

2006

## Comparison of parenting practices, acculturation, and the acceptability of behavioral parent training programs between a Native American and a non-Native American sample

Joshua J. Masse  
*West Virginia University*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://researchrepository.wvu.edu/etd>

---

### Recommended Citation

Masse, Joshua J., "Comparison of parenting practices, acculturation, and the acceptability of behavioral parent training programs between a Native American and a non-Native American sample" (2006).

*Graduate Theses, Dissertations, and Problem Reports*. 2364.

<https://researchrepository.wvu.edu/etd/2364>

This Thesis is protected by copyright and/or related rights. It has been brought to you by the The Research Repository @ WVU with permission from the rights-holder(s). You are free to use this Thesis in any way that is permitted by the copyright and related rights legislation that applies to your use. For other uses you must obtain permission from the rights-holder(s) directly, unless additional rights are indicated by a Creative Commons license in the record and/ or on the work itself. This Thesis has been accepted for inclusion in WVU Graduate Theses, Dissertations, and Problem Reports collection by an authorized administrator of The Research Repository @ WVU. For more information, please contact [researchrepository@mail.wvu.edu](mailto:researchrepository@mail.wvu.edu).

Comparison of Parenting Practices, Acculturation, and the Acceptability of Behavioral Parent Training Programs Between a Native American and a Non-Native American Sample

Joshua J. Masse

Thesis Submitted to the  
Eberly College of Arts and Sciences  
at West Virginia University  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree of

Master of Science  
in  
Psychology

Cheryl B. McNeil, Ph.D., Chair  
Daniel W. McNeil, Ph.D.  
Julie H. Patrick, Ph.D.

Department of Psychology

Morgantown, West Virginia  
2006

Keywords: Native American, Parenting Practices, Acculturation, Treatment Acceptability

## ABSTRACT

### Comparison of Parenting Practices, Acculturation, and the Acceptability of Behavioral Parent Training Programs Between a Native American and a Non-Native American Sample

Joshua J. Masse

Behavioral parent training (BPT) has been shown to be a highly effective treatment for children with disruptive behavior disorders. Although a great deal of promising research concerning BPT exists, it is important to recognize that current BPT programs were developed and normed based on European-American ideologies regarding parenting, with the assumption that these programs will apply to parents from cultural minority groups as well. The current study evaluated differences in parenting practices between a sample of Native American parents and non-Native parents. In addition, group differences regarding sensitivity and acceptability of techniques that are commonly used in BPT programs were explored. To better understand how cultural identity influenced parenting practices, a measure of acculturation was included and analyzed as well. Lastly, parenting differences between Native Americans with and without residential school experience (direct or indirect) were explored. Results demonstrated a number of important differences between the groups and help to provide some insight into both treatment acceptability and parenting practices of the Native American population, while also serving as a base of information for future research in this area. Limitations and future directions are discussed.

## Acknowledgement

A number of individuals need to be thanked for the assistance and guidance they have provided throughout this project.

First, I would like to give a big labeled praise to Dr. Cheryl McNeil who has not only been an incredible mentor from the very beginning but an amazing individual who has taught me much more than how to conduct research. Her supervision and support have been invaluable to the development of this project and for this I am truly grateful.

Next, I would like to thank Dr. Daniel McNeil for not only providing invaluable expertise but also for the way he consistently went above and beyond the call in order to make this project happen. In addition, I would like to extend my thanks to Dr. Julie Patrick for always providing invaluable advice every step of the way.

I have profound appreciation for Dr. Dee Bigfoot, whose consultation on this project was invaluable and for her I am very grateful.

I would like to acknowledge all the individuals who sacrificed their time assisting with the development and data collection phases of this project. Namely, I would like to thank Megan Ballew, Renata Martins, Maureen Conley, and Cathy Goffreda.

I also wish to thank Len Longley, Jack Johnson, and the North American Iroquois Veterans Association for allowing us access to their Pow-Wow in 2005. Without their commitment, this project would have never come to fruition.

Lastly and most lovingly, I would like to thank my friends and family for always challenging me to reach my goals, no matter how lofty they may have seemed. To my mother, who sacrificed tremendously to see to it that I would be in the position that I am today. Because of her enduring love and commitment, I dedicate this manuscript to her memory.

## Table of Contents

Title Page .....	i
Abstract .....	ii
Acknowledgements.....	iii
Table of Contents.....	iv
List of Tables .....	vi
Introduction.....	1
Behavioral parent training programs .....	2
Cultural variables and BPT.....	5
Cultural differences in parental behavior.....	6
Acceptability of BPT among culturally diverse populations.....	9
Parenting and level of acculturation .....	13
Native American parenting practices.....	14
Native American acculturation .....	18
The residential school generation .....	20
Tribal considerations.....	21
Purpose of study.....	24
Hypotheses.....	24
Method .....	26
Participants.....	26
Measures .....	27
Procedure .....	33

Results.....	33
Missing Data .....	33
Demographic Characteristics .....	34
Between-Group Comparison of Demographic Characteristics.....	34
Qualitative Comparisons with Normative Samples.....	35
Power Analyses.....	36
Major Analyses.....	36
Additional Analyses.....	37
Discussion.....	41
Limitations .....	49
Future Directions .....	51
Conclusion .....	52
References.....	54

## List of Tables

<i>Table 1.</i> Demographic Characteristics of Participants by Ethnicity.....	84
<i>Table 2.</i> Between-Group Comparison of DemographicCharacteristic.....	86
<i>Table 3.</i> Between-Group Comparison for TEI-SF Acceptability Scores.....	88
<i>Table 4.</i> Description of Extended Family Member Care-Giving Responsibilities.....	89
<i>Table 5.</i> Between-Group Comparison for APQ Subscale Mean Scores.....	90
<i>Table 6.</i> Between-Group Comparison of Residential School and Non-Residential School: TEI-SF.....	91
<i>Table 7.</i> Between-Group Comparison of Residential School and Non-Residential School: APQ Subscales.....	92
<i>Table 8.</i> Qualitative Description of Additional Parenting Strategy Write-In Item..... on the APQ.....	93
<i>Table 9.</i> Bivariate Correlations of Acculturation with Extended Family, TEI-SF..... Vignettes, & APQ Subscales.....	95

Comparison of Parenting Practices, Acculturation, and Behavioral Parent Training  
Acceptability Between a Native American and a Non-Native American Sample

Behavioral parent training (BPT) programs have been shown to be highly effective psychosocial treatments for children and adolescents with conduct-disordered behavior (e.g., Eyberg, Schuhmann, & Rey, 1996; Forehand & McMahon, 1981; McMahon & Forehand, 2003). For example, Brestan and Eyberg (1998) conducted a review of 82 controlled research studies investigating treatments for children and adolescents with Oppositional Defiant Disorder (ODD) and Conduct Disorder (CD) and found BPT programs to be well-established, efficacious treatments. BPT has demonstrated short-term (Webster-Stratton, 1994) and long-term gains in both clinic and home environments (Eisenstadt, Eyberg, McNeil, Newcomb, & Funderburk, 1993; Calvert & McMahon, 1987; Schumann, Foote, Eyberg, Boggs, & Algina, 1998; Webster-Stratton & Hammond, 1997). Additionally, BPT programs targeting disruptive behaviors in the home have shown to have generalization effects with a subsequent reduction of oppositional/conduct behaviors in the classroom setting (McNeil, Eyberg, Eisenstadt, Newcomb, & Funderburk, 1991). Although a great deal of promising research concerning BPT exists, it is important to recognize that current BPT programs were developed and normed based on European-American ideologies regarding parenting, with the assumption that these programs will apply to parents from cultural minority groups as well (Forehand & Kotchick, 1996). However, with increased recognition that parenting styles tend to differ amongst cultures, researchers recently have recommended that behavioral parent training models be examined with regard to their effectiveness in meeting the needs of families from diverse cultural backgrounds (Forehand & Kotchick, 1996; Herschell, Calzada, Eyberg, & McNeil, 2002).

One cultural group that consistently has been overlooked in the BPT literature is Native

Americans. In fact, a recent literature search failed to identify any empirical, published articles examining BPT with Native American families (Masse, Goffreda, BigFoot, McNeil, & McNeil, 2004). However, theoretical articles suggest that Native Americans subscribe to different parenting styles in comparison to the European-American population (Bigfoot-Sipes & Willis, 1993; Kallam & Coser, 1994; McDermott, 2001).

In order to provide more culturally-specific, sensitive, and efficacious behavioral interventions to the Native American population, clinicians must be aware of the disparities that exist between this group and the majority culture (Barlow & Walkup, 1998; Herring, 1996). Gaining an awareness and understanding of Native American parenting beliefs is especially important considering the majority of clinicians administering services to Native Americans are not raised in the Native culture and, in turn, are not particularly familiar with their traditional beliefs and customs (Barlow & Walkup, 1998). The current study evaluated differences in parenting practices between a sample of Native American parents and non-Native parents. In addition, group differences regarding sensitivity and acceptability of techniques that are commonly used in BPT programs were explored. Lastly, parenting differences between Native Americans with and without residential school experience (direct or indirect) were explored.

#### *Behavioral Parent Training Programs*

BPT programs have become the most frequently subscribed to and empirically-supported treatments for children with externalizing behaviors less than twelve years of age (Brestan & Eyberg, 1998; Eyberg, Schuhmann, & Rey, 1996; Forehand & McMahon, 1981; Kronenberger & Meyer, 2001). They are based on social learning principles which suggest that children learn noncompliance through a process of modeling and receiving reinforcement for problem behaviors from prominent individuals in their environment, primarily parents and

teachers (Wierson & Forehand, 1994). BPT programs are education-focused treatments which take place in a controlled environment and are designed to teach parents the appropriate skills to effectively solve problems with their children and reduce externalizing behaviors (Calvert & McMahon, 1987; Sanders & Dadds, 1993).

Oftentimes, parents unknowingly engage in behaviors which develop and maintain their child's noncompliance (Sanders & Dadds, 1993; Wierson & Forehand, 1994). Patterson (1982) describes a coercive parent-child interaction cycle which serves as the basis for the development and maintenance of noncompliant behavior. According to coercion theory, a parent and child are both negatively reinforced by each other's behavior, and the perpetual negative-reinforcement processes establish and increase noncompliance. For example, a child's misbehavior (protesting, whining, refusing to comply) is negatively reinforced by a parent's withdrawal of the command. Likewise, a frustrated parent engages in behaviors (yelling, arguing) which are negatively reinforced by decreases in child noncompliance. The negative-reinforcement cycle becomes ingrained in parent and child interactions, resulting in a destructive and dysfunctional communication pattern as well as a negative relationship between the parent and child (Patterson).

A subsequent theory that offers insight into the development and maintenance of noncompliant behavior involves inappropriately using positive reinforcement as a contingency for noncompliant behavior (Wahler, 1976). For example, a child's noncompliant behavior (shouting "No!") is positively reinforced by a parent's attention. Administering attention to undesirable behaviors increases the likelihood that the behavior will maintain over a long period of time. A parent's attention becomes a primary motivator for noncompliance and minimal, or less-appealing, incentives exist for demonstrating appropriate behavior.

Using these theories as assumptions for the development and preservation of noncompliant behaviors, BPT interventions possess two overlying goals which serve to extinguish noncompliant behaviors as well as foster a less destructive parent/child relationship. First, BPT seeks to interfere with the negative reinforcement processes and stunt the coercive cycle by teaching parents more appropriate contingency management techniques and strategies. Secondly, BPT strives to educate parents on recognizing and delivering positive reinforcement solely to appropriate, compliant behaviors (Wierson & Forehand, 1994).

In order to accomplish these aforementioned goals and reduce noncompliant behavior, BPT programs utilize a number of specific behavior modification techniques. Several BPT programs (e.g., Parent-Child Interaction Therapy [PCIT], Helping the Noncompliant Child) divide parent training into two phases. In the initial phase, enhancing the relationship between the parent and child is a priority, and parents are taught to pay attention to positive behaviors while ignoring minor inappropriate behaviors (differential attention). Specifically, parents are taught skills such as granting specific praise to appropriate behaviors, describing the child's play, effectively listening and reflecting statements back to the child, and avoiding the use of commands, questions, and criticisms (Hembree-Kigin & McNeil, 1995; Forehand & McMahon, 1981; McMahon & Forehand, 2003).

The second phase of a typical BPT program is a discipline portion in which parents are taught how to give effective directions to their children. Parents are also instructed to consistently administer appropriate consequences for compliant behavior and implement a time-out contingent upon noncompliant behavior. Some BPT programs employ a token economy system in which positive reinforcers are granted or lost (response cost) depending on a child's response to a specific, direct command. BPT programs utilize an array of methods to teach

specific behavior modification techniques, including didactic instruction, role play, modeling, live coaching, videotape modeling, group discussion and practicing in both the clinic and home settings (Christophersen & Mortweet, 2001; Hembree-Kigin & McNeil, 1995; Forehand & McMahon, 1981; McMahon & Forehand, 2003; Webster-Stratton, 1996).

### *Cultural Variables and BPT*

Although the BPT literature identifies parent training programs as efficacious and empirically-supported interventions, Forehand and Kotchick (1996) point out that the majority of BPT research has not analyzed the efficacy of parent training programs within a cultural framework. The researchers discuss that BPT programs are based on parenting ideologies central to European-American backgrounds. BPT programs, therefore, attempt to alter ethnic parenting behaviors based on the assumption that it will create the same results evidenced with the European-American culture. Researchers (Forehand & Kotchick, 1996; Herschell, Calzada, Eyberg, & McNeil, 2002) hold that this lack of cultural sensitivity and the omission of cultural acceptance in the BPT research may lead to erroneous beliefs concerning the efficacy of BPT programs with ethnically diverse cultures. Furthermore, researchers warn that disseminating the current parent training approaches to ethnic families may severely hinder the success of treating disruptive behaviors in minority populations.

Research suggests that one's cultural heritage plays a crucial role in the manner in which an individual views the world and forms beliefs and value systems (Harkness & Super, 1995). Specifically, the literature demonstrates that parenting beliefs are predominantly imbedded in one's cultural identity and that the past experience of one's culture dictates parenting practices and ideologies (Baumrind, 1995; Herschell, Calzada, Eyberg, & McNeil, 2002). Therefore, the European-American underpinnings of the current BPT programs may not

properly reflect the same values and practices of other cultures, and in turn, their attempts to explain, predict, or change parental behavior may be fallible and futile (Forehand & Kotchick, 1996; Harkness & Super, 1995).

### *Cultural Differences in Parental Behavior*

Research has shown that ethnic minority groups exhibit different parenting behaviors. In their review of ethnic and minority parenting, Garcia, Meyer, and Brillon (1995) discuss African-American parenting styles and state that child-rearing responsibilities within this culture tend to extend to the community. Oftentimes, African-American families depend upon extended family members, neighbors, and clergy to assist in child-rearing tasks (Forehand & Kotchick, 1996). In addition, qualities such as respect, obedience, and learning from elder members of the family and community are strongly emphasized in African-American parenting. Historically, African-American parents have been considered to be more physical with their children in comparison to parents of the majority culture. Specifically, research shows that African-American parents are more likely than the dominant culture to demonstrate corporal punishment techniques when modifying behavior (Garcia, Meyer, & Brillon, 1995). However, some researchers have noted that the utilization of physical punishment may be attributed more to social class than to cultural identification (Whaley, 2000).

Similar to the African-American population, Hispanic-American families share parenting responsibilities with older siblings, extended family members and family friends. However, in contrast to African-American families, research has shown that Hispanic-American parents are more likely to be permissive with their children. One aspect that permeates the Hispanic culture and is reflected in their parenting practices is the idea of respect. As members of the Hispanic population place a heavy emphasis on interpersonal relationships,

respect for oneself and members of the family is an important characteristic that parents try to instill in their children at an early age (Forehand & Kotchick, 1996; Garcia, Meyer, & Brillon, 1995).

Asian-American parenting behaviors are difficult to generalize, as the culture is made up of a number of diverse groups, including Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Vietnamese, Cambodian, Thai, Filipino, Laotian, Lao-Hmong, Burmese, Samoan, and Guamanian (Forehand & Kotchick, 1996). However, one of the primary facets of parenting within Asian-American culture is to ensure that children receive formal education. Typically, Asian-American parents place considerable emphasis on academics and for this reason consider teaching to be an important aspect of parenting. Asian-American children are taught at an early age that hard-work, perseverance, and diligence are important qualities and parents look upon these values as indicators of maturity (Garcia, Meyer, & Brillon, 1995). Also, Asian-American parents typically stress the importance of family connectedness to their children and instill the belief that a child's actions and behaviors are a reflection on the larger family network, creating a sense of obligation and loyalty to the family structure (Forehand & Kotchick, 1996). Oftentimes, because of the commonalities shared with the mainstream culture, Asian-American families are less likely to experience acculturative stress and are better able to adapt to the mainstream culture. Enough differences exist, however, that researchers have cautioned that BPT programs may still require modifications in order to meet the needs of this particular population (Forehand & Kotchick, 1996; Garcia, Meyer, & Brillon, 1995).

In summary, minority populations demonstrate relatively different parenting practices and attitudes. Although parenting practices within a particular minority population generally manifest themselves in similar ways, it must be noted that a multitude of factors (acculturation,

discrimination) determine specific parenting behaviors. Thus, the possible need to modify BPT programs should not only be considered on a cultural level, but also should take individual differences into consideration as well.

In their review, Forehand and Kotchick (1996) created an impetus amongst researchers to examine whether BPT programs are sensitive and acceptable to diverse ethnic populations. Some recent research has begun to respond to Forehand and Kotchick's "wake-up call" to consider cultural diversity in studies of BPT. Querido, Warner, and Eyberg (2002) conducted a study with one hundred and eight African-American female caregivers of children ages three to six and found that the parenting style (authoritative) manifested by this culture was congruent with the parenting beliefs and practices demonstrated by Caucasians. Similarly, Calzada and Eyberg (2002) investigated parenting styles amongst first-generation Dominican and Puerto Rican mothers residing in the United States and found that the parenting styles were similar to that of Caucasian mothers living in the United States. This research suggests the possibility that a similarity between Caucasian mothers in the United States and mothers of ethnically diverse populations may decrease the need to modify BPT programs. The logic follows that if parenting practices and intervention methods offered in BPT programs are based on European-American parenting ideologies and research demonstrates that the same targeted ideologies and parenting practices have been adopted by diverse cultures, then the necessity to adapt parent training to meet the needs of these populations may not exist.

While the results of these studies (Calzada & Eyberg, 2002; Querido, Warner, & Eyberg, 2002) may lend promise to the current state of BPT programs, it is essential to examine the drawbacks of the research prior to making inferences. For example, Eyberg et al. (2002) discuss a number of concerns regarding the cultural sensitivity of the measure used in both

studies: The Parenting Styles and Dimensions Assessment (PSD; Robinson, Mandelco, Olsen & Hart, 1995). First, the PSD was devised based upon Euro-centric ideologies regarding parenting behaviors and was normed with a European-American sample. Second, using primarily Caucasian samples, prior studies using the PSD have demonstrated three distinct parenting constructs (authoritative, authoritarian, permissive). In contrast, two studies by Eyberg et al. (2002) examining parenting practices with Puerto Rican and African-American mothers obtained a high correlation between the authoritarian and permissive parenting constructs, raising concerns about the construct validity of the measure with ethnically diverse populations. Third, Calzada and Eyberg (2002) propose that the PSD may not include items that evaluate key parenting behaviors for a particular culture, provoking questions about the measure's ability to assess parenting differences between cultures. A final limitation put forth by Eyberg et al. (2002) is with respect to the constraints of self-report measures and their inability to provide enough information for assessing the validity of actual parenting behaviors.

In summary, some studies suggest that cultural differences in parenting exist, whereas other research has shown parenting similarities on general dimensions like authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive styles. Yet, due to the limited number of studies in this area and questions about the cultural sensitivity of parenting style questionnaires, conclusions regarding the cultural similarities and differences of parenting styles cannot yet be reached.

#### *Acceptability of BPT among Culturally- Diverse Populations*

Prior evaluation of psychosocial interventions, namely behavior modification programs, has almost solely been based on outcome measures. Although an evaluation of treatment efficacy is of utmost importance for developing and modifying psychosocial interventions, researchers have pointed out that it is important to include broader treatment evaluation criteria

(Kazdin, 1980a). One such criterion is treatment acceptability. Kazdin, French, and Sherick (1981) define treatment acceptability as “judgments of lay persons, clients, and others of whether the procedures proposed for treatment are appropriate, fair, and reasonable for the problem or client” (p. 900). Similarly, Wolf (1978) discussed the importance of evaluating treatment acceptability and stressed the significance of a specific group’s perception of an intervention. If a particular group or segment of society does not deem an intervention (or certain features of an intervention) appropriate, the effectiveness of treatment will be diminished. This point is particularly salient when considering minority populations, as their views and expectations of treatment may not coincide with the components of empirically-supported behavioral interventions (Booth & Borrego, 2005). In terms of BPT programs, acceptability of treatment components is crucial in that parents who judge a treatment as unacceptable and/or inappropriate for their children will be more likely to display resistance to the intervention, deterring the effectiveness of treatment (Kazdin, 1980a). For example, a lack of treatment acceptability reduces the likelihood that parents would be motivated to attain the necessary behavior modification skills and practice them in the home environment (Booth and Borrego, 2005).

Considering the parenting differences that exist across cultures, it is logical to infer that BPT programs would need to be adapted in order to be more suitable and acceptable for a particular culture. However, some research has demonstrated the effectiveness of BPT regardless of cultural identity. In an outcome study examining the effect of PCIT on externalizing behavior disorders, Fernandez and Eyberg (2004) found a significant decrease in disruptive behaviors amongst African-American children, as reported by the childrens’ mothers, suggesting that components of BPT programs, void of modifications, can validly be generalized

and applied to African-American families. In addition, the study revealed no significant difference in attrition rates between the Caucasian and African-American families, signifying treatment acceptability and satisfaction with this sample of the population. Similarly, McNeil, Capage, and Bennett (2001) conducted a study examining discrepancies in treatment response between an African-American sample and Caucasian sample (with SES controlled) and found that both groups did not significantly differ in regard to attrition rate. McNeil et al. (2001) also found PCIT to be an effective intervention with African-American families in reducing externalizing behaviors. These findings suggest that current BPT programs may contain components which are deemed acceptable by certain minority cultures and thus modifying BPT programs for all minority groups may be unnecessary and unsubstantiated.

Although prior studies with African-American families (Fernandez & Eyberg, 2004; McNeil, Capage, & Bennett, 2002) demonstrated effectiveness in terms of subject retention and disruptive behavior reduction, it is necessary to call attention to the limitations of the studies. In discussing the shortcomings of their research, Fernandez and Eyberg (2004) note the importance of recognizing within-culture differences and caution researchers not to assume within-culture homogeneity, specifically with the African-American population. Additionally, both studies examined cultural differences with small sample sizes and one of the studies (McNeil, Capage, & Bennett, 2001) examined archival records with a proportion of the data missing. Lastly, neither study administered a measure specifically examining treatment acceptability (e.g., Therapy Attitude Inventory), making it difficult to reach a conclusion regarding satisfaction with this particular population. The limitations of these studies suggest that there is a need in the BPT literature to conduct additional research with ethnic minority populations. Lending more evidence to this statement, McCabe et al. (2005) recognized that the

state of BPT programs was not sensitive to the Mexican-American population and have thus proposed a tailored approach (GANA) to meet the needs of this minority group. Although the preliminary results of this investigation have not yet been documented, the authors state that, due to a number of factors (lack of bilingual therapists, insensitivity to unique cultural characteristics) current BPT programs were not retaining or showing efficacious results as Mexican-American families and clients of this ethnicity showed dropout rates as high as 60% to 75% after the initial session.

In order to gain an understanding of the specific components of BPT programs that were viewed as acceptable by minority populations, Kelley and Heffer (1987), using the Treatment Evaluation Inventory-Short Form (TEI-SF; Kelley, Heffer, Gresham & Elliot, 1989), examined treatment acceptability differences between African-American and Caucasian mothers of varying income levels and found that spanking was acceptable to both low-income and middle-income Black mothers whereas only low-income White mothers considered spanking as acceptable. Similar to previous findings (Peters, 1981), these results suggest that physical punishment can be viewed as a preferred behavioral modification technique for African-American families and is not simply a social class phenomenon. The TEI-SF is an acceptability measure which presents a number of frequently-utilized behavioral interventions for children and assesses which technique (positive reinforcement, response cost, differential attention, time-out, overcorrection, spanking) is looked upon most favorably. Jones, Eyberg, Adams, and Boggs (1998) presented the TEI-SF to 20 mothers of clinically-referred children with disruptive behavior disorders. Similar to previous findings (Heffer & Kelley, 1987; Kelley, Grace, & Elliot, 1990; Miller & Kelley, 1992), the results of the study demonstrated positive reinforcement and response cost to be the most acceptable treatment among the mothers.

Although participants were of mixed ethnicity, small sample size disallowed an analysis of the cultural differences. Thus, as particular cultures endorse different parenting styles and possess different ideologies and values, it is essential that BPT researchers are sensitive to and aware of the diverse needs of each cultural group and are amenable to the possible modifications needed (Forehand & Kotchick, 1996; McNeil, Capage, & Bennett, 2001).

A review of studies utilizing the Treatment Evaluation Inventory and TEI-SF showed that the majority of research examining the acceptability of behavioral treatment components did not analyze race as a variable (Adams & Kelley, 1992; Booth & Borrego, 2004; Burke, Kuhn, & Peterson, 2004; Calvert & McMahon, 1987; Kazdin, 1980a; 1980b; 1981; 1984; Miller & Kelley, 1992; Norton, Austen, Allen, Hilton, 1983). In fact, only two studies (Kelley, Grace & Elliot, 1990; Heffer & Kelley, 1987) singled out race as a potential mediator which may influence an individual's determination of treatment acceptability.

#### *Parenting and Level of Acculturation*

Garcia and Ahler (1992) (as cited in Garrett & Pichette, 2000), describe the process of acculturation as “the cultural change that occurs when two or more cultures are in persistent contact.” Parenting and acculturation are very much intertwined in that the influence of the dominant culture can play a crucial role in regard to minority parenting practices and parenting beliefs. To illustrate the potent effect mainstream society has on ethnic parenting, Rauh, Wasserman, and Brunelli (1990) examined the parenting practices of Spanish mothers born in the United States and found that they were more analogous with African-American women born in the United States than with Spanish women who had recently immigrated to America. Likewise, Kelley and Tseng (1992) conducted a study demonstrating similar use of reasoning behaviors between Caucasian mothers and immigrant Chinese mothers. These findings exhibit

the impressionistic effect acculturation has on parenting, as reasoning is not a customary parental behavior in the Chinese community. The findings of these studies reveal that acculturation is an important aspect of parenting that needs to be examined closely. Failing to scrutinize level of acculturation may lead researchers to inappropriately generalize findings without regard for within-group differences.

### *Native American Parenting Practices*

The Native American people are a diverse culture and represent a large portion of the United States population. The Native American culture is comprised of 562 recognized tribes and a population of over 4.1 million people making up 1.5% of the national population (Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA); U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2000). The BIA defines a Native American as someone who is either (a) a member of a federally-validated Native American tribe or (b) whose blood quantum levels are at least 25% derived from Native genealogy (Trimble & Fleming, 1989). Although the definition regarding which specific characteristics one must possess in order to be considered Native has been disputed by parties both within and outside the Native community, the United States Bureau of the Census solely relies on self-identification in determining Native persons (Garrett & Pichette, 2000).

Native parenting practices is an area that has been consistently overlooked in the BPT literature, creating a void which leads to many uncertainties about the acceptance and effectiveness of current BPT programs within this particular culture. Although limited in scope, Native literature, in the form of expert opinion or anecdotal evidence, suggests that there are a number of parenting practices and ideologies which differ from those evidenced by the majority culture (Kallam & Coser, 1994; McDermott, 2001). These cultural differences may influence the Native perception and ultimate acceptability of BPT programs.

One cultural difference that exists between the Native culture and the Euro-American majority culture is the role of extended family or clan. The majority culture subscribes to a philosophy that places heavy emphasis on the nuclear family where each member in the single family unit is seen as a separate individual. In the majority culture, members of the nuclear family typically do not grant parenting responsibilities to those outside of their immediate family. In contrast, Native Americans view the extended family or tribe as the basic family unit which takes precedence over individuality (Atkinson, Morten, & Sue, 1998; Garcia, Meyer, & Brillon, 1995; Wilburn, Ballew, & Sullivan, 2004). Within a Native American tribe, the individuals are interrelated and thus regarded as immediate family. Also, in contrast to Euro-centric family values and structures, elders are held in high esteem and are seen as individuals possessing profound wisdom, insight and knowledge (Glover, 1999). Therefore, elders of a Native tribe are frequently approached and utilized for a variety of reasons, namely parenting advice and counsel (Atkinson, Morten, & Sue, 1998). Commonly, Native child-rearing duties are seen as a cooperative and collective communal effort and thus is a responsibility inherent to all members of the tribe, including aunts, uncles, and grandparents (Forehand & Kotchick, 1996; Glover, 1999; McDermott, 2001). Red Horse (as cited in Atkinson, Morten, & Sue, 1998), in depicting an example of behaviors common to a Native American family, describes a young Native woman who lived with five different family members within a three year period. The article points out that the majority culture would view this familial instability as a dysfunctional component of the family structure, but Native Americans perceive these actions as common, acceptable behaviors characteristic of the culture and values which underlie the heritage.

In addition to child-rearing practices, extended families in the Native culture also

contribute to disciplining or praising Native children (BigFoot-Sipes & Willis, 1993). In terms of positive attributes, tribal (communal) praise for good behavior is not only customary, but may also serve as an impetus for children to comply or assert effort in both the home and classroom environments (Atkinson, Morten, & Sue, 1998). Oftentimes, tribes positively reinforce Native children by honoring them through ceremonies, name-giving, or dances. Likewise, extended family members are frequently involved in discipline of Native children (BigFoot-Sipes & Willis, 1993). For these reasons, Native children and families typically evaluate their behaviors based upon the advantageousness to the larger tribal community (Atkinson, Morten, & Sue, 1998).

Although the extended family participates in establishing limits and punishing Native children, Native American families in general tend to practice a relaxed, non-engaging, non-interfering parenting style (Atkinson, Morten, & Sue, 1998; Forehand & Kotchick, 1996; Kallam & Coser, 1994; Morrissette, 1994). Reasons underlying this parenting style stem from Native ideologies stating that all persons hold the innate ability and right to make their own decisions in an independent manner (Glover, 1999; Kallam & Coser, 1994). Native American culture maintains that no person is entitled to speak for or manipulate the words or actions of others, assuming that these actions do not interfere with the larger, communal values of the tribe (Forehand & Kotchick, 1996; Kallam & Coser, 1994). Rather than trying to enforce a great deal of control over their children, Native Americans believe that parenting should be congruent with the harmonious way of the world, and attempting to exert influence over nature's synchronization is not culturally acceptable (Atkinson, Morten, & Sue, 1998; Glover, 1999; Glover, 2001). This permissive, non-confrontational style of parenting lies in contrast to the practices and beliefs held by the majority culture, one which stresses control, compliance, and

structure. As Native Americans tolerate and accept a non-interfering style of parenting, the majority culture perceives parental interference as a sign of nurture and care for their children (Masse, Goffreda, BigFoot, McNeil & McNeil, 2004). BPT programs usually have components that teach parents to be directive in order to gain control over defiant child behaviors. It is possible that some Native American families could perceive this as invasive and inconsistent with traditional parenting beliefs.

Although Euro-centric discipline approaches may not fully be in line with the Native American tradition, oftentimes Native parents may employ behavioral strategies that are inherently connected to their heritage. For example, Native American parents may use storytelling as a means to demonstrate and describe appropriate manifestations of behavior. Similarly, Native American families may utilize the Medicine Wheel as a symbol to teach their children how to respect themselves and others (BigFoot-Sipes & Willis, 1993). Moreover, as seen within Asian family units (McDermott, 2001), shaming is a behavior modification technique frequently utilized as a means to extinguish inappropriate behavior (Forehand & Kotchick, 1996). As tribal identity is so important to the Native culture, much emphasis is placed on respecting and upholding standards and ideals that are important to the values of the tribe, and therefore embarrassing or disgracing one's tribe or Native heritage may serve as punishment to a Native child. In contrast, the majority culture is more likely to employ guilt as a means of gaining compliance, where a child's misbehavior is not placed in a larger communal context but is rather an event occurring within the immediate family unit (Masse, Goffreda, BigFoot, McNeil & McNeil, 2004).

While a variety of Native parenting practices and ideologies lie in contrast to those employed by the European-American culture, Native parents also are thought to engage in

several parenting practices that are in unison with the majority culture and evidenced in BPT programs. First, Native parents have been described as invested in modeling appropriate behaviors for their children. Modeling in the Native culture may take a variety of forms, including overt behaviors, storytelling, or ceremonial rituals (BigFoot-Sipes & Willis, 1993). Secondly, Native Americans may engage in planned silences or ignoring as a way to extinguish inappropriate behavior (Kallam & Coser, 1994). The behavioral modification technique of withholding parental attention (punishment) is utilized by BPT programs (Hembree-Kigin & McNeil, 1995) and has been shown to be an effective means of decreasing inappropriate behaviors. Given that some parenting practices associated with traditional Native American may be values may be consistent with the skills taught in BPT programs while other practices seem in opposition to BPT philosophies, the extent to which Native Americans might find BPT to be acceptable and appropriate remains unclear.

However, the Native American culture is diverse in respect to tribal traditions and beliefs, thus, the aforementioned parenting practices may not be a reflection of all Native parenting behaviors. It also should be recognized that the presented information on Native parenting beliefs are based solely on experts' opinions, not data-based studies. Therefore, it is important that further research is conducted to evaluate these assumptions prior to modifying BPT programs.

#### *Native American Acculturation*

It is important to consider level of acculturation when attempting to evaluate the values and customs associated with particular Native American groups and individuals. Garrett and Pichette (2000) discuss acculturation among the Native population and assert that it is essential to recognize that Native Americans, as a people, do not possess similar ideologies regarding

their cultural commitment and demonstrate varying levels of acculturation. Due to the cultural identification dissimilarities among the Native people, it is important for researchers to assess where Native Americans fall on the acculturation continuum. Attaining this information prevents researchers from inappropriately generalizing findings to the larger Native American community as well as grants more insight into the more traditional Native beliefs and customs that have not been influenced or impacted by the dominant culture. To better delineate and more specifically operationalize the levels of acculturation, researchers (Garrett & Pichette, 2000; Herring, 1996; LaFromboise, Trimble & Mohatt, 1990) have put forth specific explanations. The traditional end of the acculturation continuum is said to include individuals who entirely retain and practice the Native way of life, including the tribal customs, beliefs and means of worship. Some individuals in this category speak the Native language and may not possess fluency of the English language. The individuals who fall into the middle of the acculturation continuum are described as bicultural. These individuals subscribe to and are influenced by both the traditional and mainstream cultures. These individuals incorporate components of both cultures into their lives. Garrett and Pichette (2000) put forth that bicultural Native Americans oftentimes experience acculturation stress, as they typically perceive themselves as alienated from both groups and have difficulty identifying with one particular culture. Research has demonstrated this sense of isolation commonly leads to psychological distress among children and adolescents (Garcia, Meyer, & Brillon, 1995; Glover, 1999; Ollendick & Byrd, 2001). The extreme side of the acculturation continuum contains individuals who have entirely assimilated to the mainstream culture and solely accept the beliefs and customs of the majority culture. To sum, level of acculturation is an important issue when examining parenting characteristics, and evaluating the degree of cultural identity is essential in

order to avoid fallible generalizations of research findings.

### *The Residential School Generation*

The residential school generation refers to a group of Native American children who were removed from their families and homeland to attend residential schools modeled after a European way of life (Ing, 1991; Morrissette, 1994). In 1933, it was estimated that over seventeen hundred children from the Albertan Native population alone left their reservations to attend one of 20 residential schools throughout Canada (McDonald as cited in Morrissette, 1994). In the United States, residential schools began in the seventeenth century and were funded by the government between 1810 and 1917. The schools were scattered all over the United States from Pennsylvania to California (Child & Lomawaima, 2000). The schools were later found to be an arena for possible emotional, sexual, and physical abuse as well as an environment where the Native children may have been taught to deplore and denounce their cultural identity, namely their Native language, beliefs, and value system (Child & Lomawaima, 2000, Ing, 1991). On account of these schools and their possible efforts to forcibly assimilate Native children, an entire generation of Native children may have been deprived of the opportunity to learn their culture during a highly impressionistic period in their development.

One facet of the Native childrens' upbringing that the residential schools possibly damaged was parenting. During the time endured at the schools, Native children were denied the opportunity to observe and garner parenting practices specific to their culture. Therefore, when the schools were terminated, the children returned to their Native homeland not only with the potential to lack the culturally appropriate parenting skills and ideologies, but also with ideas about parenting which were antithetical to their heritage (Ing, 1991). As previously

discussed, a central premise of the Native culture is the emphasis on the permeating role of the extended family. As the doubt and shameful feelings of the residential school generation may have endured over time, it is possible that the failed attempt to realign with indigenous traditions has resonated throughout Native culture and the negative implications of these byproducts could continue to affect many Native generations (Ing, 1991; Morrissette, 1994). Due to their possible traumatic childhood experiences in the residential schools, it has been hypothesized that many Native parents with direct (personally attended) or indirect (parents attended) residential school experience may lack the capability of effectively disciplining their children, as they consistently experience guilt and associate discipline with a sense of harshness. In addition, Native families and parents victimized by the harsh treatments of the residential schools have been described as being overly protective of their children, compromising generational boundaries, and lacking the ability to set appropriate limits. In turn, each of these parenting deficits may perpetuate parent-child conflicts and lead to a breakdown in the relationship (Morrissette, 1994). In contrast, as stated at the The National Inquiry into First Nations Child (Ing, 1991), other parents of the residential school generation are thought to harbor feelings of anger, and their hurtful childhood experiences may have translated into poor parenting practices: "...broken dreams and broken promises (have) contributed to family breakdown. We have parents who are bitter, and are passing their own bitterness on to their children" (p. 72). As a number of generations of Native parents may have attended residential schools, it is possible that inappropriate parenting behaviors have been passed down (Ing, 1991). For example, empirical studies with non-Native populations have shown that 47% of parents who have experienced harsh treatment as children demonstrate inappropriate and harsh behaviors toward their own children and, as a result, perpetuate the cycle of negative behaviors

(Egeland, Jacobvitz, & Sroufe, 1988).

It should be noted that the residential school experience may have changed over time and could have differential effects on parents based on time of attendance. In addition, Native literature asserts that not all children were involuntarily removed from their families and some parents recognized the residential schools as an opportunity for a better education (Child & Lomawaima, 2000). Thus, the residential school experience was diverse for Native children and caution should be taken in making generalizations about this experience.

### *Tribal Considerations*

The Native American population is a heterogeneous group comprised of hundreds of individual tribes each with their own unique cultural histories and characteristics. Prior to the arrival of the Europeans, individual Native American clans were autonomous communities each functioning with separate economic and political systems. Social organization for individual tribes was self-controlled and established based solely on the idiographic needs and values of each tribe. For example, some tribes operated under patriarchal control of power, whereas other tribes clearly demonstrated matrilineal lines of power (Glover, 2001).

Over the past two centuries, Native Americans have endured violent and destructive conflicts with European colonizers. Despite experiencing significant losses in geographic land holdings and population as well as encountering numerous attempts to be assimilated to the majority culture, some Native American tribes have been able to retain their specific identities (Hirechfelder & De Monteno, 1993).

In the southwest, Native tribes (e.g., Apache, Hopi, Navajo) share a number of common interests, including a strong penchant for farming and a passion for the use of ceramics. Additionally, southwestern tribes are similar in that they typically do not possess large urban

areas and stress the desire to retain smaller, more secure reservations (Pritzker, 1998b).

In the Northwest (e.g., Chinook, Makah), the Native tribes rely heavily on oceanic and forest resources and dedicate a great amount of time to building and fishing. In contrast to the tribes of the Southwest, tribes in the Northwest traditionally valued monetary systems that base social status on material possessions. In general, social status was inherited and the social organization of the Southwestern tribes was typically separated into classes (nobility, upper class, lower class, and slaves) (Pritzker, 1998a). Native Americans in the Great Plains (e.g., Cheyenne, Lakota) possess a unique history in that the erratic weather patterns often dictated their way of life. As this region was perpetually dry, Native Americans found it difficult to survive without the essential natural resources, oftentimes forcing a nomadic way of life. However, with the arrival of the horse from Europe, the people of this land were able to travel longer distances in a shorter period of time, establishing a more stable existence (Pritzker, 1998b).

The majority of the participants in this study belong to the Haudenosaunee (Iroquois). The Haudenosaunee is comprised of Six Nations that are primarily concentrated in the Northeastern part of the United States: Seneca, Cayuga, Onondaga, Oneida, Mohawk, and Tuscarora. These Nations, although separate and possessing their own identity, form a confederacy and are unified by a traditional law of governance called the Great Law of Peace which serves as the constitution of the Six Nation confederacy. The three main teachings of the Great Law of Peace are righteousness (good news), civil authority (power), and mind (reason). These teachings continue to guide the Haudenosaunee people and are said to be central to their way of life. It should be noted that Great Law holds Haudenosaunee women in high regard and their vast and numerous responsibilities permeate tribal life. For example, women are given the

title of Clan Mother and are expected to lead the family clans. The Haudenosaunee is unique in that it has preserved its own customs, beliefs, and laws and their territories have remained a sovereign land independent of any influence from the United States government. It has been said that the Haudenosaunee constitution and representative form of government was used as a prototype for the United States constitution and democratic process (Haudenosaunee, <http://sixnations.buffnet.net/>). Currently, the Haudenosaunee people live in sixteen communities throughout the United States and Canada. The Seneca, one of the Six Nations, is comprised of approximately 10,000 members and are concentrated in upstate New York where it has a number of land leases and the traditional government structure and social practices are still observed (Pritzker, 1998b).

#### *Purpose of Study*

The literature addressing Native American parenting practices refers to ideologies and traditions that are specific to the Native culture and often contradictory to Euro-centric parenting beliefs and values. However, it is important to emphasize that this literature is based almost exclusively on opinions and historical analyses. The current literature review revealed no research studies evaluating actual parenting practices of Native American families using normed and standardized measures. As a result, the first goal of this study was to use the Alabama Parenting Questionnaire to gather information about the parenting styles and techniques employed by one group of Native American families and to compare these techniques to a group of non-Native parents. To better understand how cultural identity influences these parenting practices, a measure of acculturation was included and analyzed as well. Additionally, this study examined the differences in both the overall acceptability as well as the specific components of BPT programs between a group of Native American parents and

non-Native parents. Lastly, differences in parenting beliefs and practices were examined among Native Americans with and without residential school experience.

### *Hypotheses*

1. Based on the expectation that many Native participants identify strongly with the Native culture, the Native American group was expected to be significantly less acculturated in comparison to the non-Native group.
2. As BPT programs are based on parenting ideologies central to non-Native cultural experiences (Forehand & Kotchick, 1996), it was hypothesized that the Native American sample would have significantly lower BPT acceptability scores in comparison to the non-Native group.
3. Based on the idea that Native parents subscribe to a more permissive style of parenting and, in turn, grant their children greater autonomy and independence than non-Native parents (Atkinson, Morten, & Sue, 1998), scores on the lower monitoring subscale of the Alabama Parenting Questionnaire (APQ) for the Native group were hypothesized to be significantly higher than scores for the non-Native group.
4. Due to the heavy emphasis placed on the role of the extended family in Native culture (Atkinson, Morten, & Sue, 1998; Garcia, Meyer, & Brillon, 1995; Wilburn, Ballew, & Sullivan, 2004), the acceptability rating of the TEI-SF extended family treatment vignette for the Native group was expected to be significantly higher than the rating for the non-Native group. In addition, a significant difference between the Native American and non-Native group was hypothesized for the upbringing portion of the demographic form in that more participants in the Native group were expected to indicate that individuals other than their spouse or partner assist with child-rearing duties. Lastly, the score on APQ item #45 [(extended family members

(e.g., aunts, uncles, grandparents) play an important role in disciplining your child)] was expected to be significantly higher for the Native group than the score for the non-Native group.

5. As the influence of the residential school experience on parenting has not been empirically investigated, exploratory analyses on all dependent variables were conducted. Also, based on the limited information that exists in the literature, two general hypotheses were put forth:

(a) as the residential school experience disallowed Native children the opportunity to identify with or experience their cultural beliefs and rituals for a large portion of their impressionistic childhood years (Ing, 1991), it was predicted that individuals with direct (personally attended) or indirect (parents attended) experience with residential schools would demonstrate or be less accepting of Native-specific parenting practices.

(b) As Native Americans who attended residential schools often were administered harsh punishments and exposed to destructive and debilitating parenting practices (Ing 1991), it was hypothesized that Native American parents with direct or indirect experience with residential schools would demonstrate or be more accepting of harsher discipline techniques (Egeland, Jacobvitz, & Sroufe, 1988).

## Method

### *Participants*

Forty-one Native American and 28 non-Native parents participated in the study. In order to be included in the study, parents had to meet the following criteria: (a) report that they are the biological or adoptive parent of a child between the ages of 4 and 12 years, and (b) report having current care-giving responsibilities for the child. To be included in the Native American group parents had to report their race/ethnicity as Native American on the demographic form used in this investigation. Individuals who reported their race as mixed (N = 10) with at least

25% of Native American heritage were included in the Native American group. Participants were included in the non-Native group if they reported their ethnicity as anything other than Native American. As this particular study sought to examine the Native acceptability of specific BPT components, participants did not necessarily need to have children with behavioral problems. A portion of the data was collected at The North American Iroquois Veterans Association Pow-wow in Little Valley, New York where the researchers were granted permission by the pow-wow organizers to have a special interest booth for the specific purpose of gathering data. In order to determine the study's acceptability, all research materials were viewed by the pow-wow organizers prior to the event. All data for the Native American group were collected at the pow-wow. In addition, 21 non-Native participants completed assessments at the pow-wow and 9 of these individuals were included in the data analyses. The remaining 12 non-Native participants from the pow-wow were excluded from the data analyses as these individuals reported to be directly related to a Native American (i.e. married to a Native American, parent of Native child) thus presenting cultural influences that served as a confound in the data. The majority (N = 19) of the non-Native participants were recruited at the Boys and Girls Club in Morgantown, West Virginia. Participants were compensated seven dollars for their time upon completion of all measures. Regardless of the number of children within the family unit, each participant was only allowed to fill out the form packet once. Each participant needed approximately forty minutes to complete all assessments.

### *Measures*

*Alabama Parenting Questionnaire (APQ)-Parent Report Form.* The APQ (Shelton, Frick, & Wooton, 1996) was devised to assess specific aspects of parenting demonstrated to be connected with the development of behavioral problems in children ages 6 to 13 (see Appendix

A). In this study, the APQ was used to assess both Native American and non-Native parenting practices. The questionnaire consists of 42 items rated on a 5-point endorsement scale which assesses the frequency of parenting behaviors in the home setting: never, almost never, sometimes, often, and always. The 42 items are scored on 5 parenting constructs or subscales: parental involvement (e.g., “you help your child with his/her homework”); positive parenting (e.g., “you praise your child if he/she behaves well”); lower monitoring/supervision<sup>1</sup> (e.g., “your child is out with friends you don’t know”); inconsistent discipline (e.g., “you threaten to punish your child and then do not actually punish him/her”); corporal punishment (e.g., “you slap your child when he/she has done something wrong”). Furthermore, in order not to place a bias on the specific corporal punishment methods outlined in the APQ, an additional 7 items assessing discipline techniques are included (contingency management strategies, timeout, planned ignoring, etc.). Lastly, in order to make the measure more culturally sensitive and to include culturally specific parenting practices, the following six Native American parenting items were added and placed randomly throughout the assessment: “you indicate that the child’s behavior will cause shame to you as a parent,” “extended family members (e.g., aunts, uncles, grandparents) play a role in disciplining your child,” “you have family meetings where everyone has a turn to talk without interruptions,” “you tell tribal stories that teach your child right from wrong,” “you honor your child with an event (e.g., dances, give-away, name-giving) when he has done something well,” “you use sage, cedar, or other herbs to help your child to center their attention.” These items were developed based on personal communication with Dr. Dee Bigfoot and other consultants with expertise in traditional Native parenting practices. These six items devised the Native American parenting subscale.

---

<sup>1</sup> The original name of the construct is “poor monitoring/supervision.”

Although the psychometric properties of the APQ have not been analyzed extensively, preliminary research has demonstrated promising results. In order to expand the age range of the measure and lend more flexibility and utility to the APQ, Dadds and Fraser (2003) assessed the psychometric properties of the questionnaire with a younger population (ages 4-9) and demonstrated moderate to strong internal consistency (.55 to .77) across subscales. Also, convergent validity was strong for all subscales (-.18 to .31). Next, test-retest reliability showed stability across a 2-week span (.84 to .90). In addition, Shelton et al. (1996) found solid internal reliability among the involvement, positive parenting, and inconsistent parenting subscales (>.7) but low internal reliability for lower monitoring/supervision and corporal punishment (>.4). An insufficient number of items within each construct may play a role in this finding. Furthermore, Shelton et al. demonstrated a variability of scores throughout each construct of the APQ, indicating a low correlation with socially desirable responses. Dadds, Maujean, and Fraser (2003) demonstrated highly correlated test-retest results for each parenting construct over a 2-week period: parental involvement (.87), lower monitoring/supervision (.84), positive parenting (.85), inconsistent discipline (.88), and corporal punishment (.90). The APQ is scored by attaining scaled scores for each parenting subscale. The range for each subscales' score are as follows: parental involvement (10-50), lower monitoring/supervision (10-50), positive parenting (6-30), inconsistent discipline (6-30), and corporal punishment (5-15).

In addition to the APQ, there was an opportunity for participants to write-in parenting practices that were not included in the APQ. Similar to the majority of parenting practice measures, the APQ was developed with a predominantly European sample (Dadds et al., 2003; Shelton, Frick, & Wootton, 1996); therefore, there is an inherent risk that the measure does not capture the entire scope of Native practices. A qualitative write-in section allowed participants

the occasion to offer additional information that was helpful in enhancing the cultural sensitivity of the assessments.

*Treatment Evaluation Inventory-Short Form (TEI-SF)*. The TEI-SF was administered to study participants in order to assess which specific components of BPT programs are deemed acceptable by both the Native and non-Native populations. The TEI-SF (Kelley, Heffer, Gresham, & Elliot, 1989) is a 9-item measure used to assess the acceptability of behavior modification techniques used for children (see Appendix B). The TEI-SF is an abbreviated version of the TEI (Kazdin, 1980a; 1981; 1984). Authors of the TEI-SF modified the TEI for several reasons. First, several items on the assessment were difficult to read and wordy. Secondly, the 7-item Likert scale was not being used in its entirety, as only the beginning, middle, and end choices were being selected. Lastly, Kelley et al. (1989) determined that a couple of items on the TEI were repetitive, and a reduction in the amount of items would make it more user-friendly and comprehensible to a greater portion of the population. Although the psychometric properties of the TEI-SF need to be further investigated, Kelley et al. found that the TEI-SF was an internally reliable (alpha coefficient of .85) and valid instrument in determining acceptable behavioral interventions for children.

In completing the TEI-SF, each participant was asked to read a specific case vignette of an 8 year old male(s) (see Appendix C) who exhibited each DSM-IV symptom of oppositional defiant disorder (ODD). After the participant read the character vignette, he/she then read nine vignettes describing behavior modification techniques that are typically taught in BPT programs (differential attention, over-correction, positive reinforcement, response cost, spanking, and time-out). In addition, three vignettes that depicted Native parenting practices (talking circle, story telling, extended family involvement) were added to the assessment (see Appendix D).

Similar to the manner in which the Native American items were developed and added to the APQ, the additional Native vignettes were based on information and literature from Dr. Dee Bigfoot and other consultants with expertise in Native parenting. All treatment vignettes were matched in length and were maintained at approximately a 10<sup>th</sup> grade reading level according to the Flesch-Kincaid reading level assessment.<sup>2</sup> The order of the vignettes were randomized so that the Native-specific parenting techniques were not displayed in consecutive order. After reading the specific behavioral interventions, subjects were then asked to assess how personally acceptable each treatment would be, how likely they would be to utilize each intervention, and how effective the techniques would be if used. The 9 items were rated on a 5 point endorsement scale with 1 equaling strongly disagree and 5 equaling strongly agree. Item 6 was reverse scored. Scores of the TEI-SF range from 9 to 45 for each behavioral modification technique with 27 representing moderate acceptability (Kazdin, 1981). As BPT programs no longer use spanking as a behavioral modification technique, the score of this vignette was removed in the analysis examining treatment acceptability. Therefore, this study defined acceptability of BPT programs as the cumulative value attained from the following five vignettes: differential attention, over-correction, positive reinforcement, response cost, and time-out. Although each of these BPT components was analyzed individually, the composite BPT score was also used as a dependent measure. Scores of the BPT composite ranged from 45 to 225 with 135 signifying moderate acceptability.

*Native American Acculturation Scale (NAAS)*. In order to account for differing levels of acculturation, Garrett and Pichette (2000) devised the NAAS (see Appendix E), an assessment which examines adherence to traditional Native beliefs, values and customs. The NAAS is a 20-

---

<sup>2</sup> Formula for the Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level score is:  $(.39 \times \text{ASL}) + (11.8 \times \text{ASW}) - 15.59$  where: ASL equals average sentence length (number of words divided by the number of sentences) and ASW equals the average number of syllables per word (number of syllables divided by the number of words).

item measure assessing Native identity along a continuum ranging from a traditional Native American lifestyle to an assimilated European-American way of life. The NAAS examines Native adherence to a variety of Native American characteristics, including language, friendships, behaviors, generational/geographic background, and attitudes. The NAAS has been written on a ninth-grade reading level and is therefore comprehensible to a large portion of the population. Each item on the NAAS is rated on a 5-point Likert scale with 1 representing a low level of ethnic identification (strong Native identity) and 5 representing a high level of ethnic identification (weak Native identity). A Likert score of 3 specifies a bicultural identity. The NAAS is scored by summing all of the items and dividing by twenty and calculating an overall mean score which ranges from 1 to 5. An overall score above 3 designates a stronger non-Native affiliation whereas a mean score below 3 indicates an individual with a stronger Native identification. The overall strength of cultural identification is contingent upon the mean score, with more extreme scores (1 or 5) indicating stronger association with the Native or non-Native culture. The cutoff scores for the NAAS were devised by an expert panel composed of members from various groups and institutions, including the Indian Health Service, the Native American Research and Training Center, and the University of North Carolina at Pembroke.

Although the psychometric properties of the NAAS have yet to be firmly established, a preliminary study with a sample of 139 high school students demonstrated an encouraging alpha coefficient of 0.91. In addition, the NAAS was based on acculturation scales (Acculturation Rating Scale for Mexican Americans [ARSMA]; Suinn-Lew Asian Self-Identity Acculturation Scale [SL-ASIA]) that similarly viewed acculturation as a multi-faceted process that permeates an individual's entire sense of identity. A number of studies (Atkinson, Lowe, & Matthews, 1995; Cuellar, Harris & Jasso, 1980; Ponce & Atkinson, 1985) using these

assessments have consistently demonstrated strong psychometric properties with various populations.

*Demographic Form.* Each participant was asked to complete a demographic form which included participant's age and gender, marital status, number of children in household, ages of children in household, target child's age, target child's gender, relationship to child, participant's race, highest education level, income level, current living area, tribal affiliation, tribe mother identifies herself with, tribe father identifies himself with, distance of current residency to reservation/family, amount of times per month participant visits tribal community, individual experience with residential schools, parent experience with residential schools, occupation status, occupation description, and child-rearing responsibilities (see Appendix F).

*Hollingshead.* Information about the participant's occupation and education level was obtained from the demographic questionnaire (see Appendix F). A social position score was derived for each family based on the two-factor index created by Hollingshead (1957). In this two-factor index, education level and type of occupation were assigned a score. These scores were used in a formula in which weighted and scaled scores are multiplied for each category. The respective product of the two scores are added to attain a social class score (i.e., Class I being upper class, Class III being middle class, and Class V being lower class).

### *Procedures*

All participants at the pow-wow who approached the informational booth were initially queried about their current care-giving role and age of child. All individuals who met inclusion criteria were invited to read a cover letter outlining the purpose of the study and complete form packets comprised of the APQ, TEI-SF, NAAS, and demographic form. In addition, participants at the Boys and Girls Club were approached and queried about their care-giving

status and age of child. Individuals who met inclusion criteria for the study were given form packets to complete and return to the study coordinator. In order to control for carry-over effects between the TEI-SF and APQ, participants were asked to complete the forms in varying order. Each form packet was assigned a number. This number served as a subject number and was used for identification purposes as well as to ensure that the order of the forms administered was counter-balanced.

## Results

### *Missing Data*

There were a total of 69 participants included in the data analyses with 41 participants in the Native American group and 28 participants in the non-Native group. In terms of missing data for the TEI-SF, a participant's scores on the specific TEI-SF vignette were averaged, and this mean replaced the missing data point(s). Likewise, a participant's scores on each APQ subscale were averaged and replaced the missing data point(s). For the NAAS, the overall average of the measurement was used to replace missing data for each participant. Missing data was minimal with the majority of participants omitting less than 2% of the data. The maximum amount of data missing for one participant was 12%. In order to reduce missing data, study personnel looked over the completed assessments before the participants were compensated. If missing data was found, participants were asked if the omission was intentional.

### *Demographic Characteristics*

Demographic characteristics of the sample are presented in Table 1. A total of 24 Native American tribes were reported and are represented in the data. The majority of individuals (71.9%) reported being affiliated with one of the six tribes of the Iroquois nation. A total of twenty six (63.4%) Native American participants reported that they or their parents had direct

experience with residential schools. Twenty-two (53.7%) participants were currently living on a reservation belonging to a Native tribe or nation. In the non-Native group, there were 21 (75%) Caucasian, 4 (14.3%) African-American, 1 Asian-American (3.6%), and 2 (7.1%) Hispanic participants represented in the sample.

#### *Between Group Comparison of Demographic Characteristics*

Between-group analyses revealed no significant differences on any of the following demographic variables: age, gender, marital status, total income, mean number of children, average age of target child, and presence of child with oppositional behavior. A two-sample chi-square test revealed significant between-group differences for level of education,  $\chi^2(1, N = 68) = 4.16, p = .041$ . See Table 2 for a description of the sample.

#### *Qualitative Comparisons with Normative Samples*

Table 3 presents the APQ means and standard deviations for both groups as well as data from a study conducted by Dadds and Fraser (2003) with a community sample of 802 four-to-nine year old ( $M = 6.3, SD = 1.0$ ) children recruited from various elementary schools throughout Australia. The majority of the sample was Caucasian (90%), belonged to two-parent households (87%) and had two or fewer siblings (84%). Data from previous literature is beneficial to this study as it provides a comparative reference group. One-sample t-tests revealed no significant differences between the normative sample and the non-Native group for the following subscales: positive parenting, total involvement, and inconsistent discipline. For the lower monitoring subscale, the non-Native group ( $M = 13.6, SD = 3.5$ ) had significantly higher mean scores than the normative group ( $M = 12, SD = 2.8$ ),  $t(27) = 2.46, p < .05$ . In addition, for the corporal punishment subscale, the normative group ( $M = 5.6, SD = 1.6$ ) had significantly higher mean scores than the non-Native group ( $M = 4.9, SD = 1.4$ ),  $t(27) = -2.66, p < .05$ .

Table 4 displays the means and standard deviations for the TEI-SF acceptability scores for both the Native American and non-Native group. In addition, the mean scores and standard deviations for the six original TEI-SF vignettes from a study by Jones, Eyberg, Adams, and Boggs (1998) are included to serve as a comparative reference. The Jones et. al study included 20 mothers ( $M = 34.0$ ,  $SD = 8.6$ ) of children ( $M = 5.5$ ,  $SD = .10$ ) referred to treatment for conduct problems. The majority of the children in the sample were male (75%) and Caucasian (60%). One-sample t-tests revealed no significant differences between the normative sample and the non-Native group for the following subscales: differential attention, over-correction, positive reinforcement, response cost, and spanking. For the time out vignette, the normative group ( $M = 32.5$ ,  $SD = 5.3$ ) had significantly lower scores than the non-Native group ( $M = 34.9$ ,  $SD = 5.7$ ),  $t = 2.16$ .

#### *Power Analyses*

An analysis was conducted in order to determine the amount of power to detect true differences between group means and revealed low power on all non-significant tests. Power ranged from 9% to 36%. The power analysis suggests that non-significant results in this study should be considered with caution as there may have been additional differences between the groups that were not detected because of the low power.

#### *Major Analyses*

##### *Hypothesis 1 (Acculturation)*

An independent samples t-test was conducted to examine group differences on the NAAS (see Table 2). The Native American group attained lower scores ( $M = 2.8$ ,  $SD = .56$ ) on the measure than the non-Native group ( $M = 4.4$ ,  $SD = .44$ ). This difference was significant,  $t(67) = -12.98$ ,  $p < .001$ , with strength of effect, as measured by Cohen's  $d$ , of  $-3.17$  signifying

a large effect size. Thus, in support of the hypothesis, the Native American group showed a significantly lower level of acculturation compared to the non-Native group. Further, the Native American group scored below the cutoff of 3 indicating that this group had identified more with Native beliefs and customs. Likewise, the non-Native group's score indicates a stronger identification with non-Native customs and beliefs.

*Hypothesis 2 (BPT Composite)*

An independent samples t-test comparing the means of the groups on the TEI-SF BPT composite did not reveal a significant difference between the Native American group ( $M = 153.9$ ) and the non-Native group ( $M = 161.1, SD = 15.5, t(67) = -1.67, p > .05$ ) (see Table 4). Hence, there was not a significant difference in the acceptability of BPT programs between the groups. Additionally, both groups' scores fell above the composite score cutoff of 135 signifying greater than moderate acceptability of BPT components across groups. The results of this test were contrary to the proposed hypothesis stating that the Native American group would demonstrate a significantly lower rating of acceptability compared to the non-Native group.

*Hypothesis 3 (Extended Family)*

An independent samples t-test comparing the means of the groups on the TEI-SF extended family vignette revealed a significant difference between the Native American group ( $M = 29.6, SD = 7.9$ ) and the non-Native group ( $M = 24.7, SD = 9.5, t(67) = 2.35, p < .05$ ) (see Table 4). The strength of the effect, as measured by Cohen's  $d$ , was .57 indicating a medium effect size. The results of the test supported the hypothesis that the Native American group would be more accepting of involving extended family in child-rearing than the non-Native group. Further, mean scores revealed that the non-Native group score was below the acceptability cutoff score of 27 suggesting that this group did not rate the utilization of extended

family as an acceptable discipline strategy.

In addition, a two-sample chi-square test was conducted to determine if a larger proportion of Native American participants endorsed the utilization of extended family in child-rearing duties in comparison to non-Native participants. In order to run the statistical test, all the options (a, b, c, and f) on the upbringing portion of the demographic form indicating spousal assistance or independent rearing of children were combined into one category and both options (d and e) representing the assistance of members besides one's spouse or partner were combined to form another group. Therefore, the variables were entered into the statistical test as a dichotomy where a participant either did or did not use extended family to assist in child-rearing. Results of the test revealed that more individuals ( $N = 19, 46.3\%$ ) in the Native American group depended on extended family in comparison to the number of individuals ( $N = 5, 17.9\%$ ) in the non-Native group,  $\chi^2(1, N = 69) = 5.95, p = .015$ . Table 5 presents a description of which specific member of the family shared child-rearing responsibilities accompanied by the number of families who shared responsibility with that particular individual. Reliance on grandparents was reported most often for both groups. In addition, the Native group reported involving an older sibling in child-rearing duties ( $N = 5$ ) whereas the non-Native group did not endorse using this member of the family to assist with childcare.

Lastly, an independent samples t-test comparing the mean score for the extended family item on the APQ revealed a significant difference between the Native American group ( $M = 2.9, SD = 1.3$ ) and the non-Native group ( $M = 2.3, SD = .97$ ),  $t(66) = 2.17, p < .05$ . The strength of the effect, as measured by Cohen's  $d$ , was .53 indicating a medium effect size.

#### *Hypothesis 4 (APQ Lower Monitoring)*

An independent samples t-test comparing the means of the groups on the APQ lower

monitoring subscale revealed a significant difference between the Native American group ( $M = 16.6, SD = 6.5$ ) and the non-Native group ( $M = 13.6, SD = 3.5$ ),  $t(66) = 2.42, p < .05$  (see Table 3). The strength of this effect, as measured by Cohen's  $d$ , was .59 signifying a medium effect size. The results of this test supported the proposed hypothesis that the Native American group would monitor their children less than the non-Native group. It should be noted that Levene's test for equality of variance was significant indicating that equal variances were not assumed for this result.

*Hypothesis 5 (Residential School)*

Exploratory analyses revealed no significant differences between the Native American participants with and without residential school experience on acceptability scores for all components of the TEI-SF, except for the tribal story and differential attention vignettes (see Table 6). In addition, no significant between-group differences were found on the APQ subscales, except the corporal punishment subscale (see Table 7). An analysis was conducted in order to determine the amount of power to detect true differences between group means and revealed low power on all non-significant tests. Power ranged from 5% to 14%.

An independent samples t-test was conducted on the mean scores of the TEI-SF tribal story vignette and a revealed significant group difference between the Native American group with direct or indirect (parental) experience with residential schools ( $M = 28, SD = 6.5$ ) and the Native American group with no reported experience of residential schools ( $M = 33.9, SD = 5.99$ ),  $t(39) = -2.93, p = .003$  (one-tailed). The magnitude of the effect, as measured by Cohen's  $d$ , was .94, signifying a large effect size. This result supported the hypothesis that residential school experience resulted in less acceptability of some Native-specific parenting practices. Next, an independent samples t-test was conducted on the mean scores of the TEI-SF

differential addition vignette and a revealed significant group difference between the Native American group with direct or indirect (parental) experience with residential schools ( $M = 31.8$ ,  $SD = 6.50$ ) and the Native American group with no reported experience of residential schools ( $M = 26.5$ ,  $SD = 9.09$ ),  $t(39) = 1.97$ ,  $p = .028$  (one-tailed). The magnitude of the effect, as measured by Cohen's  $d$ , was .67, signifying a medium effect size.

An independent samples t-test was conducted on the mean scores of the APQ corporal punishment subscale and a revealed significant group difference between the Native American group with direct or indirect (parental) experience with residential schools ( $M = 5.3$ ,  $SD = 6.5$ ) and the Native American group with no reported experience of residential schools ( $M = 4.4$ ,  $SD = 1.3$ ),  $t(38) = 1.90$ ,  $p = .033$  (one-tailed). The magnitude of the effect, as measured by Cohen's  $d$ , was .62, signifying a medium effect size.

#### *Additional Analyses*

As this is the first known empirical study evaluating Native American parenting, exploratory analyses of all dependent variables were conducted. Specifically, independent samples t-tests were conducted for the Native American group versus the non-Native group on all subscales of the APQ and TEI-SF. Two variables came out significant: positive reinforcement vignette of the TEI-SF (see Table 4) and Native American subscale of the APQ (see Table 3).

#### *Treatment Acceptability*

Results on the acceptability score of the TEI-SF positive reinforcement vignette revealed a significant difference between the Native American group ( $M = 29.0$ ,  $SD = 7.8$ ) and the non-Native group ( $M = 33.6$ ,  $SD = 5.5$ ),  $t(67) = -2.88$ ,  $p < .01$  (see Table 4). The strength of the effect, as measured by Cohen's  $d$ , was -.70, indicating a large effect size. Although the

groups differed significantly, the Native American score fell above the acceptability cutoff (27) indicating that positive reinforcement is moderately accepted by this group.

#### *Parenting Practices*

An independent samples t-test conducted on the Native American subscale of the APQ demonstrated a significant difference between the Native American group ( $M = 15.5$ ,  $SD = 3.80$ ) and the non-Native group ( $M = 13.6$ ,  $SD = 2.8$ ),  $t(66) = 2.31$ ,  $p < .05$  (see Table 3). The strength of the effect, as measured by Cohen's  $d$ , was .57, signifying a medium effect size.

#### *Qualitative Comparisons of the APQ Write-In Item*

Table 8 displays the write-in results for the additional parenting strategy item on the APQ. For the Native American group ( $N = 14$ ), 7 (50%) participants reported that they splashed water in their child's face as a form of a discipline whereas no non-Native participants reported using this strategy. In addition, a relatively equal number of Native American ( $N = 3$ ) and non-Native participants ( $N = 4$ ) indicated that communication was used as a parenting technique.

#### *Correlational Analyses of Acculturation with Extended Family, Treatment Acceptability, and Parenting Practices*

Correlational analyses examining the relation between acculturation and all dependent variables were conducted (see Table 9) and the following variables came out significant: use of extended family as measured by the demographic form, positive reinforcement vignette of the TEI-SF, response cost vignette of the BPT, timeout vignette of the TEI-SF, BPT composite score, Native American subscale of the APQ, and lower monitoring subscale of the APQ.

A bivariate correlational analysis revealed a negative correlation between acculturation and the use of extended family (as assessed on the demographic form) in childrearing indicating that lower levels of acculturation increased the likelihood of extended family assistance,  $r(69)$

=  $-.26, p < .05$ .

Likewise, bivariate correlational analysis conducted on the TEI-SF acceptability scores revealed a positive correlation between acculturation and acceptability of the positive reinforcement vignette demonstrating that higher levels of acculturation were associated with greater acceptance of positive reinforcement as a treatment strategy,  $r(69) = .27, p < .05$ . Further, a positive correlation was revealed between acculturation and acceptability of the response cost vignette,  $r(69) = .24, p < .05$ . Another positive correlation was found between acculturation and acceptability of the timeout vignette indicating that higher levels of acculturation increased the likelihood of accepting timeout as a treatment strategy,  $r(69) = .26, p < .05$ . Lastly, the correlational analyses revealed a positive correlation between acculturation and the BPT composite score suggesting that higher levels of acculturation was associated with higher acceptance of the core components of behavioral parent training,  $r(69) = .24, p < .05$ .

In addition, the correlation analysis demonstrated a negative correlation between acculturation and the APQ lower monitoring subscale indicating that lower acculturation levels were associated with increased lower monitoring scores,  $r(68) = -.34, p < .01$ . Lastly, the analysis demonstrated a negative correlation between acculturation and the APQ Native American subscale suggesting that lower levels of acculturation increased the likelihood of higher scores on the Native American subscale,  $r(68) = -.29, p < .05$ .

### Discussion

This study sought to compare level of acculturation, acceptance of BPT programs, and parenting practices between a Native and non-Native American sample. Results of the study revealed a significant difference in the acculturation level between the two groups. Also, in general, the Native American and non-Native American groups endorsed using a number of

similar parenting behaviors. Study results also showed that both groups found several BPT components to be acceptable parenting interventions. Alternatively, study results indicated that several important differences existed between the two groups. As far as treatment acceptability, results showed that Native parents accepted and used extended family to assist in child-rearing duties significantly more than non-Native parents. Further, Native parents showed significantly less acceptability for positive reinforcement strategies (i.e., sticker charts). In terms of parenting practices, the study revealed significant between-group differences on parental monitoring behaviors. Also, qualitative comparisons demonstrated that this particular group of Native parents employed splashing water in their child's face as a discipline strategy. In addition, Native parents endorsed using Native-specific parenting strategies significantly more than non-Native parents. Analyses comparing Native individuals with and without direct or indirect residential school experience revealed a significant between-group difference in accepting the use of tribal stories as a possible parenting strategy. Lastly, the study revealed that cultural identification and level of education are critical factors to consider when designing and implementing BPT programs for Native families.

#### *Acculturation*

As hypothesized, the Native American group was significantly less acculturated than the non-Native group. This finding is not surprising considering the Native American data were gathered at a pow-wow on Native land thus presenting a population base rich in Native culture and tradition. Analyzing data from a group of individuals with lower levels of acculturation lends more credibility to the findings and implications of the study as it suggests that the particular parenting beliefs and practices endorsed by the Native Americans in this sample may be indicative of other individuals who identify more with Native beliefs and customs. In

contrast, the comparison group demonstrated strong identification with non-Native culture, therefore presenting behaviors and attitudes more representative of other cultures, particularly European-American. It is important to note that although this particular Native sample is less acculturated than this particular non-Native sample, there remains the possibility that this Native group is more acculturated than other Native populations in more rural and isolated areas (e.g. remote reservations in Alaska or western states). In sum, the groups represented in this study differ in level of acculturation, thus granting a certain degree of external validity to the study findings. Yet, generalizing the results of this study to other groups of Native Americans must be done with caution, as levels of acculturation are expected to vary greatly across Native American communities.

#### *Acceptability of Behavioral Parent Training Programs*

Overall acceptability of behavioral parent training programs was not significantly different between the Native and non-Native groups. In addition, it is important to note that both groups attained scores above the acceptability cutoff level of 135 on the TEI-SF, with the Native group demonstrating a slightly lower acceptability score than the non-Native group.

Interestingly, although the overall composite score on the TEI-SF did not differ between groups, exploratory analyses revealed a significant difference between the Native and non-Native groups for the positive reinforcement vignette, in that the Native group found this parenting strategy to be less acceptable. This vignette presented a situation where a parent rewarded the child with stickers that (after a certain amount have been attained) could be redeemed for other rewards. One possible explanation for the Native group reporting positive reinforcement as less acceptable is related to the idea that Native American parents tend to subscribe to a more relaxed style of parenting in which children are granted more sovereignty in

the decision-making process (Atkinson, Morten, & Sue, 1998). Therefore, children are oftentimes expected to learn from personal experience (e.g., natural consequences) rather than relying upon small reinforcements from their parents to modify their behavior. Another explanation for the finding could stem from the notion that Native American families tend to honor their children in other ways (e.g., dances, name-giving ceremonies, tribal praise) and may not find value in stickers (BigFoot-Sipes & Willis, 1993).

To further explore the acceptability of BPT programs for Native American parents, correlations between acculturation and the TEI-SF scores were examined. There were small but significant relations found between acculturation and the following TEI-SF scales: positive reinforcement, response cost, time out, and BPT composite. The positive reinforcement correlation supports the between-group finding that a greater affiliation with Native customs and beliefs is associated with less acceptability of sticker charts. Interestingly, the response cost correlation reveals that individuals with more adherence to the Native culture tend to accept this parenting strategy less. Likewise, the timeout correlation demonstrates that individuals who identify more strongly with Native customs find the timeout procedure to be a less acceptable discipline strategy. Last, the correlation examining acculturation and BPT composite suggests that a stronger Native identity is associated with less overall acceptability of BPT programs.

Taken together, the findings suggest that, in general, the Native American parents found the techniques used in BPT to be appropriate and acceptable approaches to parenting. These findings are promising for the existing state of BPT programs suggesting that they might be a suitable and sensitive treatment for this ethnic group. Although the particular groups in this study did not differ significantly on a number of acceptability variables, findings show that it is important to account for level of acculturation prior to generalizing these between-group

findings.

### *Extended Family*

As hypothesized, significant between-group differences were found for the TEI-SF extended family vignette suggesting that Native American parents use extended family to assist with disciplining their children more than non-Native parents. Adding more credibility to this finding, significantly more Native American parents indicated that individuals other than a spouse or partner actually assisted and/or shared child-rearing duties compared to the non-Native families. Additionally, scores on the APQ item assessing for the use of extended family were significantly higher for the Native group, and a correlation analysis showed that less acculturation was associated with higher dependence on extended family. The findings may have significant implications for BPT programs in that behavioral parent-training programs often focus on the parent-child interaction and do not typically involve extended family members in therapy. As Table 8 demonstrates, this sample of Native American parents reported that a number of individuals assist with the child-rearing duties including grandmothers, grandfathers, cousins, older siblings, and family friends. Therefore, researchers and clinicians may want to consider involving a wider variety of individuals in the therapy process when working with Native American families.

It should be noted that these findings may be influenced by environment in that those living on reservation lands (53.7%) may have more extended family available to assist with child-rearing. Therefore, contextual issues need to be considered when interpreting these results.

### *Parenting Practices*

Although several parenting constructs on the APQ (see Table 3) did not differ between

groups, study findings reveal significantly higher scores on the lower monitoring subscale for the Native group in comparison to the non-Native group and normative sample, providing empirical data suggesting that Native parents may engage in a more permissive, non-confrontational style of parenting characterized by a greater amount of independence and autonomy on the part of the child. This finding is important as it adds more credibility to the theoretical assumptions concerning this particular aspect of Native parenting (Atkinson, Morten, & Sue, 1998). Providing additional support to this finding, a small but significant correlation between acculturation and the APQ lower monitoring subscale revealed that higher scores on the subscale are associated with lower levels of acculturation suggesting that this parenting approach is associated with cultural identification.

As lower monitoring and supervision of one's child tends to be viewed negatively within the European-American framework of parenting, it is important to consider this finding in a cultural context. Taking into account that Native American families may rely on extended family and members of the community to participate in child-rearing activities, Native parents may have less need to closely supervise and monitor their children. In addition, consideration also should be given to the possibility that close monitoring of children in a rural area or on tribal lands may not be as necessary for the safety of the child as compared to the need for supervision in a more urban setting. Thus, this result should be interpreted with caution and further studies should examine this parenting construct within both a cultural and contextual framework (i.e. reservations).

In addition to differences on the lower monitoring subscale, significant between-group differences were also found on the APQ Native American subscale (items assessed use of extended family, honoring with ceremonies, use of sage and cedar, child's behavior causing

shame, family meetings and tribal stories) with the Native American parents demonstrating significantly higher scores than the non-Native group. This finding is to be expected as the Native American items were added in order to make the assessment more culturally sensitive. In support of this finding, correlations examining the relation between acculturation and the Native American parenting construct found that stronger identification with Native culture was associated with more Native-specific parenting practices.

In order to make BPT programs more acceptable and sensitive for cultural groups, several researchers have gathered and/or suggested the use of qualitative data as a means to collect information regarding perceptions of BPT programs (Fernandez & Eyberg, 2004; McCabe & Perez, 2002). In this study, a write-in section was included as an addendum to the APQ as a way of collecting additional parenting strategies not found on the assessment. Although a range of parenting strategies was included, one practice in particular was consistently mentioned: the use of splashing water in the child's face as a means of discipline. A review of the parenting literature [PsycInfo] found no mention of this particular strategy among any ethnic group. Clearly, as a number of Native parents referenced this parenting approach as a behavior modification technique, a more detailed investigation is needed to examine this parenting strategy. Factors such as etiology, epidemiology, acceptability, and effectiveness of this technique need to be considered in future analyses. As a first step, focus groups with Native parents in this particular part of the country, as well as other regions, should be conducted in order to gain a more thorough understanding of this parenting behavior. Currently, the use of water as a discipline technique in Native families must be interpreted with caution as it is possible that this is an idiosyncratic parenting approach used only by Native families in this region.

Overall, the findings regarding parenting practices suggest that the Native parents in this study demonstrated many similar parenting behaviors as compared to the non-Native parents. However, it is necessary to point out that enough important and unique differences existed between the groups to suggest that there are cultural differences in parenting practices that warrant attention and further investigation.

### *Residential Schools*

In order to examine the effect of residential school experience on parenting practices, the scores of Native American participants who had direct or indirect (parental) experience with residential schools were compared to the scores of Native American participants without direct or indirect residential school experience. Results of the analysis revealed that most of the treatment acceptability ratings and parenting practices were not significantly different between groups. However, the Native group with residential experience demonstrated significantly less acceptability for the telling of tribal stories. One possible explanation is that individuals who were forced to attend residential schools or those whose parents attended residential schools were essentially removed from their culture and subsequently deprived of their cultural traditions. (Ing, 1991; Morrissette, 1994). Therefore, the logic follows that these individuals ceased to have the opportunity to gain knowledge about traditional tribal stories and, in turn, perceive this parenting strategy as less useful in comparison to those individuals raised in Native households rich with culture and tradition. Further supporting this explanation, the wording of the tribal story vignette is as follows: "...his parents tell him a tribal story that has been passed down from generation to generation." Therefore, it can be said that residential schools may have disallowed Native parents the opportunity to learn tribal stories, and, in essence, occluding Native oral tradition.

Likewise, Native parents with direct or indirect residential school experience demonstrated a higher rate of acceptability for differential attention. This particular vignette describes a strategy where a parent presents social reinforcement upon child compliance and ignores the child upon noncompliance. This result was unexpected and it is difficult to interpret given the lack of knowledge regarding the impact of residential school experience on parenting. However, it is possible that ignoring was used frequently in residential schools and therefore is more familiar and comfortable to individuals with that experience. Yet, additional research is needed to determine whether this finding will be replicated with a different sample.

In addition, results supported the hypothesis that Native Americans with direct or indirect (parental) experience with residential schools would use significantly more corporal discipline strategies than those without exposure to the residential schools. Due to the deleterious conditions and exposure to the harsh discipline practices demonstrated within the residential schools (Ing, 1991; Child & Lomawaima, 2000), compounded by research that has demonstrated that individuals exposed to harsh parenting behaviors at a young age later evidence similar behaviors with their own children (Egeland, Jacobvitz, & Sroufe, 1988), these findings are not surprising. However, as the residential school experience may have been diverse in terms of time attended, quality of schools, and individual experiences, the generalizability of the results is questionable (Child & Lomawaima, 2000).

Clearly, the residential school generation is a population that needs further examination before conclusions can be made regarding the possible impact of the removal of Native American children from their families and communities might have had on subsequent parenting practices and attitudes.

*Limitations*

In addition to the promising findings of the present study, certain limitations must be considered when interpreting the results. First, as Cohen (1990) points out, the use of many statistical tests greatly increases the chance of committing Type I error, as a large number of inferential tests yield significant findings solely based on the numerous variables being analyzed. Although statistical significance was found on a number of analyses, the large number of dependent variables, coupled with a small sample size, limited the power to detect differences between groups. In order to correct for this, future studies that include a large amount of dependent variables should make great efforts to attain an equivalent number of participants for each group as well as increase sample size. Similarly, due to a small number of subjects in the residential school and non-residential school groups, there was limited power to detect between-group differences. Again, future studies with this population should strive to attain larger sample sizes in order to detect significant effects between groups.

Second, a potential limitation is the difference in the amount of education each group received. As the groups are not similar in terms of education level, it can be hypothesized that the differences found in the study are better accounted for by education level than ethnicity. On the other hand, the education levels in the study are representative of the national percentages as shown by the 2000 United States Census data (percentages based on individuals 25 years and older): 65.9% of the Native American sample had a high school degree or less versus 58.9% of the Native population. In addition, the non-Native sample is representative of the population as 40.7% of the sample had a high school degree or less in comparison to 45.9% of the Caucasian population (percentage based on Caucasian population as the majority of the non-Native group is comprised of this ethnicity). As the sample is representative of the national population, the

difference in education level may not be a limitation. Regardless, future studies should consider all demographic variables when examining cultural differences.

A third limitation is the questionable generalizability of the findings due to the regional sample of Native American families. The majority of the study participants belong to one of the six tribes of the Iroquois nation (i.e., Mohawk, Seneca). As there are over 500 federally recognized Native American tribal or village groups in the United States (U.S Bureau of the Census, 2000), many of which possess their own unique beliefs, ideologies, and practices, caution should be taken when attempting to generalize the results of this study to the entire Native American population. Likewise, the heterogeneity of the non-Native group can be interpreted as a limitation of the study results. Since BPT programs have been normed based on European-American parenting philosophies, it may have been more appropriate to utilize a more homogenous sample of non-Native Americans. On the other hand, the ethnic makeup of the non-Native group closely parallels the current ethnic distribution of the United States (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2000), thus presenting an accurate depiction of the percentage of ethnicities that present to clinics. A further problem with respect to the groups was the fact that the control group came largely from a different region of the country than the Native American group. It is possible that parenting differences were due in part to cultural issues associated with different regions of the country and not just cultural differences associated with ethnicity.

Fourth, a number of limitations are inherent in the assessments used in this study. First, the acculturation scale did not present an item on parenting, creating the necessity to infer that the Native families subscribe to their indigenous parenting style based on the fact that they are not acculturated in other societal domains (e.g., food, music, literature). Future research on this topic should make attempts to use a more detailed acculturation measure that includes items on

parenting philosophies and practices. Also, since the NAAS does not have norms, it is difficult to compare the acculturation level of this particular group of Native parents to other Natives and, in turn, limiting the generalizability of the study findings. Next, the NAAS measures ethnic identification with Native culture and non-Native culture making it difficult to assess specific non-Native cultural identification. In addition, consideration needs to be given to the concept of biculturalism (LaFromboise, Coleman, & Gerton, 1993) which asserts that an individual can identify with more than one culture without relinquishing any amount of cultural identity.

As Jones, Adams, Eyberg, and Boggs (1998) point out, the TEI-SF includes only six behavioral interventions typically employed with disruptive children. Other possible treatment alternatives, such as medication, are not considered on the TEI-SF. Further, the treatment vignettes present a very specific way of delivering the treatment. A number of the treatments (e.g., time out, positive reinforcement) presented could have been administered in a variety of ways thus making it difficult to generalize the acceptability of intervention variations. Next, there was some confusion among the study participants regarding the term “residential school” on the demographic form. As this term has a variety of meanings (some took it to mean private school), more attention should be given to clarifying this item (e.g., changing the wording, providing a detailed description). Also, as some of the assessments contained sensitive questions (e.g., spanking) it is possible that social desirability influenced responding despite the participants’ anonymity. Lastly, as self-report measures are not the decisive gauge of actual behavior, future studies should attempt to corroborate assessments with observations of actual parenting behaviors.

#### *Future Directions*

As this study is one of the first research projects investigating ethnic differences

between Native and non-Native Americans, replication is an important next step. Future studies could add to the current investigation by considering a wider variety of variables. First, as fathers tend to demonstrate different parenting behaviors compared to mothers (Nobes, Smith, Upton, & Heverin, 1999), the interaction of gender and race needs to be considered when investigating parenting beliefs and practices. Next, as these study data were gathered from a community sample, it would be helpful for future studies to obtain information from a clinic-referred population in order to get a better understanding of the behaviors of families with a conduct-disordered child. Also, it would be useful to analyze cultural acceptability of BPT programs following treatment, as research has shown that participating in an effective treatment increases acceptability ratings (Adams & Kelley, 1992). Next, an important aspect of treatment acceptability centers around therapist characteristics and the perception a client has of a therapist. For this reason, cultural acceptability research not only needs to continue to go beyond solely examining acceptability of treatment components, but also focus on cultural competence with service delivery (LaFromboise, Trimble, & Mohatt, 1998). Also, as level of acculturation may influence the way a Native parent perceives or accepts BPT programs, it is important to conduct a clinical interview assessing how strongly one identifies with Native beliefs and cultures. As suggested by the findings of this study, a Native American with lower levels of acculturation may deem BPT programs as less acceptable than a Native American more assimilated to the majority culture, possibly requiring the therapist to make cultural adaptations to evidence-based programs when working with less acculturated families. Lastly, as recommended by McCabe et al. (2005) in a study adapting Parent-Child Interaction Therapy to Mexican-American families, future research needs to take a methodological approach to adapting current BPT programs for minority cultures. This approach involves a step-by-step

model where information is first gathered from both quantitative (empirical/clinical literature) and qualitative (cultural experts, minority therapists/parents) sources. Second, if it is determined that the therapy needs modifications in order to increase cultural sensitivity, the information gathered from the sources should be used in devising possible modifications to BPT programs. Third, the modifications are reviewed by culturally sensitive experts, clinicians and researchers from both a theoretical and practical standpoint. Lastly, the modified treatment is implemented and its effectiveness is assessed.

### *Conclusion*

This study serves as an initial step in the empirical understanding of the similarities and differences between the parenting practices of Native American and non-Native cultures. In addition, this study provides valuable information concerning the Native acceptability of core components of behavioral parent training programs. Results of this study help to provide some insight into both treatment acceptability and parenting practices of the Native American population, while also serving as a base of information for future research in this area. With additional qualitative and quantitative research, it may eventually be possible to provide clear conclusions and guidelines to clinicians and researchers that will enable them to provide more sensitive, acceptable, and efficacious parenting programs to Native American families in the future.

## References

- Adams, C., & Kelley, M. (1992). Managing sibling aggression: Overcorrection as an alternative to time-out. *Behavior Therapy, 23*, 707-717.
- Atkinson, D.R., Lowe, S., & Matthews, L. (1995). Asian-American acculturation, gender and willingness to seek counseling. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 23*, 130-138.
- Atkinson, D.R., Morten, G., & Sue, D. (1998). *Counseling American minorities*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Barlow, A.W., & Walkup, J.T. (1998). Developing mental health services for Native Americans. *Child and Adolescent Psychiatric Clinics of North America, 7*, 555-577.
- Baumrind, D. (1967). Child care practices anteceding three patterns of preschool behavior. *Genetic Psychology Monographs, 75*, 43-88.
- BigFoot-Sipes, D.B., & Willis, D.J. (1993). *Helping Indian parents discipline their children*. The National Committee to Prevent Child Abuse. South Deerfield, MA.
- Booth, J., & Borrego, J. (2005). Treatment Acceptability and Treatment Compliance in Ethnic Minority Populations. In C.L. Frisby & L. Craig (Eds.), *Comprehensive handbook of multicultural school psychology* (pp. 945-972). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Brestan, E.V., & Eyberg, S.M. (1998). Effective psychosocial treatments of conduct-disordered children and adolescents: 29 years, 82 studies, and 5,272 kids. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology, 27*, 180-189.
- Burke, R.V., Kuhn, B.R., & Peterson, J.L. (2004). A "storybook" ending to children's bedtime problems: The use of a rewarding social story to reduce bedtime resistance and frequent

- night waking. *Journal of Pediatric Psychology*, 29, 389-396.
- Calvert, S., & McMahon, R. (1987). The treatment acceptability of a behavioral parent-training program and its components. *Behavior Therapy*, 18, 165-179.
- Calzada, E.J., & Eyberg, S.M. (2002). Self-reported parenting practices in Dominican and Puerto Rican mothers of young children. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology*, 31, 354-363.
- Child, B.J., & Lomawaima, K.T. (2000). A uniform course of study: Life at school. In M.L. Archuleta, B.J. Child, & K.T. Lomawaima (Eds.), *Away from home: American Indian Boarding School Experiences* (pp. 14-53). Phoenix, AZ: The Heard Museum.
- Christophersen, E.R., & Mortweet, S.L. (2001) *Treatments that work with children: Empirically supported strategies for managing childhood problems*. American Psychological Association. Washington, DC: Sheridan.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). New York: Academic Press.
- Cuellar, I., Harris, L.C., & Jasso, R. (1980). An acculturation scale for Mexican-American normal and clinical populations. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 2, 199-217.
- Dadds, M. R., Maujean, A., & Fraser, J. (2003). Parenting and conduct problems in children: Australian data and psychometric properties of the Alabama Parenting Questionnaire. *Australian Psychologist*, 38, 238-241.
- Eisenstadt, Eyberg, McNeil, Newcomb, & Funderburk. (1993). Parent-Child Interaction Therapy with behavior problem children: Relative effectiveness of two stages and overall treatment outcome. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology*, 22, 42-51.
- Elliott, K., McCabe, K., Timmer, S., & Kaneko, C. (2002, June). *The application of PCIT to*

*Latino populations*. Poster session presented at the 3rd Annual Parent-Child Interaction Therapy Conference, Sacramento, California.

- Egeland, B., Jacobvitz, D., & Sroufe, L. (1988). Breaking the cycle of abuse. *Child Development, 59*, 1080-1088.
- Eyberg, S.M., Schuhmann, E.M., & Rey, J. (1998). Child and adolescent psychotherapy research: Developmental issues. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 26*, 71-82.
- Fernandez, M.A., & Eyberg, S.M. (2004). *Race Matters: Treatment outcome for African American families in Parent-Child Interaction Therapy*. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Forehand, R., & Kotchick, B.A. (1996). Cultural diversity: A wake-up call for parent training. *Behavior Therapy, 27*, 187-206.
- Forehand, R., & McMahon, R. J. (1981). *Helping the noncompliant child: A clinician's guide to parent training*. New York: Spectrum.
- Garcia, C.T, Meyer, E.C., & Brillon, L. (1995). Ethnic and minority parenting. In M. Bornstein (Ed.), *Handbook of parenting* (Vol. 2, pp. 189-209). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Garrett, M.T., & Pichette, E.F. (2000). Red as an apple: Native American acculturation and counseling with or without reservation. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 78*, 3-13.
- Glover, G. (1999). *The handbook of group play therapy*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Glover, G. (2001). Parenting in Native American Families. In N. Webb (Ed.), *Culturally diverse parent-child and family relationships* (pp. 205-231). New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

- Harkness, S., & Super, C. (1995). Culture and parenting. In M. Bornstein (Ed.), *Handbook of parenting* (Vol. 2, pp. 211-234). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Haudenosaunee: People Building a Long House. Retrieved February 12, 2006 from <http://sixnations.buffnet.net/>.
- Heffer, R. & Kelley, M. (1987). Mother's acceptance of behavioral interventions for children: The influence of parent race and income. *Behavior Therapy, 18*, 153-163.
- Hembree-Kigin, T.L., & McNeil, C.B. (1995). *Parent-child interaction therapy*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Herring, R. (1996). Synergetic Counseling and Native American Indian Students. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 74*, 542-547.
- Herschell, A. D., Calzada, E. J., Eyberg, S. M., & McNeil, C. B. (2002). Parent-child interaction therapy: New directions in research. *Cognitive and Behavioral Practice, 9*, 6-16.
- Hollingshead, A.B. (1957). *Two factor index of social position*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Hirechfelder, A., & De Monteno, M.K. (1993). *The Native American Almanac*. New York, NY: Prentice Hall.
- Ing, N. (1991). The effects of residential schools on Native child-rearing practices. *Canadian Journal of Native Education, 18*, 67-118.
- Jones, M., Eyberg, S., Adams, C., & Boggs, S. (1998). Treatment acceptability of behavioral interventions for children: An assessment by mothers of children with disruptive behavior disorders. *Child & Family Behavior Therapy, 20*, 15-27.
- Kallam, M., & Coser, P.G. (1994). Native Americans and behavioral disorders. In R.L.

- Peterson, & S.I. Jordan (Eds.), *Multicultural issues in the education of students with behavioral disorders* (pp 126-137). Cambridge, MA: Brookline Books.
- Kazdin, A. (1980a). Acceptability of alternative treatments for deviant child behavior. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 13*, 259-273.
- Kazdin, A. (1980b). Acceptability of time-out from reinforcement procedures for disruptive child behavior. *Behavior Therapy, 11*, 329-344.
- Kazdin, A. (1981). Acceptability of child treatment techniques: The influence of treatment efficacy and adverse side effects. *Behavior Therapy, 12*, 493-506.
- Kazdin, A. (1984). Acceptability of aversive procedures and medication as treatment alternatives for deviant child behavior. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 12*, 289-302.
- Kazdin, A., French, N., & Sherick, R. (1981). Acceptability of alternative treatments for children: Evaluations by inpatient children, parents, and staff. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 49*, 900-907.
- Kelley, M., Grace, N., & Elliot, S. (1990). Acceptability of positive and punitive discipline methods: Comparisons among abusive, potentially abusive, and nonabusive parents. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 14*, 219-226.
- Kelley, M. L., Heffer, R.H., Gresham, F.M., Elliot, S.N. (1989). Development of a modified treatment evaluation inventory. *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavior Assessment, 11*, 235-247.
- Kelley, M.L., & Tseng, H. (1992). Cultural differences in child-rearing: A comparison of immigrant Chinese and Caucasian American mothers. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 23*, 444-455.

- Kronenberger, W. G., & Meyer, R. G. (2001). *The child clinician's handbook* (2nd ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- LaFromboise, T. D., Trimble, J.E., & Mohatt, G.V. (1990). Counseling intervention and American Indian tradition: An integrative approach. *The Counseling Psychologist, 18*, 628-654.
- LaFromboise, T.D., Coleman, H.L., & Gerton, J. (1993). Psychological impact of biculturalism: evidence and theory. *Psychological Bulletin, 114*, 395-412.
- McMahon, R.J., & Forehand, R. (2003). *Helping the noncompliant child: Family-based treatment for oppositional behavior* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Masse, J., Goffreda, C., BigFoot, D.S., McNeil, D., & McNeil, C. (2004, November). *Cultural issues in providing parent training to Native American families*. Poster session presented at the Association for the Advancement of Behavior Therapy, New Orleans, LA.
- McCabe, K.M., Yeh, M., Garland, A.F., Lau, A.S., Chavez, G. (2005). The GANA program: A tailoring approach to adapting parent-child interaction therapy for Mexican Americans. *Education and treatment of children, 28*, 111-129.
- McDermott, D. (2001). Parenting and ethnicity. In M.J. Fine & S.W. Lee (Eds.), *Handbook of diversity in parent education* (pp. 73-96). San Diego: Academic Press.
- McNeil, C. B., Capage, L.C., & Bennett, G.M. (2002). Cultural issues in the treatment of young African American children diagnosed with disruptive behavior disorders. *Journal of Pediatric Psychology, 27*, 339-350.
- McNeil, C. B., Eyberg, S. M., Eisenstadt, T. H., Newcomb, K., & Funderburk, B. (1991). Parent-child interaction therapy with behavior problem children: Generalization of

- treatment effects to the school setting. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology*, 20, 140-151.
- Miller, D., & Kelley, M. (1992). Treatment acceptability: The effects of parent gender, marital adjustment, and child behavior. *Child & Family Behavior Therapy*, 14, 11-23.
- Morrisette, P. J. (1994). The holocaust of first nation people: Residual effects on parenting and treatment implications. *Contemporary family therapy*, 16, 381-392.
- Nobes, G., Smith, M., Upton, P., & Heverin, A. (1999). Physical punishment by mothers and fathers in British homes. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 14, 887-902.
- Norton, G., Austen, S., Allen, G., & Hilton, J. (1983). Acceptability of time-out from reinforcement procedures for disruptive child behavior: A further analysis. *Child & Family Behavior Therapy*, 5, 31-41.
- Ollendick, T.H., & Byrd, D. (2001). Anxiety Disorders. In M. Hersen, & V.B. Van Hasselt, (Eds.) *Advanced abnormal psychology* (pp. 223-242). New York, NY: Kluwer Academic.
- Patterson, G. (1982). *Coercive family process*. Eugene, OR: Castalia.
- Peters, M.F. (1981). Parenting in Black families with young children: A historical perspective. In H.P. McAdoo & J.L. McAdoo (Eds.), *Black Families* (pp. 211-225). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Ponce, F. Q., & Atkinson, D.R. (1989). Mexican-American acculturation, counseling ethnicity, counseling style, and perceived counselor credibility. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 36, 203-208.
- Pritzker, B.M. (1998a). *Native Americans: An encyclopedia of history, culture, and peoples*

- (Vol. 1, pp. 1-412). Santa Barbara, CA: Library of Congress.
- Pritzker, B.M. (1998b). *Native Americans: An encyclopedia of history, culture, and peoples* (Vol. 2, pp. 413-868). Santa Barbara, CA: Library of Congress.
- Querido, J. G., Warner, T. D., & Eyberg, S. M. (2002). Parenting styles and child behavior in African American families of preschool children. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology, 31*, 272-277.
- Rauh, V.A., Wasserman, G.A., & Brunelli, S.A. (1990). Determinants of maternal child-rearing attitudes. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, 29*, 375-381.
- Robinson, C., Mandelco, B., Olsen, S., & Hart, C. (1995). Authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive parenting practices. Development of a new measure. *Psychological Reports, 77*, 819-830.
- Sanders, M. R., & Dadds, M. R. (1993). *Behavioral family intervention*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Shelton, K. K., Frick, P.J., & Wootton, J. (1996). Assessment of parenting practices in families of elementary school-age children. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology, 26*, 317-329.
- Trimble, J., & Fleming, C. (1989). Providing counseling services for Native American Indians: Client, counselor, and community characteristics. In P.B. Pederson, & J.G. Dragis (Eds.), *Counseling across cultures* (3rd ed, pp. 177-204). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii Press.
- Wahler, R. G. (Ed.). (1976). Deviant child behavior within the family: Developmental speculations and behavior change strategies. In H. Leitenberg (Ed.), *Handbook of behavior modification and behavior therapy*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

- Webster-Stratton, C. (1994). Advancing videotape parent training: A comparison study. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 62*(3), 583-593.
- Webster-Stratton, C. (1996). Early intervention with videotape modeling: Programs for families of children with Oppositional Defiant Disorder or Conduct Disorder. In E.S. Hibbs & P.S. Jensen (Eds.), *Psychological treatments for child and adolescent disorders: Empirically based strategies for clinical practice* (pp. 435-474). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Webster-Stratton, C., & Hammond, M. (1997). Treating children with early-onset conduct problems: A comparison of child and parent training interventions. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 65*, 93-109.
- Whaley, A. L. (2000). Sociocultural differences in the developmental consequences of the use of physical discipline during childhood for African Americans. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 6*, 5-12.
- Wierson, M., & Forehand, R. (1994). Parent behavioral training for child noncompliance: Rationale, concepts, and effectiveness. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 3*, 146-150.
- Wilburn, T., Ballew, M.S., & Sullivan, M. (November, 2004). *Characteristics of Native American parenting*. Poster session presented at the Association for the Advancement of Behavior Therapy, New Orleans, LA.
- Wolf, M. (1978). Social validity: The case for subjective measurement or how applied behavior analysis is finding its heart. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 11*, 203-214.

Appendix A

The University of New Orleans  
Alabama Parenting Questionnaire (APQ)  
(Parent Form)

ID # \_\_\_\_\_

Child's Age \_\_\_\_\_

Completing Form:     Father         Mother        Other \_\_\_\_\_

**Instructions:** The following are a number of statements about your family. Please rate each item as to how often it TYPICALLY occurs in your home. The possible answers are (1) Never, (2) Almost Never, (3) Sometimes, (4) Often, (5) Always. PLEASE ANSWER ALL ITEMS.

1. You have a friendly talk with your child.

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Almost Never	Sometimes	Often	Always

2. You let your child know when he/she is doing a good job with something.

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Almost Never	Sometimes	Often	Always

3. You threaten to punish your child, and then do not actually punish him/her.

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Almost Never	Sometimes	Often	Always

4. You volunteer to help with special activities that your child is involved in (sports, boy scouts, church groups).

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Almost Never	Sometimes	Often	Always

5. You reward or give something extra to your child for obeying you or behaving well

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Almost Never	Sometimes	Often	Always

6. Your child fails to leave a note to let you know where he is going.

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Almost Never	Sometimes	Often	Always

7. You play games or do other fun things with your child.

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Almost Never	Sometimes	Often	Always

8. Your child talks you out of being punished after he has done something wrong.

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Almost Never	Sometimes	Often	Always

9. You ask your child about his day at school.

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Almost Never	Sometimes	Often	Always

10. You indicate that the child's behavior will cause shame to you as a parent.

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Almost Never	Sometimes	Often	Always

11. Your child stays out in the evening past the time he is supposed to be at home.

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Almost Never	Sometimes	Often	Always

12. You help your child with his homework.

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Almost Never	Sometimes	Often	Always

13. You feel that getting your child to obey you is more trouble than it's worth.

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Almost Never	Sometimes	Often	Always

14. You compliment your child when he does something well.

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Almost Never	Sometimes	Often	Always

15. You ask your child what his plans are for the coming day.

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Almost Never	Sometimes	Often	Always

16. You drive your child to a special activity.

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Almost Never	Sometimes	Often	Always

17. You praise your child if he does something well.

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Almost Never	Sometimes	Often	Always

18. Your child is out with friends you don't know.

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Almost Never	Sometimes	Often	Always

19. You hug or kiss your child when he has done something well.

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Almost Never	Sometimes	Often	Always

20. Your child goes out without a set time to be home.

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Almost Never	Sometimes	Often	Always

21. You talk to your child about his friends.

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Almost Never	Sometimes	Often	Always

22. You honor your child with an event(e.g., dances, give-away, name-giving) when he has done something well.

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Almost Never	Sometimes	Often	Always

23. Your child is out after dark without an adult with him.

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Almost Never	Sometimes	Often	Always

24. You let your child out of a punishment early (like lifting restrictions earlier than you originally said).

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Almost Never	Sometimes	Often	Always

25. Your child helps plan family activities.

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Almost Never	Sometimes	Often	Always

26. You get so busy that you forget where your child is and what he is doing.

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Almost Never	Sometimes	Often	Always

27. Your child is not punished when he has done something wrong.

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Almost Never	Sometimes	Often	Always

28. You tell tribal stories that teach your children right from wrong.

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Almost Never	Sometimes	Often	Always

29. You attend PTA meetings, parent/teacher conferences or other meetings at your child's school.

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Almost Never	Sometimes	Often	Always

30. You tell your child that you like it when he helps around the house.

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Almost Never	Sometimes	Often	Always

31. You don't check that your child comes home at the time he is supposed to.

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Almost Never	Sometimes	Often	Always

32. You don't tell your child where you are going.

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Almost Never	Sometimes	Often	Always

33. Your child comes home from school more than one hour after you expect him.

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Almost Never	Sometimes	Often	Always

34. The punishment you give your child depends on your mood.

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Almost Never	Sometimes	Often	Always

35. You have family meeting where everyone has a turn to talk without interruption.

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Almost Never	Sometimes	Often	Always

36. Your child is at home without adult supervision.

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Almost Never	Sometimes	Often	Always

37. You spank your child with your hand when he has done something wrong.

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Almost Never	Sometimes	Often	Always

38. You ignore your child when he is misbehaving.

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Almost Never	Sometimes	Often	Always

39. You slap your child when he has done something wrong.

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Almost Never	Sometimes	Often	Always

40. You take away privileges or money from your child as a punishment.

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Almost Never	Sometimes	Often	Always

41. You send your child to his room as a punishment.

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Almost Never	Sometimes	Often	Always

42. You hit your child with a belt, switch, or other object when he has done something wrong.

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Almost Never	Sometimes	Often	Always

43. You yell or scream at your child when he has done something wrong.

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Almost Never	Sometimes	Often	Always

44. You calmly explain to your child why his behavior was wrong when he misbehaves.

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Almost Never	Sometimes	Often	Always

45. Extended family members (e.g., aunts, uncles, grandparents) play an important role in disciplining your child.

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Almost Never	Sometimes	Often	Always

46. You use time-out (make him sit or stand in a corner) as a punishment.

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Almost Never	Sometimes	Often	Always

47. You give your child extra chores as a punishment.

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Almost Never	Sometimes	Often	Always

48. You use sage, cedar, or other herbs to help children center their attention.

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Almost Never	Sometimes	Often	Always

49. Please list below any parenting strategy not listed on this form that you may use.

---



---

Appendix B

Treatment Evaluation Inventory-Short Form

Please complete each item below by placing a checkmark on the line next to each question that best indicates how you feel about the treatment. Please read the items very carefully because a checkmark accidentally placed on one space rather than another may not represent the meaning you intended.

Please indicate which vignette number you are evaluating: \_\_\_\_\_

I find this treatment to be an acceptable way of dealing with the child's problem behavior

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Agree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Disagree

I'd be willing to use this procedure if I had to change the child's problem behavior

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Agree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Disagree

I believe that it would be acceptable to use this procedure without children's consent

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Agree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Disagree

I like the procedure used in this treatment

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Agree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Disagree

I believe this treatment is likely to be effective

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Agree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Disagree

I believe the child will experience discomfort during this treatment

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Agree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Disagree

I believe the treatment is likely to result in permanent improvement

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Agree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Disagree

I believe it would be acceptable to use this treatment with individuals who cannot choose treatments for themselves

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Agree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Disagree

Overall, I have a positive reaction to this treatment

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Agree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Disagree

## Appendix C

## Case Description Vignette

Joe is an 8 year old boy who disobeys his mother a lot. He often refuses to do things his mother asks him to do, such as picking up toys or doing other chores. When his mother asks him to put away his toys, Joe often has a temper tantrum which includes yelling and throwing his toys. If anything breaks during a temper tantrum he sometimes swears and blames his mother. He argues with his mother a lot, especially when he doesn't get his own way. Joe also does things all the time to bother his younger sister, such as poking her over and over to make her cry. Joe also does things to his sister to make his mother mad. For example, the other day when his mother asked him to pour his sister's juice, Joe poured it on his sister. Every time Joe's mother tries to talk to him about getting along with his sister, Joe acts touchy and annoyed.

## Appendix D

## Treatment Vignettes

1. To correct Joe's behavior, his parent ignores him when he disobeys, and gives Joe lots of attention and praise every time Joe obeys. To ignore Joe, his parent does not say anything to him and acts like she doesn't notice him. Whenever Joe does what his parent tells him to do, his parent tells him how much she likes it, such as, "You did a good job of listening! Thank you for helping me."
2. To correct Joe's behavior, his parent has him practice following directions whenever he disobeys. For example, if Joe refuses to put her his shirt in the hamper when told, his parent has Joe practice obeying by having him quickly put 10 articles of clothing in the hamper, one at a time. If needed, Joe's parent helps him practice by, for example, guiding Joe to the hamper.
3. To correct Joe's behavior, his family uses a talking circle to discuss family rules or discipline strategies. A specific object (like a painted stick) is used in the talking circle, and only the person holding the object is allowed to speak. The object is passed from family member to family member so everyone has a chance to talk. For example, Joe's parents may use the talking circle to get everyone to work together to solve the problem.
4. To correct Joe's behavior, his parent waits until after Joe disobeys until a while later and again asks to the same or a different chore. Every time that Joe obeys, his parent puts a sticker on Joe's sticker chart. When Joe earns four stars, his parent gives him extra special things that he likes. The special things may be extra TV time, a special snack, a trip to the park to swing, or a small toy.
5. To correct Joe's behavior, his parent tells him a tribal story that has been passed down from generation to generation. The story is a way to describe to Joe what proper behaviors are expected. For example, Joe's parent tells him a story about a little boy who painted himself with black clay to show others that he is angry. Joe's parent uses this story to show Joe that there other ways to show he is angry.
6. To correct Joe's behavior, his parent takes away a privilege that Joe normally has, whenever Joe disobeys. Joe's parent tells Joe why he is losing the privilege for that day. The privileges that Joe might lose are things the he really likes, like a favorite TV show, dessert after dinner, a bedtime story, or playing with a favorite toy.
7. To correct Joe's behavior, his parent spanks him whenever he disobeys. For example, if Joe refuses to put his shirt in the hamper, his parent walks Joe over to a chair and tells him that because he didn't do what he was told, he is going to get a spanking. His parent than puts Joe over her lap and gives him two spanks on the bottom with the fingers on her hand.

8. To correct Joe's behavior, his parent has him sit in a chair in the corner whenever he disobeys. His parent has him sit on the chair for three minutes. After three minutes, Joe's parent will give him permission to get off the chair if he is quiet. If Joe gets off the chair before his parent gives him permission, Joe must stay on the chair another three minutes.

9. To correct Joe's behavior, his parent asks a member of his extended family or a member of his tribal community to talk to him. For example, Joe's parent asks Joe's uncle to speak with him and teach him ways to show respect. Also, Joe's parents have a family member or member of his community punish him for inappropriate behavior.

## Appendix E

## Native American Acculturation Scale

1. What language can you speak?
  1. Tribal language only (e.g., Cherokee, Navajo, and Lakota)
  2. Mostly tribal language, some English
  3. Tribal language and English equally well (bilingual)
  4. Mostly English, some tribal language
  5. English only
  
2. What language do you prefer?
  1. Tribal language only (e.g., Cherokee, Navajo, and Lakota)
  2. Mostly tribal language, some English
  3. Tribal language and English equally well (bilingual)
  4. Mostly English, some tribal language
  5. English only
  
3. How do you identify yourself?
  1. Native American
  2. Native American and some non-Native American (e.g., White, African-American, Latino, and Asian American)
  3. Native American and non-Native American
  4. Non-Native and some Native American
  5. Non-Native American (e.g., White, African-American, Latino, and Asian American)
  
4. Which identification does your mother use?
  1. Native American
  2. Native American and some non-Native American (e.g., White, African-American, Latino, and Asian American)
  3. Native American and non-Native American
  4. Non-Native and some Native American
  5. Non-Native American (e.g., White, African-American, Latino, and Asian American)
  
5. Which identification does your father use?
  1. Native American
  2. Native American and some non-Native American (e.g., White, African-American, Latino, and Asian American).
  3. Native American and non-Native American
  4. Non-Native and some Native American
  5. Non-Native American (e.g., White, African-American, Latino, and Asian American)

6. What was the ethnic origin of friends you had as a child up to age 6?
  1. Only Native Americans
  2. Mostly Native Americans
  3. About equally Native Americans and non-Native Americans
  4. Mostly Non-Native American (e.g., White, African-American, Latino, and Asian American)
  5. Only non-Native Americans
  
7. What was the ethnic origin of friends you had as a child 6 to 18?
  1. Only Native Americans
  2. Mostly Native Americans
  3. About equally Native Americans and non-Native Americans
  4. Mostly Non-Native American (e.g., White, African-American, Latino, and Asian American)
  5. Only non-Native Americans
  
8. Who do you associate with now in your community?
  1. Only Native Americans
  2. Mostly Native Americans
  3. About equally Native Americans and non-Native Americans
  4. Mostly Non-Native American (e.g., White, African-American, Latino, and Asian American)
  5. Only non-Native Americans
  
9. What music do you prefer?
  1. Native American music only (e.g., pow-wow music, traditional flute, contemporary, and chant)
  2. Mostly Native American music
  3. Equally Native American and other music
  4. Mostly other music (e.g., rock, pop, country, and rap)
  5. Other music only
  
10. What movies do you prefer?
  1. Native American movies only
  2. Mostly Native American movies
  3. Equally Native American and other movies
  4. Mostly other movies
  5. Other movies only
  
11. Where were you born?
  1. Reservation, Native American community
  2. Rural area, Native American community
  3. Urban area, Native American community
  4. Urban or rural area, near Native American community
  5. Urban or rural area, away from Native American community

12. Where were you raised?
  1. Reservation, Native American community
  2. Rural area, Native American community
  3. Urban area, Native American community
  4. Urban or rural area, near Native American community
  5. Urban or rural area, away from Native American community
  
13. What contact have you had with Native American communities?
  1. Raised for 1 year or more on the reservation or other Native American community
  2. Raised for 1 year or less on the reservation or other Native American community
  3. Occasional visits to the reservation or other Native American communities
  4. Occasional communications with people on reservation or other Native American community
  5. No exposure or communications with people on reservation or other Native American community
  
14. What foods do you prefer?
  1. Native American foods only
  2. Mostly Native American foods and some other foods
  3. About equally Native American foods and other foods
  4. Mostly other foods
  5. Other foods only
  
15. In what language do you think?
  1. Tribal language only (e.g., Cherokee, Navajo, and Lakota)
  2. Mostly tribal language, some English
  3. Tribal language and English equally well (bilingual)
  4. Mostly English, some tribal language
  5. English only
  
16. Do you
  1. Read only in a tribal language (e.g., Cherokee, Navajo, and Lakota)
  2. Read a tribal language better than English
  3. Read a tribal language and English about equally well
  4. Read English better than a tribal language
  5. Read English only
  
17. Do you
  1. Write only in a tribal language (e.g., Cherokee, Navajo, and Lakota)
  2. Write a tribal language better than English
  3. Write a tribal language and English about equally well
  4. Write English better than a tribal language
  5. Write English only
  
18. How much pride do you have in Native American culture and heritage?
  1. Extremely proud

2. Moderately proud
3. A little proud
4. No pride, but do not feel negative toward group
5. No pride, but do feel negative toward group

19. How would you rate yourself?

1. Very Native American
2. Mostly Native American
3. Bicultural
4. Mostly non-Native American
5. Very non-Native American

20. Do you participate in Native American traditions, ceremonies, occasions, and so on?

1. All of them
2. Most of them
3. Some of them
4. A few of them
5. None at all

Appendix F

Demographic Form

Please circle the most appropriate answer.

Background

1. What is your gender? *Male* *Female*
  
2. What is your age? \_\_\_\_\_ *years*
  
3. What is your race/ethnicity?
  - Native American*
  - White/Caucasian*
  - Black/African American*
  - Hispanic*
  - Asian*
  - Mixed:* \_\_\_\_\_
  - (indicate primary race first)*
  - Other:* \_\_\_\_\_
  
4. If you have Native American blood, what is your tribe?  
 (if you have more than one tribal affiliation, please list all of them,  
 from most to least)
 

---



---
  
5. What is your marital status?
  - Single* *Separated*
  - Married* *Divorced*
  - Live-in partner* *Widowed*
  
6. In what city and state do you live? \_\_\_\_\_  

*City*
*State*
  
7. Do you live on a reservation belonging to an Indian tribe or nation? *No* *Yes*  
 If not, how often do you visit your tribal community?



*Disabled - unable to work*

15. What is the annual income level for everyone living in your household, combined?

- less than \$15,000*
- \$15,000 - \$30,000*
- \$31,000 - \$45,000*
- \$46,000 - \$60,000*
- \$61,000 - \$75,000*
- \$76,000 - \$90,000*
- \$91,000 - \$105,000*
- more than \$105,000*

16. How many people depend on this income including yourself?

\_\_\_\_\_

17. How many children do you have?

\_\_\_\_\_

18. Are your children biological or adopted?

*Biological      Adopted*

19. Age and gender of children?

\_\_\_\_\_ **M F**      \_\_\_\_\_ **M F**      \_\_\_\_\_ **M F**      \_\_\_\_\_ **M F**      \_\_\_\_\_ **M F**

20. Do you have a child who refuses to obey until threatened with punishment, acts defiant when told to do something, has temper tantrums, or constantly seeks attention?      *Yes    No*

If yes, what parenting strategies have you tried?

---

---

21. With which tribe(s) does your mother identify herself?  
(if she has more than one tribal affiliation, please list all of them,  
from most to least)

---

---

22. With which tribe(s) does your father identify himself?  
(if you have more than one tribal affiliation, please list all of them,  
from most to least)

---

---

23. Have you ever gone to a residential school?      *Yes*      *No*

If yes, please indicate how this may have affected your parenting:

---

---

24. Has your spouse/partner ever gone to a residential school?      *Yes*      *No*

If yes, please indicate how this may have affected his/her parenting:

---

---

25. Has your mother ever gone to a residential school?      *Yes*      *No*

If yes, please indicate how this may have affected her parenting:

---



---

26. Has your father ever gone to a residential school?                      Yes            No

If yes, please indicate how this may have affected his parenting:

---



---

**Upbringing**

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

- a. \_\_\_\_\_ My spouse/partner and I **share** responsibility equally
- b. \_\_\_\_\_ My spouse/partner and I **share** responsibility, but I am more involved than he/she is
- c. \_\_\_\_\_ My spouse/partner and I **share** responsibility, but he/she is more involved than I am
- d. \_\_\_\_\_ I **share** responsibility with another person (other than my spouse/partner)

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

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

- e. \_\_\_\_\_ I have **primary** responsibility for my children, but others play a significant role in my child's life  
*If YES to b., please indicate who shares responsibility (check*

*all that apply):*

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

**f.**  I have **primary** responsibility for my children

Table 1

*Demographic Characteristics of Participants by Ethnicity*

Characteristic	Ethnicity	
	Native American ( <i>n</i> = 41)	Non-Native American ( <i>n</i> = 28)
	<i>n</i> (%)	<i>n</i> (%)
Reported Tribal Affiliation*		
Akwesasne ( <i>Mohawk</i> )	1 (2.4%)	
Algonquin ( <i>Tuscarora, Mohawk</i> )	1 (2.4%)	
Cayuga ( <i>Mohawk</i> )	2 (4.9%)	
Cheyenne ( <i>Seneca</i> )	1 (2.4%)	
Lakota	1 (2.4%)	
Micmac	1 (2.4%)	
Mohawk	5 (12.1%)	
Mohican	1 (2.4%)	
Muscokegee	1 (2.4%)	
Obijwa ( <i>Taos Pueblo</i> )	1 (2.4%)	
Onondaga	5 (12.1%)	
Oswegatohie ( <i>Mohawk, Abnaki</i> )	1 (2.4)	
Seneca ( <i>Oneida, Cayuga, Cree,</i> <i>Onondaga, Yakima, Patowatoni</i> )	15 (36.6%)	
Shawnee ( <i>Cherokee</i> )	1 (2.4%)	
Tuscarora ( <i>Mohawk, Haudenosaunee</i> )	4 (9.8%)	

## Residential School Experience

Yes	7 (17.1%)
-----	-----------

No	34 (82.9%)
----	------------

## Residential Experience-Mother

Yes	8 (19.5%)
-----	-----------

No	33 (80.5%)
----	------------

## Residential School Experience-Father

Yes	13 (31.7%)
-----	------------

No	28 (68.3%)
----	------------

## Living on Reservation

Yes	22 (53.7%)
-----	------------

No	19 (46.3%)
----	------------

## Non-Native Ethnicity

White	21 (75%)
-------	----------

Black	4 (13%)
-------	---------

Asian	1 (4%)
-------	--------

Hispanic	2 (7%)
----------	--------

---

\* Participants were able to report more than one tribal affiliation. Primary affiliations are listed with secondary affiliation(s) in parentheses. Number reflects only primary affiliation. Spelling of tribal names are as reported on the demographic form.

Table 2

*Between-Group Comparison of Demographic Characteristics*

	Native American (n = 41)		Non-Native American (n = 28)		<i>t</i> (67)			
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>				
Age of Parent	37.02	12.01	34.82	7.78	.855			
Number of Children	2.93	1.97	2.57	1.62	.790			
Average age of target child	7.88	3.93	7.50	2.95	.432			
NAAS	2.78	.56	4.36	.44	-12.98***			
	<i>n</i>	(%)	<i>n</i>	(%)	<i>df</i>	$\chi^2$	<i>p</i>	
Gender								
Male	15	(36.6)	11	(39.3)				
Female	26	(63.4)	17	(60.7)	1	.052	.820	
Marital Status								
Married/Live-In partner	21	(51.2)	20	(71.4)				
Single, separated, divorce, widow	20	(48.8)	8	(28.6)	1	2.82	.093	
Education								
High school diploma or less	27	(65.9)	11	(40.7)				
Some college or more	14	(34.1)	16	(59.3)	1	4.16*	.041	
Total Income								
< \$15,000	8	(22)	3	(10.7)				
\$15,000-\$45,000	23	(56)	20	(71.4)				

\$46,000-\$90,000	9	(22)	5	(17.9)	2	1.97	.373
<b>Hollingshead Social Rank</b>							
Category II	7	(17.1)	6	(22.2)			
Category III	9	(22)	7	(25.9)			
Category IV	17	(41.5)	10	(37)			
Category V	8	(19.5)	4	(14.8)	3	.618	.892
<b>Defiant Child</b>							
Yes	14	(36.9)	16	(57.1)			
No	24	(63.2)	12	(42.9)	1	2.68	.102

---

\* =  $p < .05$  \*\*\* =  $p < .001$

Table 3

*Between Group Comparison for APQ Subscale Mean Scores*

Scale	Native American ( <i>n</i> = 41)		Non-Native American ( <i>n</i> = 28)		<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>d</i>	Dadds & Fraser (2003)		
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>				<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>
Positive Parenting	26.2	2.7	26.3	2.6	-.170	66		26.0	2.7	.689
Involvement	38.9	5.7	39.3	6.5	-.235	66		40.5	4.4	-1.04
Lower Monitoring	16.6	6.5	13.6	3.5	2.42*	62	.59	12.0	2.8	2.47*
Inconsistent Disc.	13.3	4.4	13.8	3.4	-.480	66		13.9	3.5	-.060
Corporal Punishment	4.7	1.4	4.9	1.4	-.383	66		5.6	1.6	-2.66*
Other Discipline	19.1	3.1	20.0	2.8	-.124	66				
Native American	15.5	3.8	13.6	2.8	2.31*	66	.57			

\* =  $p < .05$

Table 4

*Between Group Comparison for TEI-SF Acceptability Scores*

Scale	Native American ( <i>n</i> = 41)		Non-Native American ( <i>n</i> = 28)		<i>t</i> (67)	<i>d</i>	Jones et. al (1998)		
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>			<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i> (27)
Differential Attn.	28.5	8.5	26.9	8.4	.771		29.3	9.3	-1.53
Over-correction	32.1	6.9	30.9	5.8	.781		29.2	9.0	1.51
Positive Reinf.	29.0	7.8	33.6	5.5	-2.88*	-.70	34.1	7.4	-.556
Response Cost	32.2	5.7	35.0	6.3	-1.94		33.3	5.2	1.37
Spanking	20.6	7.8	22.0	7.8	-.732		19.8	6.1	1.56
Time Out	32.2	6.5	34.9	5.7	-1.72		32.6	5.3	2.16*
Talking Circle	33.7	5.8	34.1	5.0	-.361				
Tribal Stories	31.7	6.8	31.2	8.5	.243				
Extended Family	29.6	7.9	24.7	9.4	2.35*	.57			
BPT Composite	153.9	18.9	161.1	15.4	-1.67				

\* =  $p < .05$  \*\* =  $p < .01$

Table 5

*Description of Extended Family Member Care-Giving Responsibilities*

Family Member	Native American ( <i>n</i> = 19)		Non-Native American ( <i>n</i> = 5)	
	<i>n</i>	(%)	<i>n</i>	(%)
Grandmother	11	57.9	2	40
Grandfather	9	47.4	3	60
Aunt	6	31.6	1	20
Uncle	7	36.8	2	40
Cousin	3	15.8	1	20
Older Sibling	5	26.3	0	0
Good Friend	1	5.2	0	0
Step-Grandfather	1	5.2	0	0

Table 6

*Within Native Comparison of Residential School and Non-Residential School: TEI-SF*

Scale	Residential ( <i>n</i> = 15)		Non-Residential ( <i>n</i> = 26)		<i>t</i> (39)	<i>d</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		
Differential Attn.	31.8	6.5	26.5	9.1	1.97	
Over-correction	30.4	5.6	33.0	7.5	-1.15	
Positive Reinf.	29.1	6.7	28.9	8.5	.112	
Response Cost	31.6	3.9	32.5	6.6	-.461	
Spanking	21.3	5.5	20.2	9.0	.429	
Time Out	32.2	2.9	32.3	8.0	-.040	
Talking Circle	32.9	3.4	34.1	6.8	-.662	
Tribal Stories	28.0	6.5	33.9	6.0	-2.93**	-.94
Extended Family	27.3	8.6	31.0	7.3	-1.46	
BPT Composite	155.2	16.6	153.2	20.4	.330	

\*\* =  $p < .01$

Table 7

*Between Group Comparison of Residential School and Non-Residential School: APQ Subscales*

Scale	Residential ( <i>n</i> = 14)		Non-Residential ( <i>n</i> = 26)		<i>t</i> (38)
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	
Positive Parenting	26.0	2.4	26.3	2.9	-.300
Involvement	37.8	6.4	39.5	5.4	-.902
Lower Monitoring	15.9	5.8	16.9	6.9	-.491
Inconsistent Disc.	12.9	3.4	13.6	4.8	-.520
Corporal Punishment	5.2	1.4	4.4	1.3	1.90
Other Discipline	19.1	3.5	19.2	3.0	-.078
Native American	15.6	3.2	15.5	4.2	.056

Table 8

*Qualitative Description of Additional Parenting Strategy Write-In Item on the APQ*


---

Native American (n = 14)
1.) Always talk to her about everything between right and wrong and let her know that I love and care about her even if she does make the wrong choices
2.) I have used a cup/small dipper of water splashed in her face as discipline
3.) Remind him of his age and tell him to act his age
4.) When misbehaving we often use water
5.) Glass of cold water to face or if arguing w/ sibling tell them 3 good things about them to their face
6.) My mother use to splash water in our face and now I do it to my son and it works better than anything else
7.) Give them water in their face when they misbehave
8.) Water splashing as discipline
9.) When my children act out they get the water
10.) Always hug/kiss child that are home and tell all of my children that I love them
11.) Communication and a lot of love even at a young age is very important
12.) Writing an apology note to any persons supervising for bad behaviors.
13.) Native stories are used to correct inappropriate behavior
14.) Send boy to bed earlier than usual. Make sure he is looking at me when I am talking to him

---

Non-Native American (n = 7)
1.) Calmness while listening and not reacting during conversation

---

- 2.) For problems at school, teacher has permission to ground for privileges. The teacher's grounding period is honored at home
  - 3.) Ask him why he is not listening discuss what we can do to him back on track
  - 4.) Ask him if he understands what I said and knows what he did wrong
  - 5.) Have them tell me what they did wrong and what punishment they think they should get
  - 6.) Put a paper on the wall with children's name and weekend fun activity if they do something wrong they get a check after three checks they aren't allowed to do activity
  - 7.) We pray about things together
-

Table 9

*Bivariate Correlations of Acculturation with Extended Family, TEI-SF Vignettes, & APQ Subscales*

Subscale	1
1.) NAAS	--
Demographic Form	
2.) Extended Family	-.26*
TEI-SF	
3.) Differential Attention	-.05
4.) Over-correction	-.04
5.) Positive Reinforcement	.27*
6.) Response Cost	.24*
7.) Spanking	.08
8.) Time Out	.26*
9.) Talking Circle	.06
10.) Tribal Stories	.00
11.) Extended Family	-.16
12.) BPT Composite	.24*
APQ	
13.) Positive Parenting	.09
14.) Involvement	.13
15.) Lower Monitoring	.34**
16.) Inconsistent Discipline	-.06

17.) Corporal Punishment	.00
18.) Other Discipline	.17
19.) Native American	-.29*

---

\* =  $p < .05$     \*\* =  $p < .01$