE A.1

Regressions Predicting Four Parenting Measures, Full Sample, All Controls

	Emotional Supportiveness						Cognitive Stimulation					
	(1)		(2)		(3)		(4)		(5)		(6)	
	β	SE	β	SE	β	SE	β	SE	β	SE	β	SE
Mother's place of birth for foreign-born mothers (ref = US)												
Mexico	-0.810***	(0.043)	-0.538***	(0.046)	-0.396***	(0.065)	-0.918***	(0.046)	-0.599***	(0.048)	-0.273***	(0.068)
Other Latin America	-0.414***	(0.068)	-0.286***	(0.066)	-0.142^	(0.081)	-0.621***	(0.071)	-0.453***	(0.069)	-0.123	(0.084)
China	-0.192**	(0.067)	-0.434***	(0.067)	-0.252**	(0.089)	-0.206**	(0.070)	-0.490***	(0.070)	-0.075	(0.093)
Other Asia	-0.157***	(0.048)	-0.254***	(0.047)	-0.111^	(0.065)	-0.209***	(0.050)	-0.325***	(0.049)	0.003	(0.068)
All other	-0.213***	(0.062)	-0.251***	(0.060)	-0.107	(0.076)	-0.228***	(0.065)	-0.252***	(0.063)	0.078	(0.079)
Mother's race for US-born mothers (ref = white)												
Black	-0.482***	(0.031)	-0.298***	(0.034)	-0.295***	(0.034)	-0.395***	(0.033)	-0.181***	(0.035)	-0.174***	(0.035)
Native American	-0.280***	(0.047)	-0.071	(0.046)	-0.069	(0.046)	-0.282***	(0.049)	-0.070	(0.048)	-0.065	(0.048)
Hispanic	-0.262***	(0.040)	-0.106**	(0.040)	-0.104**	(0.040)	-0.187***	(0.042)	-0.015	(0.042)	-0.011	(0.041)
Asian	-0.247***	(0.068)	-0.294***	(0.066)	-0.293***	(0.066)	-0.138^	(0.071)	-0.197**	(0.069)	-0.195**	(0.069)
Controls												
Demographic and socioeconomic context												
Child's birth weight (ref = normal weight)												
Low			-0.039	(0.032)	-0.040	(0.032)			0.003	(0.033)	0.001	(0.033)
Very low			0.006	(0.035)	0.004	(0.035)			-0.016	(0.036)	-0.020	(0.036)
Child is part of twin pair			0.034	(0.038)	0.033	(0.038)			-0.031	(0.040)	-0.033	(0.040)

	Emotional Supportiveness						Cognitive Stimulation					
	(1)		(2)		(3)		(4)		(5)		(6)	
	β	SE	β	SE	β	SE	β	SE	β	SE	β	SE
Highest education of mother (ref = less than high school)												
High school			0.238***	(0.036)	0.235***	(0.036)			0.229***	(0.038)	0.221***	(0.037)
Some college			0.397***	(0.037)	0.391***	(0.037)			0.424***	(0.038)	0.409***	(0.038)
Bachelor's degree or higher			0.516***	(0.042)	0.514***	(0.042)			0.583***	(0.044)	0.577***	(0.044)
Child's number of siblings			-0.009	(0.010)	-0.010	(0.010)			-0.008	(0.010)	-0.011	(0.010)
Mother's age			0.013***	(0.002)	0.014***	(0.002)			0.007***	(0.002)	0.009***	(0.002)
Child is female			0.033	(0.020)	0.034^	(0.020)			0.017	(0.021)	0.018	(0.021)
Child's age (years)			-0.154***	(0.030)	-0.153***	(0.030)			-0.053^	(0.031)	-0.050	(0.031)
Single parent, stepparent, or other (ref = two parents)			-0.052	(0.037)	-0.057	(0.037)			-0.051	(0.039)	-0.062	(0.039)
Income ($10,000s)			0.006***	(0.002)	0.006**	(0.002)			0.011***	(0.002)	0.010***	(0.002)
Lives in urban area			0.105***	(0.023)	0.106***	(0.023)			0.045^	(0.024)	0.047^	(0.024)
Material hardship												
Family food insecurity			0.066^	(0.037)	0.071^	(0.037)			-0.047	(0.039)	-0.036	(0.039)
Neighborhood fairly or very unsafe (ref = fairly or very safe)			-0.049	(0.044)	-0.050	(0.044)			-0.053	(0.046)	-0.056	(0.046)
Employment												
Partner employed (x has partner in household)			-0.011	(0.041)	-0.008	(0.041)			-0.013	(0.043)	-0.008	(0.043)
Mother's employment status (ref = not employed)												
Employed part-time			0.056^	(0.032)	0.052	(0.032)			0.059^	(0.033)	0.050	(0.033)
Employed full-time			-0.038	(0.024)	-0.042^	(0.024)			0.009	(0.026)	-0.000	(0.025)
Nonstandard work schedule (x employed)			0.006	(0.031)	0.009	(0.031)			-0.044	(0.032)	-0.037	(0.032)
Mother's well-being												
Mother's health is fair or poor			-0.094**	(0.035)	-0.095**	(0.035)			-0.112**	(0.037)	-0.113**	(0.037)

	Emotional Supportiveness						Cognitive Stimulation					
	(1)		(2)		(3)		(4)		(5)		(6)	
	β	SE	β	SE	β	SE	β	SE	β	SE	β	SE
Mother is depressed			-0.012	(0.028)	-0.012	(0.028)			0.013	(0.029)	0.013	(0.029)
Social support												
Takes child to religious services ≥ a few times a month			0.058**	(0.021)	0.060**	(0.021)			0.086***	(0.022)	0.090***	(0.022)
Low conflict with partner (scale) (x has partner in household)			0.021	(0.019)	0.019	(0.019)			0.031	(0.020)	0.027	(0.020)
Immigration history												
Mother's age at migration (x foreign-born)					-0.008**	(0.003)					-0.019***	(0.003)
Constant	4.606***	(0.015)	4.302***	(0.152)	4.289***	(0.152)	4.378***	(0.016)	3.753***	(0.159)	3.724***	(0.159)
N	6,850		6,850		6,850		6,850		6,850		6,850	

	Physical Punishment						Routines					
	(7)		(8)		(9)		(10)		(11)		(12)	
	OR	SE	OR	SE	OR	SE	OR	SE	OR	SE	OR	SE
Mother's place of birth for foreign-born mothers (ref = US)												
Mexico	0.522***	(0.05)	0.462***	(0.04)	0.545***	(0.07)	0.394***	(0.03)	0.537***	(0.05)	0.562***	(0.07)
Other Latin America	0.525***	(0.07)	0.526***	(0.07)	0.627**	(0.10)	0.448***	(0.06)	0.556***	(0.07)	0.582***	(0.09)
China	0.643***	(0.06)	0.950	(0.10)	1.198	(0.19)	0.612***	(0.06)	0.573***	(0.06)	0.610**	(0.10)
Other Asia	0.825*	(0.07)	1.015	(0.09)	1.222	(0.15)	0.620***	(0.05)	0.557***	(0.05)	0.585***	(0.07)
All other	0.706**	(0.08)	0.798*	(0.09)	0.963	(0.14)	0.770*	(0.09)	0.738**	(0.08)	0.774^	(0.11)
Mother's race for US-born mothers (ref = white)												
Black	2.735***	(0.16)	2.244***	(0.15)	2.252***	(0.15)	0.449***	(0.03)	0.567***	(0.04)	0.567***	(0.04)
Native American	1.220*	(0.11)	0.922	(0.09)	0.925	(0.09)	0.656***	(0.06)	0.876	(0.08)	0.876	(0.08)
Hispanic	0.949	(0.07)	0.830*	(0.07)	0.831*	(0.07)	0.594***	(0.05)	0.741***	(0.06)	0.741***	(0.06)
Asian	0.942	(0.12)	1.128	(0.15)	1.129	(0.15)	0.728*	(0.09)	0.688**	(0.09)	0.688**	(0.09)

	Physical Punishment						Routines					
	(7)		(8)		(9)		(10)		(11)		(12)	
	OR	SE	OR	SE	OR	SE	OR	SE	OR	SE	OR	SE
Controls												
Demographic and socioeconomic context												
Child's birth weight (ref = normal weight)												
Low			0.993	(0.06)	0.992	(0.06)			1.006	(0.06)	1.006	(0.06)
Very low			1.085	(0.08)	1.082	(0.08)			0.997	(0.07)	0.996	(0.07)
Child is part of twin pair			1.080	(0.08)	1.077	(0.08)			1.426***	(0.11)	1.425***	(0.11)
Highest education of mother (ref = less than high school)												
High school			1.154*	(0.08)	1.145^	(0.08)			1.461***	(0.10)	1.459***	(0.10)
Some college			1.032	(0.07)	1.020	(0.07)			2.039***	(0.15)	2.033***	(0.15)
Bachelor's degree or higher			0.795**	(0.07)	0.788**	(0.07)			2.657***	(0.22)	2.652***	(0.22)
Child's number of siblings			0.996	(0.02)	0.994	(0.02)			1.097***	(0.02)	1.097***	(0.02)
Mother's age			0.977***	(0.00)	0.979***	(0.00)			1.002	(0.00)	1.003	(0.00)
Child is female			0.837***	(0.03)	0.837***	(0.03)			1.036	(0.04)	1.036	(0.04)
Child's age (years)			0.777***	(0.05)	0.778***	(0.05)			1.171**	(0.07)	1.172**	(0.07)
Single parent, stepparent, or other (ref = two parents)			0.890	(0.07)	0.884	(0.07)			1.338***	(0.10)	1.335***	(0.10)
Income ($10,000s)			0.989**	(0.00)	0.988**	(0.00)			1.004	(0.00)	1.004	(0.00)
Lives in urban area			0.659***	(0.03)	0.660***	(0.03)			1.183***	(0.06)	1.183***	(0.06)
Material hardship												
Family food insecurity			1.174*	(0.09)	1.182*	(0.09)			0.947	(0.07)	0.949	(0.07)
Neighborhood fairly or very unsafe (ref = fairly or very safe)			1.044	(0.09)	1.042	(0.09)			0.875	(0.08)	0.875	(0.08)
Employment												
Partner employed (x has partner in household)			1.332***	(0.11)	1.335***	(0.11)			0.895	(0.07)	0.895	(0.07)

	Physical Punishment						Routines					
	(7)		(8)		(9)		(10)		(11)		(12)	
	OR	SE	OR	SE	OR	SE	OR	SE	OR	SE	OR	SE
Mother's employment status (ref = not employed)												
Employed part-time			0.894^	(0.06)	0.889^	(0.06)			1.005	(0.06)	1.003	(0.06)
Employed full-time			1.067	(0.05)	1.059	(0.05)			0.796***	(0.04)	0.794***	(0.04)
Nonstandard work schedule (x employed)			0.949	(0.06)	0.953	(0.06)			0.792***	(0.05)	0.793***	(0.05)
Mother's well-being												
Mother's health is fair or poor			1.187*	(0.08)	1.184*	(0.08)			0.883^	(0.06)	0.882^	(0.06)
Mother is depressed			1.300***	(0.07)	1.300***	(0.07)			0.842**	(0.05)	0.842**	(0.05)
Social support												
Takes child to religious services ≥ a few times a month			1.032	(0.04)	1.034	(0.04)			1.395***	(0.06)	1.396***	(0.06)
Low conflict with partner (scale) (x has partner in household)			0.793***	(0.03)	0.792***	(0.03)			1.330***	(0.05)	1.330***	(0.05)
Immigration history												
Mother's age at migration (x foreign-born)					0.990*	(0.01)					0.997	(0.01)
Constant												
N	8,000		8,000		8,000		8,000		8,000		8,000	

Source: Preschool wave of the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study, Birth Cohort.

Notes: Standard errors in parentheses. Sample sizes rounded to nearest 50 in compliance with National Center for Education Statistics privacy standards.

^ p < 0.10 * p < 0.05 ** p < 0.01 *** p < 0.001

TABLE A.2

Regressions Predicting Four Parenting Measures, Hispanic Sample, All Controls

	Emotional Supportiveness						Cognitive Stimulation					
	(1)		(2)		(3)		(4)		(5)		(6)	
	β	SE	β	SE	β	SE	β	SE	β	SE	β	SE
Mother's place of birth for foreign-born mothers (ref = US)												
Mexico	-0.547***	(0.06)	-0.450***	(0.06)	-0.365***	(0.10)	-0.731***	(0.06)	-0.560***	(0.06)	-0.295**	(0.10)
Other Latin America	-0.151^	(0.08)	-0.177*	(0.08)	-0.088	(0.11)	-0.433***	(0.08)	-0.437***	(0.08)	-0.165	(0.11)
Controls												
Demographic and socioeconomic context												
Child's birth weight (ref = normal weight)												
Low			-0.205*	(0.08)	-0.210*	(0.08)			-0.022	(0.08)	-0.037	(0.08)
Very low			0.007	(0.09)	0.003	(0.09)			0.092	(0.09)	0.081	(0.09)
Child is part of twin pair			-0.018	(0.11)	-0.013	(0.11)			-0.199^	(0.11)	-0.184^	(0.11)
Highest education of mother (ref = less than high school)												
High school			0.198**	(0.07)	0.198**	(0.07)			0.237***	(0.07)	0.235***	(0.07)
Some college			0.400***	(0.08)	0.392***	(0.08)			0.466***	(0.08)	0.439***	(0.08)
Bachelor's degree or higher			0.463***	(0.11)	0.460***	(0.11)			0.493***	(0.11)	0.483***	(0.11)
Child's number of siblings			0.007	(0.02)	0.005	(0.02)			0.035	(0.02)	0.029	(0.02)
Mother's age			0.008^	(0.00)	0.009*	(0.00)			0.004	(0.00)	0.009*	(0.00)
Child is female			-0.020	(0.05)	-0.019	(0.05)			0.021	(0.05)	0.024	(0.05)
Child's age (years)			-0.115	(0.07)	-0.117	(0.07)			-0.079	(0.07)	-0.086	(0.07)
Single parent, stepparent, or other (ref = two parents)			-0.195^	(0.11)	-0.200^	(0.11)			-0.182^	(0.11)	-0.198^	(0.11)
Income ($10,000s)			0.010	(0.01)	0.009	(0.01)			0.018**	(0.01)	0.015*	(0.01)
Lives in urban area			0.039	(0.07)	0.040	(0.07)			0.027	(0.07)	0.031	(0.07)
Material hardship												
Family food insecurity			0.049	(0.08)	0.057	(0.08)			-0.075	(0.08)	-0.051	(0.08)

	Emotional Supportiveness						Cognitive Stimulation					
	(1)		(2)		(3)		(4)		(5)		(6)	
	β	SE	β	SE	β	SE	β	SE	β	SE	β	SE
Neighborhood fairly or very unsafe (ref = fairly or very safe)			-0.026	(0.09)	-0.028	(0.09)			-0.012	(0.09)	-0.017	(0.09)
Employment												
Partner employed (x has partner in household)			-0.057	(0.10)	-0.052	(0.10)			0.048	(0.11)	0.062	(0.11)
Mother's employment status (ref = not employed)												
Employed part-time			-0.048	(0.09)	-0.049	(0.09)			0.094	(0.09)	0.093	(0.09)
Employed full-time			-0.010	(0.06)	-0.014	(0.06)			0.110^	(0.06)	0.096	(0.06)
Nonstandard work schedule (x employed)			0.041	(0.08)	0.043	(0.08)			-0.119	(0.08)	-0.111	(0.08)
Mother's well-being												
Mother's health is fair or poor			-0.173*	(0.07)	-0.173*	(0.07)			-0.208**	(0.07)	-0.206**	(0.07)
Mother is depressed			-0.002	(0.07)	-0.004	(0.07)			-0.052	(0.07)	-0.060	(0.07)
Social support												
Takes child to religious services ≥ a few times a month			0.189***	(0.05)	0.191***	(0.05)			0.123*	(0.05)	0.127*	(0.05)
Low conflict with partner (scale) (x has partner in household)			-0.036	(0.05)	-0.036	(0.05)			-0.081	(0.05)	-0.083^	(0.05)
Immigration history												
Mothers' age at migration (x foreign-born)					-0.005	(0.00)					-0.017***	(0.00)
Constant	4.343***	(0.04)	4.423***	(0.39)	4.399***	(0.39)	4.191***	(0.04)	4.131***	(0.39)	4.056***	(0.39)
N	1,200		1,200		1,200		1,200		1,200		1,200	

TABLE A.2 (CONTINUED)

	Physical Punishment						Routines					
	(7)		(8)		(9)		(10)		(11)		(12)	
	OR	SE	OR	SE	OR	SE	OR	SE	OR	SE	OR	SE
Mother's place of birth for foreign-born mothers (ref = US)												
Mexico	0.556***	(0.06)	0.625***	(0.08)	0.905	(0.18)	0.684***	(0.07)	0.787^	(0.10)	0.851	(0.17)
Other Latin America	0.560***	(0.08)	0.614**	(0.10)	0.912	(0.20)	0.771^	(0.11)	0.768^	(0.12)	0.834	(0.18)
Controls												
Demographic and socioeconomic context												
Child's birth weight (ref = normal weight)												
Low			0.933	(0.15)	0.914	(0.15)			1.050	(0.17)	1.047	(0.17)
Very low			1.256	(0.22)	1.226	(0.21)			1.195	(0.21)	1.190	(0.20)
Child is part of twin pair			1.003	(0.22)	1.011	(0.22)			1.022	(0.21)	1.024	(0.21)
Highest education of mother (ref = less than high school)												
High school			1.167	(0.16)	1.163	(0.16)			1.694***	(0.22)	1.692***	(0.22)
Some college			1.276	(0.19)	1.227	(0.19)			2.540***	(0.37)	2.521***	(0.37)
Bachelor's degree or higher			1.276	(0.28)	1.247	(0.27)			2.601***	(0.55)	2.594***	(0.55)
Child's number of siblings			0.981	(0.05)	0.975	(0.05)			1.096*	(0.05)	1.094^	(0.05)
Mother's age			0.972**	(0.01)	0.979*	(0.01)			1.007	(0.01)	1.009	(0.01)
Child is female			0.870	(0.09)	0.876	(0.09)			1.126	(0.11)	1.128	(0.11)
Child's age (years)			0.610***	(0.09)	0.609***	(0.09)			1.395*	(0.20)	1.393*	(0.20)
Single parent, stepparent, or other (ref = two parents)			0.724	(0.15)	0.715	(0.15)			1.514*	(0.31)	1.506*	(0.31)
Income ($10,000s)			0.990	(0.01)	0.985	(0.01)			1.004	(0.01)	1.003	(0.01)
Lives in urban area			0.878	(0.11)	0.883	(0.12)			1.044	(0.13)	1.045	(0.13)
Material hardship												
Family food insecurity			1.131	(0.18)	1.176	(0.19)			0.926	(0.14)	0.932	(0.15)

	Physical Punishment						Routines					
	(7)		(8)		(9)		(10)		(11)		(12)	
	OR	SE	OR	SE	OR	SE	OR	SE	OR	SE	OR	SE
Neighborhood fairly or very unsafe (ref = fairly or very safe)			1.286	(0.22)	1.274	(0.22)			1.114	(0.19)	1.112	(0.19)
Employment												
Partner employed (x has partner in household)			1.001	(0.21)	1.028	(0.22)			1.010	(0.20)	1.017	(0.20)
Mother's employment status (ref = not employed)												
Employed part-time			0.876	(0.15)	0.876	(0.15)			1.141	(0.19)	1.140	(0.19)
Employed full-time			0.947	(0.12)	0.929	(0.12)			0.774*	(0.09)	0.771*	(0.09)
Nonstandard work schedule (x employed)			0.930	(0.15)	0.930	(0.15)			0.845	(0.13)	0.847	(0.13)
Mother's well-being												
Mother's health is fair or poor			1.072	(0.15)	1.078	(0.15)			0.635**	(0.09)	0.635**	(0.09)
Mother is depressed			0.909	(0.13)	0.892	(0.13)			0.765^	(0.11)	0.763^	(0.11)
Social support												
Takes child to religious services ≥ a few times a month			0.986	(0.11)	0.987	(0.11)			1.363**	(0.14)	1.367**	(0.14)
Low conflict with partner (scale) (x has partner in household)			0.695***	(0.07)	0.690***	(0.07)			1.396***	(0.14)	1.394***	(0.14)
Immigration history												
Mother's age at migration (x foreign-born)					0.976*	(0.01)					0.995	(0.01)
Constant												
N	1,350		1,350		1,350		1,350		1,350		1,350	

Source: Preschool wave of the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study, Birth Cohort.

Notes: Standard errors in parentheses. Sample sizes rounded to nearest 50 in compliance with National Center for Education Statistics privacy standards.

^ p < 0.10 * p < 0.05 ** p < 0.01 *** p < 0.001

TABLE A.3

Regressions Predicting Four Parenting Measures, Asian Sample, All Controls

	Emotional Supportiveness						Cognitive Stimulation					
	(1)		(2)		(3)		(4)		(5)		(6)	
	β	SE	β	SE	β	SE	β	SE	β	SE	β	SE
Mother's place of birth for foreign-born mothers (ref = US)												
China	0.055	(0.09)	-0.072	(0.10)	0.067	(0.13)	-0.068	(0.10)	-0.317**	(0.11)	-0.005	(0.14)
Other Asia	0.090	(0.08)	0.065	(0.08)	0.178^	(0.10)	-0.071	(0.08)	-0.087	(0.08)	0.167	(0.11)
Controls												
Demographic and socioeconomic context												
Child's birth weight (ref = normal weight)												
Low			0.271*	(0.12)	0.267*	(0.12)			0.142	(0.13)	0.132	(0.13)
Very low			0.354^	(0.20)	0.345^	(0.20)			0.161	(0.22)	0.141	(0.22)
Child is part of twin pair			-0.311	(0.23)	-0.341	(0.23)			-0.051	(0.25)	-0.119	(0.25)
Highest education of mother (ref = less than high school)												
High school			0.385*	(0.17)	0.367*	(0.17)			0.111	(0.18)	0.069	(0.18)
Some college			0.567***	(0.17)	0.552***	(0.17)			0.417*	(0.18)	0.384*	(0.18)
Bachelor's degree or higher			0.596***	(0.17)	0.587***	(0.17)			0.549**	(0.18)	0.528**	(0.18)
Child's number of siblings			-0.075*	(0.03)	-0.083*	(0.03)			-0.068*	(0.03)	-0.086*	(0.03)
Mother's age			0.015**	(0.01)	0.018**	(0.01)			0.006	(0.01)	0.013*	(0.01)
Child is female			0.132*	(0.06)	0.138*	(0.06)			0.050	(0.07)	0.064	(0.06)
Child's age (years)			-0.262**	(0.09)	-0.253**	(0.09)			-0.081	(0.09)	-0.061	(0.09)
Single parent, stepparent, or other (ref = two parents)			0.146	(0.16)	0.117	(0.16)			0.115	(0.17)	0.052	(0.17)
Income ($10,000s)			0.004	(0.00)	0.003	(0.00)			0.016***	(0.00)	0.014**	(0.00)
Lives in urban area			-0.059	(0.10)	-0.058	(0.10)			0.003	(0.10)	0.004	(0.10)
Material hardship												
Family food insecurity			0.181	(0.16)	0.179	(0.16)			0.195	(0.17)	0.191	(0.17)

	Emotional Supportiveness						Cognitive Stimulation					
	(1)		(2)		(3)		(4)		(5)		(6)	
	β	SE	β	SE	β	SE	β	SE	β	SE	β	SE
Neighborhood fairly or very unsafe (ref = fairly or very safe)			-0.212	(0.18)	-0.208	(0.18)			-0.061	(0.20)	-0.052	(0.20)
Employment												
Partner employed (x has partner in household)			0.068	(0.14)	0.066	(0.14)			-0.069	(0.15)	-0.075	(0.14)
Mother's employment status (ref = not employed)												
Employed part-time			-0.004	(0.09)	-0.015	(0.09)			-0.002	(0.10)	-0.025	(0.10)
Employed full-time			-0.133^	(0.07)	-0.146*	(0.07)			-0.006	(0.08)	-0.035	(0.08)
Nonstandard work schedule (x employed)			-0.027	(0.10)	-0.026	(0.10)			0.001	(0.10)	0.002	(0.10)
Mother's well-being												
Mother's health is fair or poor			0.074	(0.13)	0.064	(0.13)			0.025	(0.14)	0.003	(0.14)
Mother is depressed			-0.036	(0.09)	-0.029	(0.09)			0.042	(0.10)	0.058	(0.10)
Social support												
Takes child to religious services ≥ a few times a month			0.011	(0.06)	0.018	(0.06)			-0.083	(0.07)	-0.067	(0.07)
Low conflict with partner (scale) (x has partner in household)			-0.011	(0.07)	-0.019	(0.07)			0.078	(0.07)	0.061	(0.07)
Immigration history												
Mother's age at migration (x foreign-born)					-0.007^	(0.00)					-0.016***	(0.00)
Constant	4.359***	(0.06)	4.550***	(0.52)	4.481***	(0.52)	4.240***	(0.07)	3.748***	(0.56)	3.593***	(0.56)
N	750		750		750		750		750		750	

TABLE A.3 (CONTINUED)

	Physical Punishment						Routines					
	(7)		(8)		(9)		(10)		(11)		(12)	
	OR	SE	OR	SE	OR	SE	OR	SE	OR	SE	OR	SE
Mother's place of birth for foreign-born mothers (ref = US)												
China	0.637**	(0.10)	0.655*	(0.12)	0.823	(0.20)	0.834	(0.13)	0.692*	(0.12)	0.754	(0.18)
Other Asia	0.856	(0.13)	0.837	(0.13)	1.009	(0.21)	0.848	(0.12)	0.816	(0.13)	0.874	(0.18)
Controls												
Demographic and socioeconomic context												
Child's birth weight (ref = normal weight)												
Low			1.154	(0.27)	1.161	(0.27)			0.712	(0.17)	0.712	(0.17)
Very low			0.716	(0.31)	0.711	(0.30)			1.171	(0.45)	1.171	(0.45)
Child is part of twin pair			0.937	(0.40)	0.902	(0.38)			0.840	(0.35)	0.828	(0.34)
Highest education of mother (ref = less than high school)												
High school			1.082	(0.25)	1.051	(0.25)			1.061	(0.26)	1.050	(0.25)
Some college			0.858	(0.19)	0.831	(0.19)			1.806*	(0.43)	1.783*	(0.42)
Bachelor's degree or higher			0.870	(0.19)	0.851	(0.18)			2.129***	(0.48)	2.111***	(0.48)
Child's number of siblings			0.978	(0.06)	0.964	(0.06)			0.987	(0.06)	0.982	(0.06)
Mother's age			0.988	(0.01)	0.994	(0.01)			1.016	(0.01)	1.018	(0.01)
Child is female			0.699**	(0.08)	0.699**	(0.08)			1.073	(0.12)	1.074	(0.12)
Child's age (years)			1.137	(0.17)	1.147	(0.17)			1.119	(0.17)	1.123	(0.17)
Single parent, stepparent, or other (ref = two parents)			0.685	(0.21)	0.651	(0.20)			1.369	(0.39)	1.344	(0.39)
Income ($10,000s)			0.991	(0.01)	0.990	(0.01)			1.005	(0.01)	1.004	(0.01)
Lives in urban area			0.837	(0.16)	0.846	(0.16)			1.353^	(0.25)	1.354^	(0.25)
Material hardship												
Family food insecurity			0.918	(0.24)	0.926	(0.24)			0.931	(0.24)	0.932	(0.24)

	Physical Punishment						Routines					
	(7)		(8)		(9)		(10)		(11)		(12)	
	OR	SE	OR	SE	OR	SE	OR	SE	OR	SE	OR	SE
Neighborhood fairly or very unsafe (ref = fairly or very safe)			0.733	(0.24)	0.735	(0.24)			0.925	(0.30)	0.925	(0.30)
Employment												
Partner employed (x has partner in household)			0.904	(0.22)	0.894	(0.22)			0.796	(0.19)	0.790	(0.19)
Mother's employment status (ref = not employed)												
Employed part-time			0.976	(0.17)	0.954	(0.16)			1.051	(0.18)	1.046	(0.18)
Employed full-time			1.207	(0.16)	1.172	(0.15)			0.913	(0.12)	0.904	(0.12)
Nonstandard work schedule (x employed)			0.984	(0.18)	0.988	(0.18)			0.854	(0.15)	0.855	(0.15)
Mother's well-being												
Mother's health is fair or poor			1.356	(0.31)	1.342	(0.31)			1.246	(0.30)	1.238	(0.29)
Mother is depressed			1.536*	(0.27)	1.552*	(0.27)			0.957	(0.16)	0.960	(0.16)
Social support												
Takes child to religious services ≥ a few times a month			0.937	(0.11)	0.944	(0.11)			1.127	(0.13)	1.131	(0.13)
Low conflict with partner (scale) (x has partner in household)			0.665**	(0.08)	0.657***	(0.08)			1.634***	(0.21)	1.629***	(0.21)
Immigration history												
Mother's age at migration (x foreign-born)					0.989	(0.01)					0.996	(0.01)
Constant												
N	1,100		1,100		1,100		1,100		1,100		1,100	

Source: Preschool wave of the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study, Birth Cohort.

Notes: Standard errors in parentheses. Sample sizes rounded to nearest 50 in compliance with National Center for Education Statistics privacy standards.

^ p < 0.10 * p < 0.05 ** p < 0.01 *** p < 0.001

Notes

1. Following National Center for Education Statistics privacy protocol, we round our numbers to the nearest 50 throughout this report.
2. Children with low or very low birth weight and twin pairs were also oversampled.
3. Or mother figure, which could be a grandmother, aunt, or other person.
4. We first assign parents points based on how often they report spanking: zero points if they say they did not spank the child in the past week, one point for once in the past week, two points for twice in the last week, and three points for three or more times in the past week. We then add points based on how parents responded to the punishment vignette question. Parents who said they would spank or hit their child received three points; those who said they would only "yell at or threaten" or "make fun of" the child received two points; those who said they would give a timeout, assign housework, or take away a privilege received one point; and those who said they would talk to the child, ignore the behavior, make the child apologize, or give a warning received zero points. The correlation between the frequency-of-spanking measure and the vignette measure is 0.45.
5. The ECLS-B assigned children a single race using a set of hierarchical coding rules described by Snow and colleagues (2009). This is the race of the child that we use for sampling purposes.
6. Those with household income reported as "$200,001 or more" were assigned the dollar value $341,881, which was the mean household income for households earning over $200,000 in 2005, according to the Current Population Survey (Current Population Survey 2006).
7. We also explored models controlling for whether the family most commonly spoke a language other than English at home. A high share of mothers across foreign-born groups reported speaking a language other than English at home, as shown in table 1 on page 20. We ultimately determined that this measure was too highly correlated with place of birth to separate the associations between place of birth and parenting and between language spoken at home and parenting. Further, it does not seem to us that language spoken at home should affect parenting, except as mediated by other measures already included in our models, such as employment type and quality (roughly captured by whether mothers work nonstandard schedules) and by maternal depression and levels of social support. We considered controlling for the language of the two-bag task and parent interview, but these measures were so highly correlated with the mother's place of birth that we felt their coefficients were partly representing the relationship between place of birth and parenting. Models with the language controls are available from the authors upon request.

References

Astone, Nan Marie, and Sara S. McLanahan. 1991. "Family Structure, Parental Practices and High School Completion." *American Sociological Review* 56 (3): 309–20. doi:10.2307/2096106.

Augustine, Jennifer March. 2013. "Mothers' Employment, Education, and Parenting." *Work and Occupations* (September): 1–34. doi:10.1177/0730888413501342.

Berlin, Lisa J., Jean M. Ispa, Mark A. Fine, Patrick S. Malone, Jeanne Brooks-Gunn, Christy Brady-Smith, Catherine Ayoub, and Yu Bai. 2009. "Correlates and Consequences of Spanking and Verbal Punishment for Low-Income White, African American, and Mexican American Toddlers." *Child Development* 80 (5): 1403–20. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8624.2009.01341.x.

Bianchi, Suzanne M. 2000. "Maternal Employment and Time with Children: Dramatic Change or Surprising Continuity?" *Demography* 37 (4): 401–14. doi:10.1353/dem.2000.0001.

Borre, Alicia, and Wendy Kliewer. 2014. "Parental Strain, Mental Health Problems, and Parenting Practices: A Longitudinal Study." *Personality and Individual Differences* 68 (October): 93–97. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2014.04.014.

Brooks-Gunn, Jeanne, and Lisa Markman. 2005. "The Contribution of Parenting to Ethnic and Racial Gaps in School Readiness." *Future of Children* 15 (1): 139–68. doi:10.1353/foc.2005.0001.

Brooks-Gunn, Jeanne, Wen-Jui Han, and Jane Waldfogel. 2002. "Maternal Employment and Child Cognitive Outcomes in the First Three Years of Life: The NICHD Study of Early Child Care." *Child Development* 73 (4): 1052–72. doi:10.1111/1467-8624.00457.

Burchinal, Margaret R., Andrea Follmer, and Donna M. Bryant. 1996. "The Relations of Maternal Social Support and Family Structure with Maternal Responsiveness and Child Outcomes among African American Families." *Developmental Psychology* 32 (6): 1073–83.

Bzostek, Sharon, Noreen Goldman, and Anne Pebley. 2007. "Why Do Hispanics in the USA Report Poor Health?" *Social Science & Medicine* 65 (5): 990–1003. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2007.04.028.

Cabrera, Natasha J., Jacqueline D. Shannon, Jerry West, and Jeanne Brooks-Gunn. 2006. "Parental Interactions With Latino Infants: Variation by Country of Origin and English Proficiency." *Child Development* 77 (5): 1190–1207. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8624.2006.00928.x.

Carlson, Marcia J., Natasha V. Pilkauskas, Sara S. McLanahan, and Jeanne Brooks-Gunn. 2011. "Couples as Partners and Parents over Children's Early Years." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 73 (2): 317–34. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2010.00809.x.

Ceballo, Rosario, and Vonnie C. McLoyd. 2002. "Social Support and Parenting in Poor, Dangerous Neighborhoods." *Child Development* 73 (4): 1310–21. doi:10.1111/1467-8624.00473.

Chan, Kathy, Kailee Penner, Janet W. T. Mah, and Charlotte Johnston. 2010. "Assessing Parenting Behaviors in Euro-Canadian and East Asian Immigrant Mothers: Limitations to Observations of Responsiveness." *Child & Family Behavior Therapy* 32 (2): 85–102. doi:10.1080/07317101003776423.

Chao, Ruth K. 1994. "Beyond Parental Control and Authoritarian Parenting Style: Understanding Chinese Parenting through the Cultural Notion of Training." *Child Development* 65 (4): 1111–19.

Current Population Survey. 2006. "Table HINC-06. Income Distribution to $250,000 or More for Households: 2005." Washington, DC: US Bureau of Labor Statistics and US Bureau of the Census. https://www.census.gov/hhes/www/cpstables/macro/032006/hhinc/new06_000.htm.

Driscoll, Anne K., Stephen T. Russell, and Lisa J. Crockett. 2008. "Parenting Styles and Youth Well-Being across Immigrant Generations." *Journal of Family Issues* 29 (2): 185–209. doi:10.1177/0192513X07307843.

Elder, Glen H., Jr. 1998. *Children of the Great Depression, 25th Anniversary Edition*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press. First published 1974.

Elder, Glen H., Jr., and Rand D. Conger. 2000. *Children of the Land*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Elder, Glen H., Jr., Tri Van Nguyen, and Avshalom Caspi. 1985. "Linking Family Hardship to Children's Lives." *Child Development* 56 (2): 361–75. doi:10.2307/1129726.

Fauth, Rebecca C., Christy Brady-Smith, and Jeanne Brooks-Gunn. 2003. *Parent-Child Interaction Rating Scales for the Play Doh® Task and Father-Child Interaction Rating Scales for the Three-Bag Task.* New York: National Center for Children and Families, Teachers College, Columbia University.

Figueroa-Moseley, Colmar De Von, Craig T. Ramey, Bette Keltner, and Robin G. Lanzi. 2006. "Variations in Latino Parenting Practices and Their Effects on Child Cognitive Developmental Outcomes." *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences* 28 (1): 102–14. doi:10.1177/0739986305284036.

Frech, Adrianne, and Rachel Tolbert Kimbro. 2011. "Maternal Mental Health, Neighborhood Characteristics, and Time Investments in Children." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 73 (3): 605–20. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2011.00833.x.

Furstenberg, Frank F., Jr. 1993. "How Families Manage Risk and Opportunity in Dangerous Neighborhoods." In *Sociology and the Public Agenda*, edited by William Julius Wilson, 231–58. Newbury Park, CA: SAGE Publications.

Gershoff, Elizabeth Thompson. 2002. "Corporal Punishment by Parents and Associated Child Behaviors and Experiences: A Meta-Analytic and Theoretical Review." *Psychological Bulletin* 128 (4): 539–79.

Gershoff, Elizabeth T., J. Lawrence Aber, C. Cybele Raver, and Mary Clare Lennon. 2007. "Income Is Not Enough: Incorporating Material Hardship into Models of Income Associations with Parenting and Child Development." *Child Development* 78 (1): 70–95.

Gibson-Davis, Christina M. 2008. "Family Structure Effects on Maternal and Paternal Parenting in Low-Income Families." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 70 (2): 452–65. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2008.00493.x.

Glick, Jennifer E., Littisha Bates, and Scott T. Yabiku. 2009. "Mother's Age at Arrival in the United States and Early Cognitive Development." *Early Childhood Research Quarterly* 24 (4): 367–80. doi:10.1016/j.ecresq.2009.01.001.

Glick, Jennifer E., Laura D. Hanish, Scott T. Yabiku, and Robert H. Bradley. 2012. "Migration Timing and Parenting Practices: Contributions to Social Development in Preschoolers with Foreign-Born and Native-Born Mothers." *Child Development* 83 (5): 1527–42. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8624.2012.01789.x.

Grzywacz, Joseph G., Stephanie S. Daniel, Jenna Tucker, Jill Walls, and Esther Leerkes. 2011. "Nonstandard Work Schedules and Developmentally Generative Parenting Practices: An Application of Propensity Score Techniques." *Family Relations* 60 (1): 45–59. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3729.2010.00632.x.

Guo, Guang, and Kathleen Mullan Harris. 2000. "The Mechanisms Mediating the Effects of Poverty on Children's Intellectual Development." *Demography* 37 (4): 431–47. doi:10.1353/dem.2000.0005.

Hall, Matthew, and Emily Greenman. 2013. "Housing and Neighborhood Quality among Undocumented Mexican and Central American Immigrants." *Social Science Research* 42 (6): 1712–25. doi:10.1016/j.ssresearch.2013.07.011.

Hashima, Patricia Y., and Paul R. Amato. 1994. "Poverty, Social Support, and Parental Behavior." *Child Development* 65 (2): 394–403. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8624.1994.tb00758.x.

Hill, Terrence D., Amy M. Burdette, Mark Regnerus, and Ronald J. Angel. 2008. "Religious Involvement and Attitudes toward Parenting among Low-Income Urban Women." *Journal of Family Issues* 29 (7): 882–900.

Ho, Caroline, Deborah N. Bluestein, and Jennifer M. Jenkins. 2008. "Cultural Differences in the Relationship between Parenting and Children's Behavior." *Developmental Psychology* 44 (2): 507–22. doi:10.1037/0012-1649.44.2.507.

Hsueh, JoAnn, and Hirokazu Yoshikawa. 2007. "Working Nonstandard Schedules and Variable Shifts in Low-Income Families: Associations with Parental Psychological Well-Being, Family Functioning, and Child Well-Being." *Developmental Psychology* 43 (3): 620–32. doi:10.1037/0012-1649.43.3.620.

Ispa, Jean M., Mark A. Fine, Linda C. Halgunseth, Scott Harper, JoAnn Robinson, Lisa Boyce, Jeanne Brooks-Gunn, and Christy Brady-Smith. 2004. "Maternal Intrusiveness, Maternal Warmth, and Mother-Toddler Relationship

Outcomes: Variations across Low-Income Ethnic and Acculturation Groups." *Child Development* 75 (6): 1613–31. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8624.2004.00806.x.

Jackson, Aurora P., Peter M. Bentler, and Todd M. Franke. 2008. "Low-Wage Maternal Employment and Parenting Style." *Social Work* 53 (3): 267–78. doi:10.1093/sw/53.3.267.

Jackson, Margot. 2012. *Parenting Behavior, Health, and Cognitive Development among Children in Black Immigrant Families: Comparing the United States and the United Kingdom*. Washington, DC: Migration Policy Institute.

Kiernan, Kathleen E., and M. Carmen Huerta. 2008. "Economic Deprivation, Maternal Depression, Parenting and Children's Cognitive and Emotional Development in Early childhood." *British Journal of Sociology* 59 (4): 783–806. doi:10.1111/j.1468-4446.2008.00219.x.

Klebanov, Pamela Kato, Jeanne Brooks-Gunn, and Greg J. Duncan. 1994. "Does Neighborhood and Family Poverty Affect Mothers' Parenting, Mental Health, and Social Support?" *Journal of Marriage and Family* 56 (2): 441–55. doi:10.2307/353111.

Kotchick, Beth A., and Rex Forehand. 2002. "Putting Parenting in Perspective: A Discussion of the Contextual Factors That Shape Parenting Practices." *Journal of Child and Family Studies* 11 (3): 255–69. doi:10.1023/A:1016863921662.

Lareau, Annette. 2011. *Unequal Childhoods: Class, Race, and Family Life, with an Update a Decade Later*. Second edition. Oakland: University of California Press.

Lee, Shawna J., and Inna Altschul. 2015. "Spanking of Young Children: Do Immigrant and U.S.-Born Hispanic Parents Differ?" *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 30 (3): 475–98. doi:10.1177/0886260514535098.

Leventhal, Tama, and Jeanne Brooks-Gunn. 2000. "The Neighborhoods They Live in: The Effects of Neighborhood Residence on Child and Adolescent Outcomes." *Psychological Bulletin* 126 (2): 309–37.

Love, John M., Ellen Eliason Kisker, Christine M. Ross, Peter Z. Schochet, Jeanne Brooks-Gunn, Diane Paulsell, Kimberly Boller, Jill Constantine, Cheri Vogel, Allison Sidle Fuligni, and Christy Brady-Smith. 2002. *Making a Difference in the Lives of Infants and Toddlers and Their Families: The Impacts of Early Head Start.* Washington, DC: US Department of Health and Human Services.

MacKenzie, Michael J., Eric Nicklas, Jane Waldfogel, and Jeanne Brooks-Gunn. 2012. "Corporal Punishment and Child Behavioural and Cognitive Outcomes through 5 Years of Age: Evidence from a Contemporary Urban Birth Cohort Study." *Infant and Child Development* 21 (1): 3–33. doi:10.1002/icd.758.

McLanahan, Sara, and Gary Sandefur. 1997. *Growing Up With a Single Parent: What Hurts, What Helps*. Reprint edition. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. First published 1994.

Mistry, Rashmita S., Elizabeth A. Vandewater, Aletha C. Huston, and Vonnie C. McLoyd. 2002. "Economic Well-Being and Children's Social Adjustment: The Role of Family Process in an Ethnically Diverse Low-Income Sample." *Child Development* 73 (3): 935–51. doi:10.1111/1467-8624.00448.

National Institute of Child Health and Human Development Early Child Care Research Network. 1999. "Chronicity of Maternal Depressive Symptoms, Maternal Sensitivity, and Child Functioning at 36 Months." *Developmental Psychology* 35 (5): 1297–1310.

Ornelas, India J., and Krista M. Perreira. 2011. "The Role of Migration in the Development of Depressive Symptoms among Latino Immigrant Parents in the USA." *Social Science & Medicine* 73 (8): 1169–77. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2011.07.002.

Parke, Ross D., Scott Coltrane, Sharon Duffy, Raymond Buriel, Jessica Dennis, Justina Powers, Sabine French, and Keith F. Widaman. 2004. "Economic Stress, Parenting, and Child Adjustment in Mexican American and European American Families." *Child Development* 75 (6): 1632–56. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8624.2004.00807.x.

Raver, C. Cybele, Elizabeth T. Gershoff, and J. Lawrence Aber. 2007. "Testing Equivalence of Mediating Models of Income, Parenting, and School Readiness for White, Black, and Hispanic Children in a National Sample." *Child Development* 78 (1): 96-115.

Ryan, Rebecca M., Anne Martin, and Jeanne Brooks-Gunn. 2006. "Is One Good Parent Good Enough? Patterns of Mother and Father Parenting and Child Cognitive Outcomes at 24 and 36 Months." *Parenting Science and Practice* 6 (2-3): 211–28. doi:10.1080/15295192.2006.9681306.

Schmitz, Mark F. 2005. "Cultural and Acculturation Differences in Trajectories of Home Environment Inventory Scores for Latino Children and Families." *Journal of Family Issues* 26 (5): 568–83. doi:10.1177/0192513X04273586.

Simons, Ronald L., Fred O. Lorenz, Chyi-in Wu, and Rand D. Conger. 1993. "Social Network and Marital Support as Mediators and Moderators of the Impact of Stress and Depression on Parental Behavior." *Developmental Psychology* 29 (2): 368–81.

Snow, Kyle, Azucena Derecho, Sara Wheeless, Jean Lennon, Jeff Rosen, James Rogers, Susan Kinsey, Karen Morgan, and Peter Einaudi. 2009. *Early Childhood Longitudinal Study, Birth Cohort (ECLS-B), Kindergarten 2006 and 2007 Data File User's Manual (2010-010).* Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics, Institute of Education Sciences, US Department of Education.

Snow, Kyle, Lisa Thalji, Azucena Derecho, Sara Wheeless, Jean Lennon, Susan Kinsey, James Rogers, Melissa Raspa, and Jennifer Park. 2007. *Early Childhood Longitudinal Study, Birth Cohort (ECLS-B), Preschool Year Data File User's Manual (2005–06).* Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics, Institute of Education Sciences, US Department of Education.

Spanier, Graham. 2015. "Dyadic Adjustment Scale." Accessed February 6. http://www.mhs.com/product.aspx?gr=cli&prod=das&id=overview#scales.

Straus, Murray A., Sherry L. Hamby, Sue Boney-McCoy, and David B. Sugarman. 1996. "The Revised Conflict Tactics Scales (CTS2): Development and Preliminary Psychometric Data." *Journal of Family Issues* 17 (3): 283–316. doi:10.1177/019251396017003001.

Tendulkar, Shalini A., Stephen Buka, Erin C. Dunn, S. V. Subramanian, and Karestan C. Koenen. 2010. "A Multilevel Investigation of Neighborhood Effects on Parental Warmth." *Journal of Community Psychology* 38 (5): 557–73. doi:10.1002/jcop.20381.

Tienda, Marta, and Ron Haskins. 2011. "Immigrant Children: Introducing the Issue." *Future of Children* 21 (1): 3–18.

Turney, Kristin, and Grace Kao. 2009. "Assessing the Private Safety Net: Social Support among Minority Immigrant Parents." *Sociological Quarterly* 50 (4): 666–92. doi:10.1111/j.1533-8525.2009.01157.x.

Urban Institute. 2013. "Children of Immigrants Data Tool." Washington, DC: Urban Institute. http://datatool.urban.org/charts/datatool/pages.cfm.

US Census Bureau. 2013. "Selected Characteristics of the Foreign-Born Population by Region of Birth: Latin America, 2013 American Community Survey." Table S0506. http://factfinder.census.gov/faces/tableservices/jsf/pages/productview.xhtml?pid=ACS_13_1YR_S0506&prodType=table.

Yeung, W. Jean, Miriam R. Linver, and Jeanne Brooks-Gunn. 2002. "How Money Matters for Young Children's Development: Parental Investment and Family Processes." *Child Development* 73 (6): 1861–79.

Yoshikawa, Hirokazu. 2011. *Immigrants Raising Citizens*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Yu, Stella M., and Gopal K. Singh. 2012. "High Parenting Aggravation among US Immigrant Families." *American Journal of Public Health* 102 (11): 2102–8. doi:10.2105/AJPH.2012.300698.

About the Authors

Julia Gelatt is a research associate in the Center on Labor, Human Services, and Population at the Urban Institute, where her research focuses on immigration, child well-being, and early education. Her work uses mixed methods, including secondary data analysis, original survey development, administrative data analysis, and qualitative interviews.

Gelatt's work on immigration includes a review of promising practices for connecting immigrant families to prekindergarten; analysis of the implications of the Affordable Care Act for immigrants' health care access in California; a description of the limited English proficient population in Washington, DC; and research on the implications of parents' and children's immigration status for children's health and well-being. Her work on early education includes an evaluation of the Head Start designation and renewal system, and a policy brief on New York City's streamlined early education system, EarlyLearn NYC. Gelatt's other ongoing research includes an evaluation of a supportive housing program for families involved in the child welfare system. Before joining Urban, Gelatt worked on topics related to US immigration policy and immigrant integration at the Migration Policy Institute.

H. Elizabeth Peters is the director of the Center on Labor, Human Services, and Population at the Urban Institute. An economic demographer, her research focuses on family economics and family policy, specifically examining the effects of public policies such as divorce laws, child support policy, child care policy, taxes, and welfare reform on family formation and dissolution; inter- and intra-household transfers; father involvement; and family investments in children. She recently completed a program project grant funded by the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development on the transition to fatherhood and is currently coprincipal investigator on an Administration for Children and Families project that examines innovative practices involving fathers in home visiting programs.

Before joining Urban, Peters was a professor in the department of policy analysis and management at Cornell University and the founding director of the Cornell Population Center. From 1993 to 2004, she was a partner in the Family and Child Well-being Network, where she directed the network's fatherhood efforts. She was also a member

of the steering committee that guided the Federal Interagency Forum on Child and Family Statistics' Nurturing Fatherhood initiative.

Peters's work has appeared in peer-reviewed journals such as the *American Economic Review*, *Journal of Human Resources*, and *Demography*. She coedited the volume *Marriage and Family: Perspectives and Complexities*, published by Columbia University Press in 2009.

Heather Koball is a senior fellow in the Center on Labor, Human Services, and Population at the Urban Institute, where her areas of expertise include immigration and at-risk youth. Koball has directed multiple projects on issues faced by children of immigrants, including a study of the well-being of children whose families have been affected by immigration enforcement, access to public benefits among immigrant families, the implications of the Affordable Care Act for immigrants' health care, and immigrant integration in new destination areas.

Koball's research also focuses on programs to improve the well-being of at-risk youth. As coprincipal investigator of the Opportunities Youth project, she is developing and evaluating interventions to improve the employment outcomes of disconnected youth. She is also principal investigator for an evaluation of after-school programs in New York City that aims to improve youths' social and emotional development. Before joining Urban, Koball was coprincipal investigator for the Youth Demonstration Development project, which developed a conceptual framework to improve the self-sufficiency of at-risk youth. She has published on the life course of young adults, the effect of welfare policies on teen pregnancy, and family formation among low-income couples.

William Monson is a research associate in the Center on Labor, Human Services, and Population at the Urban Institute. He first joined Urban in 2011 as a research assistant with a background in Stata and quantitative work. He has subsequently expanded his qualitative research skills with focus groups, interviews, site visits, and other project fieldwork, contributing to projects including a symposium on problems faced by low-income men, a randomized controlled trial of a health care training assistance program, analysis of social safety net programs during the Great Recession, and the impact of regional immigration enforcement policies on child well-being.

Statement of Independence

The Urban Institute strives to meet the highest standards of integrity and quality in its research and analyses and in the evidence-based policy recommendations offered by its researchers and experts. We believe that operating consistent with the values of independence, rigor, and transparency is essential to maintaining those standards. As an organization, the Urban Institute does not take positions on issues, but it does empower and support its experts in sharing their own evidence-based views and policy recommendations that have been shaped by scholarship. Funders do not determine our research findings or the insights and recommendations of our experts. Urban scholars and experts are expected to be objective and follow the evidence wherever it may lead.

2100 M Street NW
Washington, DC 20037

www.urban.org