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ABSTRACT

Past research has neglected second generation onward immigrant families in Britain as they further acculturate into host society culture, as well as the experiences of majority ethnic-group families in relation to second generation immigrant families. The central focus of this study was an in-depth assessment of the similarities and differences in parenting practices, parent-child relationships, child psychological adjustment and parental social experiences in British-born Indian, Pakistani and non-immigrant White mothers with 5-7 year old children living in culturally diverse areas of the UK. This is the first in-depth comparative study focusing on normative second generation families rather than disadvantaged samples.

In total, 90 mothers participated, and the study employed a multi-method approach. A range of measurement techniques including standardised interviews, questionnaires, observations of parent-child interaction and a child test were used. The study was organised according to two aspects of family life. A quantitative approach was used to investigate parenting and child adjustment. A mixed-methods approach, using both quantitative and qualitative analyses was used to examine the broader social environment of the mother and child, exploring family life in relation to surrounding cultural and contextual factors in the three ethnic groups.

The children showed positive levels of adjustment, with no differences between groups. In terms of parenting, similarities were found between family types for some aspects of parenting as assessed by interview, including maternal warmth, mother-child interaction and maternal control. The differences that were identified generally reflected differences between the Pakistani and White mothers, with the Indian mothers lying between the two. For example, the British Pakistani group showed higher levels of child supervision, child-centredness, and overt discipline compared to White mothers. They were also more likely to be in an arranged marriage and less likely to confide in their partner. Regarding the observational measure of mother-child interaction, there was no difference between family types for the overall construct of mutuality.

In relation to cultural and contextual factors, Pakistani mothers were more religious, compared with Indian and White mothers. Overall, both second generation Indian and Pakistani mothers showed a more bicultural identity. Qualitative analysis revealed that a range of ethnic-racial socialisation techniques for discussing race and ethnicity with children were used by mothers from all groups. Pakistani mothers remained more traditional and were most likely to use religio-cultural socialisation whereas Indian and White mothers used
egalitarianism more, i.e. teaching children the importance of individual qualities as opposed to membership in their ethnic group. Indian mothers were the most positive about multiculturalism and seemed to face fewer challenges associated with diversity. Both Pakistani and White mothers experienced discrimination. White mothers felt they were still trying to adapt to increased diversity, some believing that their culture was being sidelined and under threat.

It was concluded that there were many similarities in parenting practices and family life between British Indian, British Pakistani and non-immigrant White groups, with children from each group showing positive adjustment. However, although all mothers were born and raised in Britain, differences still existed indicating that ethnicity was an influential factor in parenting. The study increases understanding of the extent to which the parenting processes that have been found to be most significant for positive child development can be generalised to other ethnic groups. It also provides information on acculturation patterns in the host society and what it means to be born to second generation parents and live in a multicultural environment in the UK today. The findings have implications for theory and policy development regarding family life in different ethnic groups.
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INTRODUCTION

Like much of the rest of the world, Britain has felt the effects of increased globalisation. One of the main outcomes of this has been a rise in immigration on an unprecedented scale. Of course, Britain is no stranger to immigration, having had particularly large influxes of immigrants from former colonies following the Second World War. However, the scale of immigration over the past few decades has increased exponentially, resulting in immense cultural diversity in cities and towns across the UK. Many immigrants, such as those from India and Pakistan, now have British-born children and grandchildren. These families are well into their second and third generations and, together with other immigrant families, form large ethnic groups with unique cultural practices and traditions. Immigration has also meant that ethnic groups (including the non-immigrant White ethnic group) have had to live in close vicinity and engage with each other. Yet with Prime Minister David Cameron recently describing the ‘doctrine of state multiculturalism’ as a ‘failed’ concept due to lack of civic integration and the ‘existence of segregated communities’ (Cameron, 2011), it is important to probe further, particularly into family life and intergroup contact to understand how well ethnic groups are doing in the UK and if, indeed, their communities are segregated.

This thesis focuses on parenting practices and family life in the three largest ethnic groups in the UK: British Indian, British Pakistani and non-immigrant White. The study focuses specifically on British-born members of these ethnic groups and explores important questions such as: Does being born and raised in a country lead to an acculturation of parenting and family life? What are the day-to-day socialisation messages around race and ethnicity that families engage in? And how much does being British-born, yet growing up in a multicultural neighbourhood, impact the content and frequency of these messages?

In the UK, the number of British-born ethnic minority parents is rising. These parents were born and educated in the UK, but had parents or grandparents who moved to the UK from abroad. This group is of particular interest for a number of reasons. Firstly, families headed by British-born ethnic minority parents represent a new type of family, in which British-born ethnic minority parents, raised in some cases by immigrant parents, themselves, are now
raising their British-born children.\textsuperscript{1} Secondly, British-born ethnic minority parents are an under-researched group. Little is known about parenting processes within ethnic minority families and the impact of those processes on their children’s psychological well-being. Indeed, a study looking exclusively at British-born ethnic minority parents and the psychological well-being of their children has not yet been conducted. Thirdly, British-born ethnic minority parents do not generally face the same disadvantages that have been associated with poorer child outcomes in immigrant families, such as a move to a new culture or a struggle with language barriers. Thus, research carried out on immigrant families can not always be generalised to the experiences of British-born ethnic minority families.

Looking specifically at the three ethnic groups in question, a view often held about British Pakistanis is that they are ‘culturally conservative and separatist’ (Modood, et al. 1997). A comparison is often made between British Indians and British Pakistanis, with the latter group being viewed as less acculturated into mainstream British society and more traditional in nature (Robinson, 2009; Stopes-Roe and Cochrane, 1990). However, studies have shown that many British Pakistanis have managed to acculturate and associate themselves with the dominant culture and thus see themselves as more mixed than many other ethnic minority groups in Britain (Modood et al., 1997; McCrone et al., 1996; Saeed et al., 1999). Yet, despite this view, the northern race riots,\textsuperscript{2} the 7/7 London bombings, September 11th and the following War on Terror, all seem to have led to a public perception of the Pakistani ethnic group as problematic. The media, in particular, often presents the Pakistani community in relation to highly controversial issues, such as religious extremism, oppression of women and domestic violence. British Pakistanis are often seen as responsible for many of the problems in British society, and for this reason, have recently become the focus of research.

The British Indian ethnic group, on the other hand, is often perceived as a success story. It has managed to a large extent to integrate into British society and achieve great social mobility, as compared to the British Pakistani group. It is important to probe into why this is so, particularly as both groups came to Britain at around the same time. Interestingly, the non-immigrant White community, despite representing the largest ethnic group in the UK

\textsuperscript{1} For some ethnic minority groups, such as Black-Caribbean, for whom there has been a longer history in the UK, the issue of British-born minority parenting is not as new, and many black Caribbean families have grandparents who were born in the UK.

\textsuperscript{2} of 1995 and 2001, respectively.
with its own culture, history and identity, is generally not perceived as an ethnic group in its own right.

One topic that has attracted much public attention in recent years is the difference in educational attainment of children from these three ethnic groups. Some British Indian children fare better than their counterparts from non-immigrant White families, but in almost all cases, British Pakistani children show poorer outcomes than non-immigrant White children. Does family life have anything to do with this? Research on normative samples of these ethnic groups will help answer these questions.
Chapter 1

LITERATURE REVIEW

The literature review is composed of five sections. Section I reviews ethnicity and ethnic identity. Section II briefly examines cross-cultural psychology as well as three relevant theories: bioecological theory (Bronfenbrenner, 1979; 1999), acculturation theory (Berry, 1970; Berry and Sam, 1997; Berry and Sam, 2010) and ethnic-racial socialisation theory (ERS) (Hughes et al., 2006; Hughes et al., 2008). Section III briefly discusses multiculturalism. Section IV reviews contextual factors and beliefs important to British South Asian communities. Finally, Section V explores literature relating to parenting, child development and ethnicity.

Section I: Exploring Ethnicity

This section will explore the concept of ethnicity and examine some of the features associated with it. Ethnicity has been described as being constructed by the members of a group based on a shared sense of identity connected to heritage, place of origin, religion, culture and language (Atkin and Chatoo, 2006). Phinney (1996) views ethnicity as comprised of three elements: ethnic identity, culture and minority versus majority status. Parekh (2000) describes how it is often portrayed as a political symbol, representing exclusion from the majority group as well as a source of belonging and pride that allows minority ethnic groups to feel a sense of collectiveness and make legitimate demands as citizens. Another definition, which has been put forward by a number of theorists, involves shared attitudes, and describes ethnicity as: ‘The sharing of a common culture, including shared origin, shared psychological characteristics and attitudes, shared language, religion and cultural traditions’ (Ford and Kelly, 2005, p.1662).³

In this latter definition, ethnicity is linked to cultural identification, has multiple dimensions and is changeable (Ford and Kelly, 2005). An example of the changing nature of ethnicity is found in the West Indian immigrant group of Britain. This group represents one of the oldest and most established diasporic groups in the UK. In the 1980s, they allowed themselves to be

³ Ethnicity as a shared identity is also described by Sheldon and Parker (1992); Chaturedi and McKeigue, (1994); Senior and Bhopal, (1994); Beutler at al., (1996); Freeman, (1998).
categorised, without comment, as ‘West Indian’. However, in more recent years, members of this diaspora, especially those born in Britain, have campaigned successfully for the term ‘Black British’ to be used instead (Sillitoe and White, 1992). In relation to other diasporic groups, many of the UK classifications seem dated, as more than 40% of the UK’s ethnic minority populations were born in the United Kingdom (Modood et al., 1997). Members of these minorities have begun to redefine their identity by adopting terms such as ‘British Muslim’ or ‘British Caribbean’ (Atkin and Chattoo, 2006).

Understanding race and ethnicity as separate constructs is a common approach in research in this area (Hahn and Stroup, 1994; McKenney and Bennett, 1994; Senior and Bhopal, 1994; Warren at al., 1994; Ford and Kelly, 2005). It has been argued that race is more linked with biological and phenotypic concerns, whereas ethnicity can be understood as a socio-political construct. Despite this, in many cases, the two overlap. For example, in the British context, each of the racial categories of White, Asian, Black, Chinese and non-immigrant White (as identified by the Commission for Racial Equality)\(^4\) includes diverse ethnic groups. So, for example, the Asian category includes members from Pakistani, Indian and Bangladeshi origin, each with their distinct culture. When examining a process such as acculturation, it is very important to recognise this race/ethnicity distinction in order to avoid generalisation.

Phoenix and Husain (2007) also describe ethnicity as multifaceted. However, they use the term ‘intersectionality’ in an attempt to explain the interaction of ethnicity and social trends. They argue that categories such as ‘race, ethnicity, class and gender’ cannot be viewed in a mutually exclusive manner. Each operates alongside, and intersects with, other categories. According to Phoenix and Pattynama (2006), intersectionality methods are gaining popularity as a means of analysing and studying multiple positioning. Similarly, Atkin and Chatoo (2006) argue that a multifaceted approach to understanding ethnicity allows one to clearly see how gender and socio-economic position interact to shape group and individual experiences of discrimination and disadvantage.

Ethnicity has therefore been shown to be a product of social construction. A good example of this at the national level, in both the UK and the US, is of policy makers using national statistics and research questionnaires to assign ethnicity on the basis of ethnic description that individuals and groups self-attribute (Rutter and Tienda, 2005). Such a method can be

---

problematic for a number of reasons. Firstly, individuals are asked to select their ethnicity from a predetermined set of categories, which forces individuals from mixed-race backgrounds to simply categorise themselves as ‘non-White’. Secondly, categories used to represent ethnicity vary between countries. For example, there is a large and diverse Hispanic population in the US, but the corresponding group in the UK is so small that it is not taken into account. Language, religion and geography are just three aspects that can serve as differentiators in the same ethnic groups across countries. Thirdly, use of categories is reductionistic and pre-assumes that ethnicity is categorical and fixed rather than dimensional in nature. Fourthly, a categorical approach is founded on the assumption that individuals only have one ethnic identity. This is contrary to research indicating it is possible for people to have multiple identities that can vary in context. For example, it is possible for a person to consider themselves Black (in race), Scottish (in nationality) and Muslim (in religion). Finally, the self-descriptive approach assumes that an individual’s concept of self is most important, and does not take into consideration the fact that the response of others may be a decisive aspect in determining ethnicity. Social construction can, in actuality, hold a large sway in ethnic identification. For example, despite the designation of Black in the UK to include dark-skinned Asians as well as Africans, these groups see themselves as extremely different from a historical, cultural and even genetic point of view (Rutter and Tienda, 2005).

Despite all of these problems, realistically it is difficult to depart from using any sort of categorical approach, especially in research on ethnic groups. Therefore, when using a categorical approach, it is important to keep in mind the above-mentioned difficulties and to minimise their effects as much as possible. In particular, the assumption that individuals only have one identity often holds little ground in the context of diasporic population groups that are no longer in their first or second generation.

**The Idea of an Ethnic Identity**

Ethnic identity (EI) is a complex phenomenon that changes over time. The study of EI has been based around the work of a number of important theories. Two of these are Tajfel and Turner's social identity theory (1986) and Erikson’s developmental theory of ego psychology (1950; 1968) (Roberts et al., 1999).
Tajfel and his colleagues (1986) examined EI as an aspect of social identity, defining it as: ‘that part of an individual’s self-concept which derives from [his] knowledge of [his] membership of a social group (or groups) together with the value and emotional significance attached to that membership’ (Tajfel, 1981, p.255). Social identity theory describes how individuals who are members of groups compare membership between their own group and other groups to achieve a positive social identity and sense of self. This theory was initially created to understand the reasons behind intergroup discrimination. It is argued that individuals try to protect and maintain their positive feelings regarding group membership through ‘positive distinctiveness’ (Tajfel and Turner, 1979; Turner and Giles, 1981). According to social identity theory, a person can have multiple social identities and will closely link their concept of self to the interpersonal and intergroup contact in which they engage and where social comparison occurs (Kessler et al., 2000). Tajfel and Turner (1979) also describe concepts of ingroups and outgroups and discuss factors that lead to ingroup favouritism.

Erikson’s (1950; 1968) developmental theory, on the other hand, views identity formation as occurring through the processes of internal exploration and commitment at different life stages (Roberts et al., 1999). From this perspective, ethnic identity develops not only in the self but also in conjunction with the surrounding environment and culture. This characteristic of identity becomes particularly relevant in a context where immigrants and diasporic groups are involved, as interaction with a new environment may help to mould an individual’s ethnic identity in a specific way. Indeed, Goulbourne and Solomos (2003) describe ethnic identity as having the ability to auto-maintain itself and incorporate a great deal of change. Erikson (1950; 1968) used the terms ‘identity achievement’ and ‘identity confusion’ to describe the development of identity. Identity achievement refers to the development and maintenance of a stable identity, while individuals failing to develop and establish a stable identity are said to be in identity confusion (Gaines et al., 2010). Erikson also discussed the idea of a spectrum of identity within a particular ethnic group. Members of the group will be at different points on this spectrum, ranging from ethnic identity achievement at the high end to ethnic identity confusion at the low end (Gaines et al., 2010).

Marcia’s model of identity status (1966; 1980) was the first identity theory to follow Erikson’s theory of ego psychology and is helpful for understanding different stages of identity formation. Marcia examined the two key processes of exploration of identity and
commitment, and postulated four levels of identity status (Marcia, 1980). Exploration refers to the process of examining and classifying the various identity alternatives, while commitment refers to the selection of one or more of these alternatives and the decision to follow them (Gaines et al., 2010). The levels of identity status that Marcia developed are as follows:

1. **Identity diffusion**: the status of individuals who have not engaged in exploration or commitment.
2. **Identity foreclosure**: the status of individuals who have made a commitment but have not explored or experienced a crisis.
3. **Identity moratorium**: the status of individuals who have engaged in exploration (they are experiencing a crisis) without commitment.
4. **Identity achievement**: individuals who have explored important identity issues and made a commitment.

According to Marcia (1968; 1980), identity achievement is the most complex stage of identity development, while identity diffusion is the least developed stage (Gaines et al., 2010).

Jean Phinney was influenced by the work of both Erikson and Marcia, and in 1990 developed her own model of the stages of EI development. According to her perspective, the unexamined identity stage is the lowest level of EI development and incorporates both identity diffusion and identity foreclosure. The intermediate level is known as the ‘ethnic identity search’ or ‘exploration stage’, and incorporates identity crises and moratorium. The highest level of EI development is known as the ‘achieved ethnic identity’, or the ‘achievement stage’, and is Phinney’s final stage (Gaines et al., 2010). Phinney’s theory has subsequently undergone much further development.

In another study, Phinney and Ong (2007) describe EI in a more holistic manner, stating that it encompasses feelings of belonging to a group and a clear understanding of what it means to be a member, including positive group attitudes, knowledge of group history, group practices and group culture. Components of EI have been described by both Ashmore et al. (2004) and Phinney et al. (2007), and include self categorisation, commitment and attachment, exploration, ethnic values and beliefs, importance or salience of group membership and EI in relation to national identity.
Ashmore et al. (2004) suggested that the identification of one’s self as a member of a particular group is an intrinsic element of group identity. However, the label itself is less important than the meaning attached to it by the individual, for example, through feelings of ethnic pride. Related to this is the individual’s classification across ethnic or racial categories (as discussed above), which is particularly important when making group comparisons.

Feelings of commitment and attachment to a group are central aspects of EI (Ellemers, Spears and Doosje, 1999; Roberts et al., 1999). Research has shown that the strength of this attachment is not always related to the particular attitudes held by the individual (Cokley, 2005; 2007). Furthermore, commitment to an EI does not always guarantee a secure and stable sense of self and sense of achieved identity. Gaining this sense of commitment is associated with the process of exploration and the desire to gain knowledge and further understanding about one’s ethnicity, an ongoing process that can continue through life. It incorporates a spectrum of activities, including reading, learning cultural practices and rituals, talking to people and attending cultural events. It is also associated with the values and knowledge gained during childhood in ethnic socialisation practices by parents.

Ethnic behaviours are another aspect of ethnic identity and include behaviours relating to ethnic membership, such as speaking the traditional language, eating traditional food and interacting with other group members. Ethnic behaviours are important for demonstrating identity and have been found to be correlated with other aspects of EI. However, Phinney and Ong (2007) suggest that EI is an internal structure and ethnic behaviours are not necessary for EI to exist. Further, they state that for clarity of research purposes, behaviour should be analysed separately from identity in order to help understand how external behaviours may be associated with the more internal state of identity.

Another distinct component of EI relates to the feelings a person has for the group. Positive attitudes towards one’s ethnic group and commitment to the group have been found to predict daily happiness (Kiang et al., 2006). Further, the development of a positive ethnic identity helps in the rejection of negative views originating from stereotypes. ‘Private regard’ is a term often used in literature on racial identity to describe positive group attitudes towards race. Many minority ethnic groups have, at some point, been victims of discrimination. Positive ingroup attitudes are believed to counter feelings of victimisation following a racist incident. Umaña-Taylor et al. (2004) have also shown that it is possible to be both committed
to one’s group and have negative feelings towards the group and a desire to gain membership of another group.

A further component of EI is the importance given to one’s ethnic identity, which also varies across groups and individuals, as well as across an individual’s lifespan. Phinney and Ong (2007) have demonstrated that dominant majority ethnic groups assign less importance to EI as compared to minority groups.

Finally, another way of looking at EI is in conjunction with other important group identities that individuals may have, such as their national identity. Acculturation theorists examine this specific aspect of EI. Early theorists believed EI and national identity to be negatively correlated, but more recent research has demonstrated that the two are independent, and therefore potentially positively correlated, negatively correlated or uncorrelated. There is wide variation in correlation patterns between EI and national identity across countries and across the four acculturation profiles of assimilation, separation, integration and marginalisation. Furthermore, Worrel et al. (2006) argued that the construct of EI only holds importance in multicultural or pluralistic societies, where different ethnic groups are in contact, and that in a homogeneous society EI holds very little importance.

Clarification of the difference between ethnic and racial identities is important when examining EI. Racial identity has tended to focus on racism and internalisation of racism mainly in Black samples (Helms, 2007 in Phinney, 2007), while ethnic identity research has drawn from a much more varied range of ethnic and racial groups and has tried to understand the strength of identification to an ethnic group and how this links to culture, values, tradition and language.

Development of Ethnic Identity

When does ethnic identity develop? Literature around this subject originates from Erikson’s ego identity measure (1968). Erikson viewed identity as a feeling of sameness and continuity that allows individuals to have a secure sense of self and helps guide decisions and life choices. Identity formation was described as a continual process that begins in childhood, is particularly important in adolescence and continues into adulthood leading to the formation
of an achieved identity. An achieved identity is not always attained, but is correlated with many indicators of psychological well-being (Phinney and Ong, 2007).

Although ethnic identity is associated with the self, it is also associated with shared collective meaning and, unlike some aspects of personal identity, is passed on to a person based on ethnic background or phenotype. People can therefore engage with their EI (Phinney and Ong, 2007). Ruble et al. (2004) showed that EI starts to develop in a very basic form in childhood, and Suárez-Orozco (2001) also demonstrated that self identity and ethnic identity begin to develop around the same time, at around seven to eight years old.

Motti-Stefanidi, Berry, Chryssochoou, Sam and Phinney (2012) discuss the importance of an individual’s choices and actions to EI development, while also recognising the relevance of contexts to ethnic identity formation. This is in line with the term ‘communal culture’, used by Erikson in his 1968 theory. The contexts in which an individual is situated, such as family, peers and community, are central factors in a young person’s development of a stable and meaningful identity (Kroger, 2007). These contexts provide choices and challenges, which lead to further identity development. Motti-Stefanidi et al. (2012) also discuss identity formation in immigrant youths. The contexts in which these youth develop are often different from those of non-immigrant youth. For example, it is common for immigrant parents to expect their children to succeed academically and economically. Often, immigrant parents move to a new country to provide better opportunities for their children, yet these parents may also lack understanding of the issues their children face and may not be able to provide adequate guidance to allow for strong EI formation (Motti-Stefanidi et al., 2012).

Chun et al. (2003) add to the discussion on immigration and EI development. According to their research, factors affecting EI vary in importance according to the individual and his or her immigration history. They demonstrate that first-generation immigrants are often more attached to group values and traditions than second- or third-generation immigrants, who by then have adjusted to the new society.

In his studies on minority groups in the UK, Modood (2005) revealed that members from minority groups, including those born and raised in Britain, associate strongly with their ethnic and family origins and that this identification remains strong across generations. Modood (2005) also demonstrated that the type of identity a group takes on can vary in values. For example, in Britain, colour is very significant to the Caribbean community
whereas religion is important to South Asians. These identities are maintained through community-based practices and socio-political conflict, as seen in Muslims at the moment. Through these mechanisms, it is believed that ethnic identities are able to persist.

Stanley Gaines and his colleagues (2010) discuss how very few studies of ethnic identity have taken place in the United Kingdom. This is in contrast to the US, for which the 1990s was proclaimed the ‘decade of ethnicity’ owing to the large number of EI-based studies that were carried out there. Moreover, almost all UK studies on EI have failed to view EI and acculturation as distinct constructs and failed to measure EI across multiple ethnic groups. Therefore, it is important to view ethnic identity and acculturation distinctly, when starting investigation of ethnic groups.

Section II: Cross-cultural Psychology

Section II discusses the relatively contemporary discipline of cross-cultural psychology, which offers important guidance when conducting research across ethnic groups. The aim of cross-cultural psychology is to understand variation and similarity in human behaviour in their cultural contexts (Berry, Poortinga, Segall and Dansen, 2002). Historically, psychology has tended to ignore culture when attempting to understand human behaviour, and has focused on European and American samples. This is problematic, as it means that research in psychology is non-representative of the larger global population. Cross-cultural psychology emerged as a counter to this trend. Berry and Dansen (1974) identified three goals of cross-cultural psychology: (1) to investigate whether current psychological findings and research remain applicable when implemented in other cultures, (2) to investigate and discover novel aspects of the phenomenon being explored in the local terms of other cultures, and (3) to use the findings of the first two approaches to develop a holistic understanding of various phenomena with more ‘pan-human validity’.

Cross-cultural psychology has been used in conjunction with many psychological disciplines, particularly developmental psychology. Bornstein (1980, p.232) describes studies of development using cross-cultural psychological methods in the following way:

‘This type of analysis helps to distinguish behaviours that emerge in a cultural-dependent (emic) fashion from those that are independent of culture (etic). Further,
genetic universals can be distinguished from structural ones. Finally, this analysis lays bare how forces that vary globally (e.g. family structure, degree of urbanisation, nationality, religion, economic system or status etc.) differentially mould human behaviour.

Cross-cultural psychology is highly comprehensive in nature, as it examines human variation across time and region. It focuses on description and explanation (Bornstein, 1980) and allows research to shift away from ethnocentrism. In his research, Bornstein also touches upon some of the important perspectives within psychology of behaviour-cultural interaction (Berry and Poortinga, 2006). These have been described by Berry et al. (2002) as ‘absolutism’, ‘relativism’ and ‘universalism’.

The absolutist perspective views human behaviour as the same across cultures, with the implication being that culture does not play an important role in an individual’s nature or behaviour. For example, in an absolutist study, ‘anxiety’ would be found to be the same across whichever groups were measured. Similarly, absolutist studies may use standardised tests and assessments and make interpretations in a similar manner. This perspective uses an ethnocentric approach, described by Berry as ‘an imposed etic approach’ (Berry, 2006). The relativist approach, on the other hand, is an emic-based approach. The relativist perspective sees behaviour to be defined by culture and human diversity to be nested in the cultural context in which a group interacts. Comparisons between groups are viewed as ethnocentric and are discouraged. Rather, studies are carried out using the values and meanings that individual groups give to behaviours (Berry and Poortinga, 2006). Cultural psychology and indigenous psychology use a basic relativist ideology. Finally, the approach of universalism is similar to what Berry (1969) describes as a ‘derived etic approach’. Universalism finds commonalities in human behaviour across groups, but believes that culture impacts the development and manifestation of that behaviour. Universalist studies use measurements that take this principle into account, and conducted comparisons between groups carefully using culturally-based meaning. Cross-cultural psychology follows this perspective to understand behaviour across different groups.

Bornstein (1980) states that the main aim of cross-cultural psychology is to increase understanding about other cultures. He points out that other disciplines, such as anthropology and sociology, have long been involved in comparing humans from different parts of the world and from different periods in history (Bornstein, 1980; Bronfenbrenner, 1979; Erikson,
1950; Kessen, 1975; LeVine, 1974; Monroe and Monroe, 1975; Werner, 1979; Whiting and Whiting, 1975). Indeed, as a result, cross-cultural psychology holds its origins in many academic disciplines, such as philosophy, history, biology and anthropology.

Anthropology, in particular, has offered more to the discipline than any other field. This is firstly through broadening the understanding of children’s lives, particularly through ethnographic accounts. Secondly, anthropologists were the first to conduct formal observations of cultural dimensions of personality and cognition. Anthropologists also helped psychology to realise the limitations of ethnocentrism (so common in social science of the time), and the importance of understanding culture. However, as Whiting and Whiting (1975) noted, within anthropology – particularly in ethnographic accounts – the degree of variation in sample as well as sample size was often small. This is where cross-cultural psychology steps in as a discipline that can help in understanding patterns and norms by examining specific groups in relation to others.

Cross-cultural comparisons are thus a powerful force in social scientific analysis, and comparisons of human development in different cultures are central to this discipline. Sample representativeness and population matching, as well as the quality of experimenter/subject communication, are all important in cross-cultural psychology due to its comparative nature (Bornstein, 1980). In fact, to a large extent, the study design and methodology used in cross-cultural research does not depart far from classical psychological research (Bornstein, 1980). This is not to say that cross-cultural methodology has not developed some of its own unique methodology.5 Studies based on this framework have utilised specialised methods, such as the natural experiment.

Bornstein (1980) further discusses how, traditionally, comparative studies that have been cross-cultural or developmental in nature have tended to examine a phenomenon in a Western society and then examine this phenomenon in a non-Western culture to establish whether difference or generalisability can be established. Studies of this sort are limited when researchers do not have empirical justification for the sources of group differences they find. Researchers may conclude that culture, race or ethnicity is the source of these group differences, but simply identifying differences between groups does not allow for such interpretations, as two or more groups can vary in many ways, some of which may be a result

---

5 Further details on the methodological implications of cross-cultural research can be found in the methodology chapter.
of culture, while others may be due to non-cultural factors. Furthermore, even if culture is identified as a factor producing difference, researchers often do not highlight the specific cultural variables that cause this difference. The conclusion that group difference is due to culture, without empirical evidence for that conclusion, is known as the ‘cultural attribution fallacy’ (Matsumoto and Jones, 2009). Cultural attribution fallacy can arise in studies due to the way cultures are sampled, and it typically arises when a grouping used to compare groups is not culturally-based. In addition, previous comparative studies have not always been truly developmental (i.e. have not examined several points across an individual’s lifespan) (Bornstein, 1980).

Further, cross-cultural psychology recognises the nature/nurture aspect of difference among groups, and gives importance to both an individual’s genetics and environment. Achenbach et al. (2008) discuss this in relation to children, and examine the ways in which cultural factors shape the environments in which children develop.

Achenbach et al. (2008) also state that it is important to also take into account the idea of intragroup variability. In their study examining the use of the Achenbach System of Empirically Based Assessment (ASEBA) and the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ) instruments in a range of countries (including Sweden, Norway, the US and UK, among others), their scale scores show that variation within populations is larger than differences between populations, and they conclude that it is problematic to understand populations as internally homogeneous. Given this fact, it is important that cross-cultural developmental psychology studies take this aspect of diversity into account.

In conclusion, cross-cultural developmental psychology allows us to rethink the development of human behaviour. It enables greater involvement (within research) of non-Western societies and is particularly significant in an era of rapid urbanisation, globalisation and migration, when different cultures are interacting on a level never before witnessed.

Three main theories will guide this research and help in interpreting the complexity of ethnicity, parenting and child development: the bioecological theory of human development (using the Process-Person-Context-Time model (PPCT)) (Bronfenbrenner, 1979; 1999; Bronfenbrenner and Morris, 2006); the theory of ethnic-racial socialisation (Hughes et al., 2006a; Hughes et al., 2008); and acculturation theory (Berry, 2003). These theories originate from different disciplines in psychology, namely developmental psychology, social
psychology and acculturation psychology, respectively. Using such a multi-disciplinary approach ensures that parenting and child development in different ethnic groups is understood holistically and across different levels.

The Bioecological Theory of Human Development

Up until his death in 2005, Urie Bronfenbrenner continuously re-evaluated and updated his bioecological systems theory from its original 1979 form. In 1999 he made this particularly apparent when he wrote: ‘It is useful to distinguish two periods; the first ending with the publication of The Ecology of Human Development (Bronfenbrenner, 1979) and the second characterised by a series of papers that call the original model into ‘question’ (Bronfenbrenner, 1999, in Tudge et al., 2009).

Bronfenbrenner’s original (1979) model discussed culture in terms of contexts. It examined the interrelationships between individuals and contexts, thus acknowledging diversity in psychological processes. Culture was defined in relation to an individual’s environment as well as societal customs and values, and was not described as the explicit property of an individual but in terms of the meanings people constructed or derived from experiences (Cooper and Denner, 1998). Bronfenbrenner placed the developing child at the centre of a framework surrounded by different contextual levels (the microsystem, mesosystem and macrosystem) and examined how the child develops across these different levels as well as across historical time (chronosystems) (Bronfenbrenner, 1989; 1993; 1995). Bronfenbrenner originally developed the model to address the lack of context he perceived in other psychological theories of development (Cooper and Denner, 1998). However, he later criticised his work for its lack of focus on the individual’s influence on their own development and its over-emphasis on the role of context (Tudge et al., 2009). Although Bronfenbrenner subsequently removed some of the concepts of his original model (such as ecological transitions), one major element remained in all revised versions: the ecological nature of his theory and the interrelation between an individual and his or her context (Tudge et al., 2009).

The main difference between Bronfenbrenner’s earlier and later work is his focus on human developmental processes. In his work in the 1990s, he viewed ‘proximal processes’ as the key
mechanisms of human development (Bronfenbrenner, 1994; 1995; 1999; Bronfenbrenner and Ceci, 1994; Bronfenbrenner and Morris, 1998). These proximal processes are interactions that explain the link between a factor relating to context (such as social class or culture) or a factor relating to the individual (such as gender), and the outcome being studied. In his final paper, published after his death, he referred to them as the ‘primary engines of development’ (Bronfenbrenner and Morris, 2006). Following his definition of proximal processes, Bronfenbrenner discussed his theory in terms of a Process-Person-Context-Time (PPCT) model (Bronfenbrenner, 2005; Bronfenbrenner and Evans, 2000; Bronfenbrenner and Morris, 2006). According to Bronfenbrenner, it is in the interrelations between these four areas that development occurs.

**Process**

Bronfenbrenner believed that the processes of interaction (or proximal processes) play a vital role in an individual’s development. Examples of interaction processes include reading, children’s solitary play, activities between children, interactive child play and acquisition of new skills (Tudge et al., 2009). These processes take place frequently in the life of a developing person and allow the individual to understand their surrounding environment. Motti-Stefanidi et al. (2012) also recognised the importance of process in the PPCT model and wrote: ‘Human development is seen as the result of interactions that must take place on a fairly regular basis and over an extended period of time between an active and evolving human organism and the persons in his or her immediate environment.’

The characteristics of proximal processes vary according to the nature of the developing person, the environment, the type of development outcome, the social continuities and the changes taking place over time.

**Person**

Bronfenbrenner recognised both genetic and biological traits, but he focused more on the individual’s personality and characteristics in a given social situation. These were categorised into three types: ‘demand’, ‘resource’ and ‘force’. Demand characteristics include physical
appearance, skin colour and gender, all of which are visible and can influence a person’s immediate behaviour during initial interactions due to expectations that may be developed by others. Resource characteristics are associated with ‘social and material resources’ (for example, food, housing and educational opportunities) as well as a person’s emotional and mental aspects (for example, intelligence and skills) (Tudge et al., 2009). Finally, force characteristics relate to personal psychological characteristics, such as temperament.

Bronfenbrenner discussed how two children with the same resource characteristics can have very different developmental outcomes if their force characteristics are different. Further, he asserted that a person’s role in shaping their own development and the environment around them can be passive or active. For example, a person with a specific skin colour (demand characteristic) can affect people’s behaviour towards them without the person actively doing anything. Another example would be a person with strong motivation (force characteristic) actively striving for success and actively impacting the environment around them.

**Context**

Context is comprised of interrelated levels. Bronfenbrenner (1979) summed up these levels in his original paper on the bioecological model, in which he wrote: ‘The child is not only affected by his or her own characteristics (the individual level), but also by his or her immediate social and physical environment (the microsystem level), and by the interrelationalship among the various settings in his or her immediate environment (the mesosystem level). The child is further influenced by the broader social setting, such as economic processes (the exosystem level), which in turn, are influenced by cultural attitudes and ideologies (the macrosystem level).’

An example of an interaction between levels is that of a mother who has had a very difficult day at work (the exosystem level, as her child is not directly present) and is subsequently excessively agitated with her child when she gets home (microsystem level).
**Time**

The PPCT model characterises time in three ways (Tudge et al., 2009): (1) micro-time, which is the span of a particular interaction or activity, (2) meso-time, which is the degree to which particular interactions and activities take place though a developing person’s environment, and (3) macro-time (known as the ‘chronosystem’ in the original model), which takes into account the person’s age and the specific historical events in which the person has developed. For example, a Muslim youth growing up following the September 11th terror attacks may have very different interactions than a Muslim youth growing up ten years before that event.

Tudge et al., (2009) argued that recent studies following Bronfenbrenner’s (1999) paper have failed to adequately acknowledge the changes he made to his theory and the development of the PPCT model. They analysed twenty-five studies and identified only four that applied Bronfenbrenner’s PPCT concepts in the correct form. The criticism aimed at most of the studies they analysed was that they were too focused on contextual factors and did not emphasise the importance of proximal processes.

**Ethnic-Racial Socialisation (ERS)**

Ethnic and racial socialisation are concepts that have been used to describe how parents transmit information, perspectives and values relating to race and ethnicity to their children (Hughes et al., 2006a; Hughes et al., 2008). These terms have been used, particularly with reference to specific groups in the US. Racial socialisation has been used in relation to African American parents, particularly in respect to how they establish high self-esteem in their children and help them to understand barriers of race as a result of racial stratification systems in the US (Boykin and Toms, 1985; Peters, 1985; Spencer, 1983; Spencer and Markstrom-Adams, 1990; Tatum, 1987; Thornton et al., 1990). Ethnic socialisation, on the other hand, emerged from the circumstances of Latino, Asian (Chinese) and (less often) Caribbean and African groups in the US, and examines aspects such as cultural transmission and retention, identity development and assimilation into the host society (Knight, Bernal, Cota et al., 1993; Knight et al., 1993; Ou and McAdoo, 1993; Quintana and Vera, 1999). However, the two ideas overlap to a great extent and the term ‘ethnic-racial socialisation’ (ERS) was coined as an amalgamated term to refer to the range of literature relating to this
concept in studies of both minority and majority ethnic groups. Research in this realm has often tended to ignore the White ethnic group as a racialised or ethnicised construction, with few studies incorporating this group in this manner (Hamm, 2001; Hughes and Chen, 1999).

Themes in ERS

Dianne Hughes and her colleagues (Hughes et al. 2006a; 2008) have conducted extensive research in ERS and highlighted its extremely multifaceted nature, its need to be understood in terms of its content, its mode of transmission and the underlying beliefs and aims behind it. They state (2008, p.228): ‘Ethnic-racial socialisation messages are often seamlessly woven into families’ habits, customs and daily routines. They can be verbal or nonverbal, deliberate or unintended, proactive or reactive, inhibited by parents or initiated by children and part of a larger child rearing agenda or not.’

Hughes et al. (2008) conducted a large mixed-methods study among adolescents and their parents to understand the situations or contexts that serve as cues for ERS, how socialisation takes place and how effectively adolescents understand the messages their parents give them. Their sample was drawn from adolescents and parents from middle schools in New York and from a range of ethnic groups (Black, Chinese, Latino and White). In total, 700 adolescents took part and the parents of 200 of these adolescents also participated. Hughes et al. (2008) used surveys and interviews to help understand the types of strategies their participants used and found ERS practices in the majority of families studied. However, these practices were often elusive in nature, sometimes appearing in routines and daily life without parents even recognising their presence. The types of socialisation strategies they found could be categorised into similar themes as those developed in their 2006 study, in which they conducted a review of the literature on ethnic and racial socialisation. They categorised the research into the four themes of cultural socialisation, preparation for bias, promotion of mistrust and egalitarianism. It was found that these themes can exist simultaneously within the same instance of ERS (Hughes et al., 2008), and parents are likely to use different types of strategies with children according to particular circumstances and environmental factors.
Cultural Socialisation

Cultural socialisation relates to parenting practices in which children are taught about their racial heritage and history in a way that encourages traditions and cultural customs and pride in their ethnicity, culture or race (Hughes et al., 2006a). Some of the studies Hughes et al. (2006a) looked at in their literature review included those of Boykin and Toms (1985), Hughes, Bachman, Ruble and Fuligni (2006), Hughes and Chen (1999), Thornton et al. (1990) and Umaña-Taylor and Fine (2004). Literature relating to acculturation and identity formation were also incorporated into the theme of cultural socialisation, primarily because of its link to culture. Hughes et al. (2008) described this type of socialisation as important at the level of the family, being ‘so deeply ingrained in family life that it is taken for granted’ (Hughes et al., 2008).

It was found that parents have different approaches to cultural socialisation, which may be intentional or unintentional (Hughes et al., 2008). Identity-enhancing cultural socialisation is an overt type of cultural socialisation that occurs through special projects and events such as family celebrations and school projects. Covert ethnic socialisation\(^6\) occurs when ethnic practices are deeply ingrained in the daily routine and life of group members. This includes food preparation and meals, traditional language use, music, dancing, culture and media (Hughes et al., 2008). Covert socialisation is often unintentional and not linked to an agenda, but just part and parcel of daily family life. A third type of socialisation is related to parents showing ethnic art, discussing ethnic literature, history, important figures or culturally specific knowledge and attending ethnic museums, in order to expose their children to their culture and help them understand their roots. Finally, parents may also use cultural socialisation by discussing phenotype and skin colour. This is also linked to preparation for bias. The aim of such socialisation is to ensure children understand the connotations of belonging to a particular race or ethnicity and all that it stands for. It has been particularly seen in Black samples in past studies and can also act as a type of resistance (Hughes et al., 2008).

There are a number of goals of cultural socialisation, including self-knowledge, instillation of important values (such as a work ethic) in children, respect for elders and family, discipline,

religion and spirituality. Another goal that has been mentioned above is to arm children with self pride, strength and resistance (Hughes et al., 2008).

Egalitarianism

Parents use egalitarianism to teach children the importance of individual qualities as opposed to membership in a racial group. ‘Mainstream socialisation’ (Boykin and Toms, 1985) is a term that refers to egalitarianism-based practices that are employed in order to encourage assimilation into mainstream culture. However, as discussed earlier, assimilation into mainstream culture is not an end point for many ethnic groups, who instead choose to integrate. Further, studies have shown that a contradiction can occur between parents’ views and their actions, in relation to egalitarianism (Hughes et al., 2008). Thus, when conducting research in this area, researchers should fully probe respondents to obtain a realistic picture of parenting practices and the motivations behind those practices.

Hughes et al. (2008) found that parents using this strategy have an appreciation for diversity and a desire for their children to mix and learn from people of different backgrounds. They are also open and accepting of others’ beliefs. Hughes et al. (2008) wrote: ‘mothers’ openness is often reflected in claims that they do not notice race and do not use it as a basis for making life choices (e.g. about housing, friendship, activities, work).’ Although this was found to be true for many of the mothers interviewed, they also found a number of mothers who spoke about the importance of diversity but, in practice, lived in ethnically homogenous areas and had few friends from ethnic groups different from their own. Thus, some parents demonstrate a contradiction between belief and action.

It was also found that one way in which parents practice egalitarianism is through silence around the topic of race and ethnicity. By not acknowledging race and ethnicity they indirectly emanate the ideas that everyone is equal and that race and ethnicity should not be a basis for discussion (Spencer, 1983; Hughes et al. 2006a). Hughes et al. (2008) also found that egalitarian practices could be both reactive and proactive. One example of a reactive strategy, linked to preparation for bias (discussed further below), is the use of egalitarianism to increase a child’s self worth, by helping them understand that people should be not discriminated against because of difference. This strategy might take place following a racial
incident or when parents anticipate their children might encounter discrimination and believe this strategy will protect them.

Hughes et al. (2008) found that mothers demonstrate proactive egalitarianism when they expose their children to the culture, beliefs and way of living of many cultural groups. Some parents actively choose to live in highly multicultural neighbourhoods or to send their children to specific schools due to a school’s plural nature. Parents may also celebrate festivals and discuss other cultures with their children, to help them celebrate and appreciate diversity (Hughes et al., 2008).

There are numerous underlying goals of egalitarianism, including the instillation of moral principles (such as respect for others’ beliefs and religion) and the assurance that children understand social justice values (such as prejudice and discrimination) to be wrong. Parents may also use egalitarianism in an instrumental manner to ensure that children have the tools to interact in a multicultural society by not only appreciating others’ beliefs but also appreciating their own beliefs and values.

Preparation for Bias

Preparation for bias relates to parenting practices that aim to make children aware of discrimination and teach them how to deal with it (Hughes et al., 2006a; Hughes and Chen, 1999). This practice has been examined with particular reference to the African American group, and can be linked to their history of oppression. Hughes et al. (2008) found preparation for bias most often in discussions relating to discrimination or unfair treatment, with the aim of instilling coping mechanisms in children. Both children and parents may initiate preparation for bias. As with egalitarianism, there are two types of strategy: proactive and reactive (Hughes and Chen, 1999; Stevenson, 1999). Proactive strategies are used when parents believe that their children will encounter discrimination and try to equip them with useful skills. Reactive strategies, on the other hand, relate to discussions following incidents that have already occurred. Parental guidance when engaging in these discussions, varies. Some parents downplay race-related events and encourage children to ignore them in order to help them cope, while others address the incident directly.
Hughes et al. (2008) discussed three main goals behind preparation for bias: (1) equipping a child with tools for success, such as education, (2) increasing a child’s psychological resources, such as their self-confidence and determination, and (3) protecting the emotional state of a child who has just encountered discrimination.

Promotion of Mistrust

Finally, promotion of mistrust refers to parenting practices that encourage distrust and carefulness in interracial communication. These include discussions with children on how to behave with certain groups and on barriers to success they may encounter in their life paths (Hughes et al., 2006a; Hughes and Chen, 1999). Hughes et al. (2008) found promotion of mistrust messages differ from preparation from bias messages, in that they offer no suggestions of how to cope with or manage discrimination. In a British context, promotion of mistrust could be found to be an important form of parenting among certain groups, such as Muslims in our increasingly Islamophobic environment. This parental strategy can lead to restrictions in children’s movements, as a UK study conducted by Chahal and Julienne (1999) showed. The study found that parents who had experienced racial harassment or attacks restricted their children’s movement in the neighbourhoods being studied. However, promotion of mistrust was found to be very subtle. Hughes et al. wrote (2008): ‘Unlike preparation for bias or egalitarianism, these cautions and warnings tend to transpire in brief and fleeting exchanges or in isolated comments that are embedded in other interactions. They rarely surface as extended conversations that can be readily recounted.’

Thus, researchers must be careful to correctly identify promotion of mistrust messages. Sometimes parents can unintentionally promote mistrust through brief comments in which they tell their children to be cautious of members from specific groups. However, mistrust can also be intentionally expressed, through derogatory comments made about particular groups, and is found in both ethnic minority as well as majority groups. ‘Contrast training’ is a term Hughes et al. (2008) used to highlight one way in which promotion of bias might manifest. It occurs when parents or children frequently compare other groups to their own group. This ‘us’ versus ‘them’ comparison facilitates the creation of ingroup and outgroup attitudes, with parents and children trying to differentiate themselves from other groups. In older children, these discussions can be triggered by their choice of partner or ‘love interest’,
particularly if parents discourage cross-cultural relationships (Hughes et al., 2008). Preparation for bias and promotion of mistrust were reported by Hughes et al. (2008) as occurring least frequently amongst ethnic groups, and they stated that more research was needed in these areas.

Further Features of ERS

The above themes represent four broad types of parenting methods associated with ethnic groups. It is important to keep in mind that these practices vary on both an individual level (depending on the specific characteristics of the parent and the child), and a group level (depending on the characteristics of the ethnic group and other contextual factors). At the group level, studies have shown that preparation for bias may be related to the views of the larger society about a particular ethnic group (Hughes and Chen, 1999; Hughes and Johnson, 2001; Phinney and Chavira, 1995). For instance, at the individual level, studies have highlighted the link between ERS and child development. Parents have been found to show similar cultural socialisation levels with their child across their child’s lifespan. However, parents are less likely to discuss the complex concept of discrimination and intergroup relations with younger children (Hughes and Chen, 1997, Hughes et al., 2006a, McHale et al., 2006). Therefore, the child’s age is an important predictor of ERS. Gender is also an important predictor, as girls are more likely to experience cultural socialisation parenting than boys. This could be linked to the idea that girls are carriers of culture (Hughes et al., 2006a). The type of socialisation strategy parents use also relates to parental characteristics such as socio-economic status, ethnic identity, geographical location and past experiences of racism. For example, Hughes et al. (2008) found that parents who had stronger ethnic identities showed more cultural socialisation practices, while parents who had been victims of discrimination, themselves, were more likely to use preparation for bias socialisation with their children.

Literature about the outcomes of using particular ERS parenting strategies is currently not very rich. One important finding is that adolescents who have experienced cultural socialisation parenting practices from childhood seem to have more positive ingroup feelings towards their ethnicity and greater knowledge of their culture (Lee and Quintana, 2005; O’Conner, Brooks-Gunn and Graber, 2000; Quintana and Vera, 1999; Stevenson, 1995;
Umaña-Taylor and Fine, 2004; Umaña-Taylor, Bhanot and Shin, 2006, in Hughes et al., 2008). Other findings in this area have been inconsistent, and research relating to child behaviour and psychological adjustment, in particular, is less developed and often conflicting and incomparable because of methodological problems relating to sample characteristics and data analysis techniques (Hughes et al., 2008).

**ERS Literature in the UK**

Unlike the US, Britain has few researchers working on ERS. Studies that do exist are most often limited to understanding cultural socialisation practices, such as transmission of culture in ethnic groups, and acculturation processes, while less often related to practices resulting from intergroup contact. One example is a study conducted by Barn et al. (2006) in which it was found that the transmission of traditions and cultural values from parent to child is important among minority ethnic groups living in contemporary Britain. This was demonstrated in relation to religion and language. Bilingual households are more common in African and Asian groups as a result of the parents’ effort to ensure their children speak their traditional language. The practice of religious rituals and the passing of religious knowledge from parent to child were conducted in different ways between ethnic groups. In addition, Barn et al. (2006) showed that time and generational change causes a shift in thinking from assimilation based thinking to bicultural based thinking, which allows groups to maintain aspects of both cultures and has, in turn, been linked to higher self-esteem and increased intellectual flexibility (Ramirez and Cox, 1980; Costa and Santesteban, 2004).

As previously mentioned, studies often ignore the majority ethnic group when thinking about transmission of information on race and ethnicity in parenting practices. Studies exploring ERS among the White majority ethnic group in a British context include that of Holden (2006), who examined the views of young people and teachers in two northern UK cities with an emphasis on interfaith dialogue. The research revealed that teachers who strive to incorporate multicultural elements into their curriculum and discuss diversity in the classroom, experience objections from parents, who find that those practices undermine what it means to be British. On the other hand, Reay et al. (2006) identified White middle class families from three areas in England who chose to place their children in ethnically-mixed secondary schools to allow them to experience diversity and build up cultural capital.
Acculturation: Theory and Definition

In the space of a few years, acculturation has become a prominent psychological topic because of its link to understanding the behaviour and well-being of ethnic minorities and immigrants (Motti-Stefanidi et al., 2012; Berry et al., 2010; Sam and Berry, 2010; Kang, 2006; Ward, 2001; Rogler, Cortes and Malgady, 1991; Suinn, Richard-Figueroa, Lew and Vigil, 1987). A range of acculturation models have been conceptualised, using both unidimensional and bidimensional systems (Berry, 2003; Rudmin, 2003; Cabassa, 2003; Nguyen and von Eye, 2002; Ryder, Alden and Paulhus, 2000; Berry, Trimble and Olmedo, 1986). Although there are now a series of definitions of acculturation, two of the earlier definitions remain important in the field (Berry, 2005). First, the classic definition:

‘Acculturation comprehends those phenomena which result when groups of individuals having different cultures come into continuous first-hand contact, with subsequent changes in the original culture patterns of either or both groups...under this definition, acculturation is to be distinguished from culture change, of which it is but one aspect, and assimilation, which is at times a phase of acculturation.’

(Redfield, Linton, and Herskovits, 1936, p.149-150)

A second widely referenced definition is that offered by the Social Science Research Council in 1954:

‘[Acculturation is a] culture change that is initiated by the conjunction of two or more autonomous cultural systems. Acculturative change may be the consequence of direct cultural transmission; it may be derived from non-cultural causes, such as ecological or demographic modification induced by an impinging culture; it may be delayed, as with internal adjustments following upon the acceptance of alien traits or patterns; or it may be a reactive adaptation of traditional modes of life.’

(Social Science Research Council, 1954, p 974)

The first definition focuses on contact between individuals from two or more cultural groups and suggests the broader notion that culture is fluid. Change not only takes place in the immigrant or non-dominant groups, but also in the mainstream or dominant group (Berry, 2005). Following initial contact, these changes continue when ethnic groups that maintain their culture and traditions interact with other groups (Motti-Stefanidi et al., 2012).
Acculturation is considered to have different dimensions and is distinguished from assimilation.\(^7\)

The second definition, focuses on group level acculturation and examines some additional aspects, such as its sometimes indirect and delayed nature (Berry, 2005), and, importantly, the fact that it can be reactionary, meaning that groups may cling to traditions as a coping measure rather than incorporate the ideas and practices of the dominant group into their identity.

When viewed simultaneously, both definitions of acculturation highlight that it occurs at two levels: the group level and the individual level. Sam and Berry (2010) discussed the importance of this distinction, stating that changes occurring at each of these levels can be very different. However, they also argued that group and individual levels are interrelated, as individuals interact in both ecological and cultural contexts and these contexts, in turn, affect individual behaviour (Sam and Berry, 2010).

In acculturation literature, there are two types of models: unidimensional (also known as the assimilation or bipolar model) and bidimensional (Kang, 2006). The unidimensional model views acculturation as a phenomenon of a group in which individuals move from one type of cultural identity (e.g. ethnic identity) to the other (e.g. mainstream identity) over a period of time (Kang, 2006). This model has a very basic premise, and critics have argued that it is far too simplistic and lacks insight. Their main contention is that unidimensional models view cultural identities as ‘mutually exclusive’ (Kang, 2006) and, therefore, do not allow for the existence of bicultural identities such as British Pakistani and British Indian, as many diasporic and immigrant groups describe themselves.

The bidimensional model, on the other hand, does allow for the existence of two cultural identities and, for this reason, has gained much popularity amongst theorists. At the centre of the model is an independence assumption, which states that: ‘the maintenance of ethnic identity is independent from the development of mainstream cultural identity’ (Kang, 2006). In this way, the model does not view acculturation as moving along a spectrum with assimilation as the end point, and instead allows for more flexibility. It incorporates people with bicultural identities as well as individuals who do not associate with either culture. When using this framework to develop measures of acculturation, care has to be taken that
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\(^7\)This occurs when the non-dominant group identifies with the host culture and rejects its own culture.
this independence assumption is accurately incorporated. The present study is based on the bidimensional model of acculturation.⁸

**Psychological and Cultural Acculturation**

Graves (1967) was the first to distinguish between psychological and cultural acculturation. He defined psychological acculturation as ‘changes in an individual who is a participant in a culture contact situation being influenced both directly by the external culture (usually dominant) and by the changing culture (usually non-dominant) of which the individual is a member’ (Berry, 2005). Psychological acculturation occurs at the individual level, whereas cultural acculturation occurs at the group level and reflects a change in the culture of the group as a whole (Berry and Sam, 1997). These cultural changes at the group level, in turn, affect individual level acculturation. Psychological and cultural acculturation are particularly important concepts in Berry’s framework of acculturation and will be described further, below (Sam and Berry, 2010; Berry, 2006).

**Adaptation and Acculturation Strategies**

According to Berry (1970), individuals in a plural⁹ society have to develop means of acculturation. Two important issues are central to developing such strategies: (1) cultural maintenance, and (2) contact and participation. Berry (1970) defines cultural maintenance as ‘the extent to which cultural identity and characteristics are considered important for individuals and their maintenance strived for.’ Contact and participation refers to the degree to which people involve themselves with other groups or remain amongst themselves (Berry, 1970).

Berry’s framework of acculturation is continually being updated with recent research focusing on modifications and new applications of the model. As discussed, the framework views both group level and individual level aspects of acculturation. Group level aspects include: (1) the characteristics of the two cultural groups before contact; immigrants¹⁰ and
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⁸ With particular reference to the work of John Berry, David Sam and their colleagues in this area (Berry, 1997; 2003; 2006; Sam and Berry, 2010).

⁹ A multicultural society composed of a diverse range of groups with different ethnic make-ups (see Berry and Sam, 1997).

¹⁰ And ethnic minority groups
host members bring psychological and cultural characteristics to the contact setting and it is important to examine how compatible these qualities are for acculturation, which follows contact (Motti-Stefanidi, 2012), (2) the type of relations between the groups in contact; for instance, is it one of respect, domination or mutual animosity?, and (3) the cultural changes that occur during acculturation in both the non dominant and dominant groups (Motti-Stefanidi, 2012).

At the individual level, psychological changes and adaptation should also be studied. These include ‘behaviour shifts’ (such as changes in food, language and dress) (Berry and Sam, 1997), also known as ‘cultural learning’ (Brislin, Landis and Brandt, 1983), and ‘social skills acquisition’ (Furnham and Bochner, 1986). These three terms refer to the change of one’s behaviour and ways of living in response to a new cultural situation. ‘Cultural shedding’ and ‘cultural conflict’ (Berry, 1992) are important elements of this behaviour change. Cultural shedding is defined as ‘the unlearning of aspects of one’s previous repertoire that are no longer appropriate’ (Berry and Sam, 1997), while cultural conflict occurs ‘where incompatible behaviours create difficulties for the individual and need to be addressed’ (Berry and Sam 1997). Psychological changes, therefore, can be negative. When conflict exists, ‘acculturative stress’ (Berry et al., 1987) may develop in response to external environmental stressors. Often, individuals face only moderate difficulties (such as psychosomatic problems). However, in some cases, psychopathology or mental disease can occur, as in individuals who cannot cope with the strain of change and as a result develop problems, such as anxiety and depression (Berry and Sam, 1997).

Adaptation occurs when, after a span of time, individuals manage to acculturate to the cultural context. Adaptation is therefore an outcome of acculturation (Sam and Berry, 2010). Psychological adaptation is related to factors such as an understanding of one’s personal and cultural identity, a sense of satisfaction with the new cultural set up and good mental health (Berry and Sam, 1997). Socio-cultural adaptation, on the other hand, involves dealing with social and structural problems, such as work- and school-related issues (Ward, Bochner and Furnham, 2001).

Based on these issues, Berry developed four types of acculturation strategies. These strategies describe the different approaches individuals and groups take towards the process of
acculturation. They include attitudes, behaviours and cultural identities (Motti-Stefanidi et al., 2012) and describe how non-dominant individuals or groups can:

1. **Assimilate**: identify with other cultures (in some cases the host\(^{11}\) culture, also known as the dominant /mainstream culture) and reject one’s own culture; groups/individuals seek interaction with the dominant group and structures.

2. **Marginalise**: reject both the host culture and one’s own culture; this strategy is typically employed by those individuals who have no interest in cultural maintenance or relations with others (can be due to discrimination and exclusion factors).

3. **Separate**: identify with one’s own culture and reject the dominant or host culture; the non-dominant group avoids interaction with the dominant group (‘segregation’ is the term used when the dominant group wish to avoid contact with the non dominant group).

4. **Integrate**: identify with one’s own culture as well as the host culture or other cultural group, and adopt a bicultural identity; those who integrate have an interest in maintaining their own culture, yet, at the same time, interacting with and being part of a larger social network.

The term ‘bicultural’ essentially refers to acculturation involving interaction with two cultures with which a person is in contact.\(^{12}\) It has been used by a number of theorists other than Berry (Benet-Martínez, 2011; 2007; Benet-Martínez and Haritatos, 2005; Padilla, 1994; Szapocznik and Kurtines, 1993; LaFromboise, Coleman and Gerton, 1992). Integration has been shown, with some exceptions, to lead to the least acculturative stress as opposed to marginalisation, which is the most stressful form of acculturation strategy (Berry, 2005). This was concluded from research that used a range of indicators of mental health. Indeed, studies have shown that an individual’s acculturation strategy relates to how well they adapt (Sam and Berry, 2010). Integration has been shown to result in better psychological and socio-cultural adaption, and one reason for this could be that integration allows a ‘form of double competence and the availability of double resources’ (Sam and Berry, 2010). Berry (2005) showed that the acculturative strategy of separation causes the fewest behavioural changes, unlike assimilation, which causes the most. Integration involves a selection of behaviours from the dominant group as well as the maintenance of a range of traditional behaviours,
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\(^{11}\)The word ‘host’ refers to the dominant group within which non-dominant or immigrant groups have settled.

\(^{12}\) Discussed in further detail below
while marginalisation involves ‘major heritage culture loss and the appearance of a number of dysfunctional and deviant behaviours’ (Berry, 2005), such as delinquency and abuse.

Each of these strategies is dynamic and does not represent a final outcome. Individuals have the ability to change and renegotiate strategies based on contextual factors, such as historical events and public attitudes (Sam and Berry, 2010). Further, an individual may use different acculturation strategies in different areas of their life, from religious beliefs to social interaction in a given situation. The type of acculturation strategy an individual prefers depends on the characteristics of the ethnic group and the type of society the group has settled in (Berry, 2003). Research has concluded that, most often, integration is the most popular strategy while marginalisation is the least preferred. Importantly, individuals and groups are not always in complete control of their choice of strategy; the attitudes of the larger host society may influence their selection. Motti-Stefanidi et al. (2012) discussed Berry’s terms (Sam and Berry, 2010) to describe the dominant group’s attitudes towards the non-dominant cultural groups. These include:

1. **Melting pot**: the dominant group seeks assimilation in the non-dominant group.

2. **Segregation**: the dominant group forces separation on the non-dominant group.

3. **Exclusion**: the dominant group imposes marginalisation on the non-dominant group.

4. **Multiculturalism**: the dominant group accepts diversity in society as a whole, respects integration and embraces non-dominant cultural and ethnic groups.
Figure 1 demonstrates the nature of acculturation strategies in both ethnic groups and larger society, as discussed above.

**Figure 1: Acculturation strategies in Ethnocultural Groups and the Larger Society**

Whether relationships exist between the non-dominant group’s acculturation strategies and the dominant society’s views on acculturation is therefore important to address when examining a particular set of ethnic groups (Motti Stefanidi et al., in press).\(^ {13} \)

The type of society in which people live also impacts on how well individuals adapt. In a large comparative study of immigrant youth, Berry et al., (2006) differentiated between two types of society: (1) settler societies that are open to immigration (e.g. Canada, Australia and the US), and (2) non-settler societies in which immigration is perceived as being essential for the country and aimed at helping less privileged individuals (e.g. the UK, France, Germany and Sweden) (Sam and Berry, 2010). The study found greater integration in settler societies than non-settler societies, and that integration is associated with better adaptation in both types of society. Individuals who experience other forms of acculturation, such as separation, were also found to have good psychological adaptation in non-settler societies, but this was not the case for socio-cultural adaptation (Berry et al., 2006).

Discrimination has also been found to be a predictor of how well individuals adapt to a culture (Robinson, 2009; Schmitt and Branscombe, 2002; Verkuyten and Thijs, 2002). People
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\(^ {13} \) Discussed further in Section III: Multiculturalism
experiencing high discrimination are more likely to acculturate using separation strategies, while people experiencing less discrimination are more likely to integrate or assimilate (Berry and Sam, 2010). It has been suggested that one reason people may opt for separation is to reciprocate feelings of rejection, which they may experience from members of the host society. Discrimination been shown to be related to lower levels of psychological and socio-cultural adaptation. Sam and Berry (2010) described a triangular relationship between acculturation strategies, adaptive outcomes and discrimination, due to the connected nature of these three areas, with high discrimination relating to low levels of integration and adaptation for immigrants, and integration predicting better adaption.

**An Acculturation Framework**

Based on the aspects of acculturation described above, Berry (2003) developed a framework that explains and links psychological and cultural acculturation and is useful for presenting the main areas that need to be understood when conducting research on acculturation (Sam and Berry, 2010) (see Figure 2). Studies that ignore these aspects fall short, as they do not examine the entire process of acculturation.

**Figure 2: Framework for Conceptualising and Studying Acculturation**

(Sam and Berry, 2010)
The left side of the diagram displays acculturation processes at a group level while the right side displays psychological acculturation phenomena at an individual level. The significance of this distinction in acculturation has already been discussed. To conceptualise acculturation fully, Berry asserts the importance of understanding the key features of the original cultural groups (‘Culture A’ and ‘Culture B’) before contact (Sam and Berry, 2010). Other aspects of acculturation at the group level also need to be considered, such as compatibility of the cultures. These have been discussed, above. Following contact, cultural changes occur in both groups, including changes to their collective features (political, economic and social structures) (Berry and Sam, 1997). The two-way nature of acculturation means that cultural groups do not remain unchanged.

The right portion of the framework describes psychological acculturation and the changes that occur in individuals during the process of acculturation (discussed above). At the individual level, a range of potential changes, including ‘behavioural shifts, acculturative stress and psychopathology’ (Berry and Sam, 1997), can occur in members of both cultures (Sam and Berry, 2010). Ultimately, these changes lead to a person’s adaptation, on both psychological and socio-cultural levels. A degree of variance exists in the extent of psychological acculturation as well as the group level acculturation.

*The ABCs of Acculturation*

Colleen Ward (Ward, 2001; Ward, Bochner and Furnham, 2001) conducted a thorough review of the literature on individual level acculturation. She described the three areas in individuals that are influenced by acculturation as the ‘ABCs of acculturation’ (Ward, 2001), with ‘A’ referring to affective aspects, ‘B’ referring to behavioural aspects and ‘C’ referring to cognitive aspects. These ABCs are associated with stress and coping, cultural learning and social identification, and represent the main theory and evidence-based approaches dominating the literature (Matsumoto, 2001).

Berry’s work on acculturative stress has been important in the literature around the affective perspective and the stress and coping framework of acculturation. Emotional aspects of acculturation, as well as issues such as psychological well-being and life satisfaction, are
included in this area (Sam and Berry, 2010). The cultural learning approach (behavioural perspective) centres on the idea that immigrants lack the important skills needed to interact in their new culture, which can create difficulties in daily social interactions (Masgoret and Ward, 2006; Ward et al., 2001). In order to prevail in the new culture, individuals should gain or learn cultural specific behaviour skills, such as language. This approach is heavily influenced by social psychology and, particularly, the work of Argyle (1969).

Social identity theories (cognitive perspective) relate to the way people see themselves and others during intercultural contact. These originate from the work of Tajfel and Turner (1979; 1986) on social identity theory, which was discussed earlier and focuses on how individuals categorise and identify each other as well as think about their own group (ingroup) and other groups (outgroups). Benet-Martínez has taken this cognitive-based research in a new direction, introducing a new theory, Bicultural Identity Integration, and addressing the lack of research on differences within acculturation strategies (Benet-Martínez, in press).

**Bicultural Identity Integration**

Following a thorough review of the literature on acculturation and multiculturalism, Benet-Martínez and colleagues proposed the construct of Bicultural Identity Integration (BII) as a model for understanding differences in bicultural identity organisation between individuals. BII explores the extent to which ‘biculturals perceive their mainstream and ethnic cultural identities as compatible and integrated vs. oppositional and difficult to integrate’ (Benet-Martínez et al., 2002). In other words, it describes how people cognitively and affectively manage their different identities based on their expectations and perspectives, and how much people perceive their dual cultural identities to overlap or intersect (Sam and Berry, 2010).

Benet-Martínez illustrates how two people who are classed as being ‘integrated’ according to Berry’s acculturative strategies can in fact be very different in how they negotiate the two cultures. Using BII can help identify this difference. Individuals who have high BII view themselves as being part of ‘a hyphenated culture’ or a ‘combined emerging third culture’ (Benet-Martínez, in press). They manage to integrate both cultures easily. On the other hand, individuals with low BII perceive themselves as ‘living in-between cultures’ (Benet-
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14 Acculturative stress is shown in Berry’s framework of acculturation (2003) (see Figure 2)
15 See Section I: Development of Ethnic Identity
Martínez, in press), and see the cultures as clashing and causing conflict. Therefore, both individuals with low and individuals with high BII identify with mainstream culture and their ethnic group, but differ in how they ‘create a synergistic integrated cultural identity’. It is difficult to distinguish between these individuals, as both groups may have similar demographic variables and migration patterns. However, those with low BII may have weaker language skills and may identify less with the mainstream culture.

Benet-Martínez linked differences in BII to variations in cultural frame-switching, which is the ability of multicultural individuals who possess two or more cultural orientations to shift between those identities or orientations according to different cultural signals (Hong et al., 2000; Verkuyten and Pouliasi, 2006). This can occur in many areas, such as behaviour, personality, ethnic identity and cooperation. Cultural frame-switching relies on specific cultural schemas being cognitively available, accessible and applicable in given situations (Benet-Martínez, in press). Benet-Martínez argues that people with higher BII are able to access these cultural schemas with less effort than people with lower BII.

In her recent work, Benet-Martínez (in press) describes how BII is not a unitary construct, as previously thought, but in fact comprised of two independent psychological constructs: (1) cultural harmony vs. conflict, and (2) cultural blendedness vs. distance. Cultural harmony vs. conflict represents the extent of harmony versus tension a person feels between the two cultures, while cultural blendedness vs. distance represents the extent of intersection versus separation or compartmentalisation a person feels between the two cultures of which they are a part (Benet-Martínez, in press). These components are related to different contextual factors and aspects of an individual’s personality performance. Cultural harmony is linked to intra- and interpersonal factors (e.g. emotional stability), while cultural blendedness is related to personal qualities and context-based challenges (e.g. the personality trait of openness) (Benet-Martínez, in press).

Benet-Martínez (in press) also discusses the phenomenon of ‘cultural encapsulation’, which describes the phenomenon whereby some immigrants and the generations following them associate and identify with their cultural and ethnic values to an even greater extent than members of their country of origin. This phenomenon occurs independently of how much the individual internalises and practices the culture of the majority society. Benet-Martínez (in press) states that this may be due to the individual becoming ‘gradually “encapsulated”’
within the norms and values of an earlier era in their homeland’. In other words, cultural encapsulation may result from members continuing to follow cultural values from the era in which they migrated, despite the values in their home culture having changed through, for example, modernisation and globalisation. Further, being ‘more traditional’ may be a reactive mechanism to cultural contact, culture clash or the excessive cultural shedding of earlier generations. Such strengthening and practice of traditional beliefs from the original home culture may act as a mechanism to prevent cultural loss. Individuals may or may not be aware of this reactive mechanism.

*Development and Acculturation*

Theories of acculturation have tended to ignore or give little attention to ontogenetic development (Sam, 2006). Both acculturation and development involve change and Sam and Berry (2010) point out that separating the two concepts can be difficult. In fact, some theorists, such as Oppedal (2006), view acculturation as essentially a developmental process, with immigrant children and youth experiencing important developmental and acculturation processes simultaneously, and with those two areas essentially confounding one another. An approach taken by some theorists to further explore the relationship between development and acculturation is to study specific aspects of development and explore how these relate to acculturation processes. An example of this would be a study on cultural identity and the development of self. Questions central to this type of research include: (1) should acculturating children be viewed as special or different when compared with ‘normal’ non-acculturating children? and (2) does acculturation influence development outcomes in children?

As discussed above, adaptation outcomes of acculturation are often measured for success according to whether individuals achieve particular developmental goals across their lifespan (Motti-Stefanidi et al., 2012). Examples of these developmental tasks include achievement at school, identity formation and development of friendships. Developmental changes are important, as they affect how children see themselves and understand the world around them. Brown and Bigler (2005) discussed the example of discrimination. At around the age of six years, children develop the cognitive abilities required to perceive discrimination in situational contexts. These abilities develop further into adolescence. However, as discussed
above, discrimination affects a person’s acculturation strategy and adaption to their social environment. Thus, development occurs within specific cultural and environmental contexts and also in relation to others, such as parents, peers, teachers and individuals, themselves. Development, therefore, may differ between individuals according to the contexts in which they interact (Masten et al., 2006). In the case of immigrant children and ethnic minorities, these contexts may be particularly complicated.

Masten et al. (2006)\textsuperscript{16} argued that a child’s level of success at one stage of development often predicts their success in future developmental tasks (Masten et al., 2006). This idea forms the basis of developmental task theory. Motti-Stefanidi et al. (2012) wrote that it is important to recognise that, although many developmental tasks are universal, there can be differences in the time points at which members of different cultures achieve the tasks. Further, there may be culturally-specific developmental tasks that make comparison impossible. One of the problems with trying to understand more about adaptation in ethnic groups and immigrants is that differences in the achievement of developmental tasks and milestones are often not taken into consideration. Developmental tasks tend to be defined by the dominant culture, yet are often seen to be the yardstick by which development is measured across all groups. Immigrant and ethnic minority children must then acquire these developmental tasks, but also learn to adapt and acculturate in the other culture.

\textit{Adaptation Using an Integrated Approach}

Recent work by Motti-Stefanidi, Berry, Chrysssochou and Phinney (2012) has tried to address the lack of theoretical work linking characteristics such as developmental processes and personality, with acculturative adaptation, through the development of an integrated model of adaptation in immigrant youth and children. They argue that due to the multifaceted nature of adaptation in immigrant youth, it is necessary to draw from different psychological disciplines to create an effective and holistic model of adaption. Different disciplines ask different research questions, use different methodologies and have different origins. They draw from developmental psychology, acculturation theory and social psychology, and their model conceptualises adaptation as a process that occurs over different levels of analysis, which are interrelated but should be examined separately. The first level is the individual.

\textsuperscript{16} In Motti-Stefanidi et al., 2012
level and includes ‘intra-individual characteristics’ of children and youth, including personality, motivation and temperament. The second level is the level of interaction, in which the child interacts with others. The contexts in which interaction occurs allow for both development and acculturation. This level also includes people with whom the child may not be in contact, but who are in contact with individuals that the child interacts with frequently (e.g. people at the parents’ workplace). This is similar to Bronfenbrenner’s exosystem level. Further, the child’s home culture and ethnic group network also fall into this second level. Finally, the third level includes variables such as cultural beliefs and ideologies at the level of the society, which can impact upon adaptation.

This model is useful as it uses a top-down approach to try to capture the many ways in which an immigrant child can adapt (Motti-Stefanidi et al., 2012). Although the model is very new, it is also relevant to the present study in helping to conceptualise the many areas in which ethnic minority children interact to achieve adaptation. They may face fewer problems of acculturation than immigrant children, yet still contend with aspects such as ethnic identity development and exposure to discrimination, which can affect child development and adaptation outcomes.

Section III: Multiculturalism

The study of intercultural relations is closely linked to acculturation and focuses on the psychological processes and outcomes that arise from the contact of cultural groups and their individual members. It aims to understand how people negotiate their lives while living together in culturally plural societies (Berry, 2011; Berry et al., 2011; Sam and Berry, 2006; Ward, 2006). The above section, discussing acculturation, touched upon acculturation strategies in the non-dominant group and the attitudes of the larger society (dominant group), which are also known as intercultural strategies. Berry (2011) described these intercultural strategies as ‘the core idea that groups and individuals (both dominant and non-dominant) living in plural societies engage each other in a number of different ways’. This section will focus on one type of intercultural strategy; that of multiculturalism. Berry and his colleagues (2011) discussed two very important aspects of intercultural relations in plural societies: (1) dominant group policies and ideologies, and (2) non-dominant group preferences. They also
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17 See Section II: Adaptation and Acculturation Strategies
argued that there are three levels for understanding the dominant group and non-dominant group acculturation strategies: national, institutional and individual. These three levels exist for the dominant group as well as the non-dominant groups.

The top (or national) level for the dominant group relates to national policies in the plural society, and can include multiculturalism policies such as those fostered by the European Union (2005), which has adopted specific immigration policies of integration, stating: ‘integration is a dynamic two-way process of mutual accommodation by all immigrants and residents of member states’ (Berry et al., 2011). This policy advocates change as essential in both dominant and non-dominant groups. Another example of multiculturalism policy is found in Canada, which promotes both the cultural maintenance and contact and participation of all groups. At the non-dominant group level, this includes the goals of the group as a whole, such as a preference for integration or separation (as is the case in the Scottish National Party).

The bottom level for the dominant group relates to attitudes towards the four intercultural strategies of multiculturalism, melting pot, segregation and exclusion. For the non-dominant group, these include the acculturative strategies of integration, assimilation, separation and marginalisation.

Finally, the middle, institutional, level involves the interaction of the top (policy) level and bottom (individual) level at the institutional level on a daily basis (e.g. in education, health and defence). Non-dominant groups often aim for diversity and equal opportunities in these institutions. Further, the combination of integration strategy and multiculturalism policy leads to diversity, whereas the combination of assimilation strategy and melting pot policies can lead to more uniformity.

Berry (2011) defined multiculturalism as having two important components. Multicultural societies try: (1) to maintain and develop their diversity (as opposed to minimising/removing it), and (2) to encourage equal participation in daily life and social institutions (thus not placing barriers to participation). Integration and multiculturalism are closely linked, and it is this meaning of multiculturalism that is used presently. It is important to establish this definition, as a society must have both of these two components to label itself as
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18 It is important to distinguish pluralism from multiculturalism. While societies can be culturally diverse (or plural), only some meet all criteria and are truly multicultural (Berry et al., 2010).
Multicultural. Berry and his colleagues (2011) also point to the definition of Watts and Smolicz (1997) as particularly useful: ‘Multiculturalism presupposes the existence of an overarching framework of shared values that acts as a linchpin in a multiethnic state . . . a framework that is flexible and responsive to the various cultures and ethnic groups that compose the nation.’

Multiculturalism can therefore be seen as a framework in which people can live with equal opportunities. Multicultural policy and ideology are both important aspects of multiculturalism. Multicultural policy incorporates both cultural maintenance and equal contact and participation of all groups in the wider plural society. Multicultural ideology is wide social acceptance of the multicultural way of living and the central components of multicultural policy. Studies of multicultural ideology examine how members in society perceive and understand multicultural policy. This includes their views on cultural maintenance, contact and participation, and the level of acceptance from the dominant group of intragroup change in order to achieve mutual accommodation (Berry et al., 2011). In some societies, there is a difference between attitudes on multiculturalism in the private and public spheres. Research by van de Vijver, Breugelmans and Schalk-Soekar (2008) showed that although there is general support for multiculturalism in the Netherlands that is stable over time, a difference exists between the private and public spheres. Individuals are accepting of others expressing their traditional cultures within their family and community, but not in the public domain (Berry et al., 2011). These attitudes are oppositional to the aforementioned EU outlook on multiculturalism.

Finally, the multiculturalism hypothesis, proposed by Berry and his colleagues (1977), asserts that people possess a sense of belonging and self confidence when they have confidence in their own identity, and this leads to greater respect and acceptance for others’ cultures and a decrease in discrimination. Research on this concept has examined security of cultural and ethnic identity and attitudes towards other groups (Phinney et al., 2007; Ward and Masgoret, 2009; Berry, 2006a). Overall, the findings have shown that a secure identity is linked to positive attitudes about the individual’s own group as well as positive attitudes towards other groups and multicultural policy.
Multiculturalism in the UK

As discussed above, the United Kingdom has traditionally been a non-settler society and has always, in theory, been supportive of diversity (Sam and Berry, 2010). As early as 1966, the home secretary at the time, Roy Jenkins, made a prominent speech on multiculturalism arguing for the importance of integration ‘not as a flattening process of assimilation but as equal opportunity, accompanied by cultural diversity, in an atmosphere of mutual tolerance’ (Jenkins, 1967; Weedon, 2011). Subsequently, policies emerged focusing on the importance of racial equality. Yet achieving those multicultural ideals has not always been harmonious and successful. Racial discrimination still exists in British institutions and society, and the UK has been grappling with its immigration since the early days of mass economic immigration. Today, the complexities of the media, terrorism and economic instability have meant that this topic continues to be of paramount importance.

Joppke (2004) argued that the UK has recently moved away from a multiculturalism agenda to that of civic integration. According to Joppke, multicultural policy has traditionally been more focused on the local level than the central government level. In 2000, with the publication of the Runnymede Trust report, which associated the term ‘Britishness’ with ‘systematic largely unspoken racial connotations’ (Runnymede Trust, 2000), the debate on multiculturalism has come to the fore. The findings of this report can be linked to the findings of van di Vijver et al. (2008) regarding the separation of multicultural components in the public and private spheres. The report argued for the importance of cultural diversity to be recognised in the British public sphere.

In 2001, race riots in Bradford caused multiculturalism to be viewed in a very different way. A government investigation led by Councillor Ted Cantle observed high degrees of physical segregation, not only in housing estates but in all spheres of life. Polarisation in towns and cities was found in educational and community institutions, voluntary bodies, places of work and social and cultural networks. Cantle wrote (2009): ‘Many communities operate on the basis of a series of parallel lives. These lives often do not seem to touch at any point, let alone overlap and promote any meaningful interchanges.’

The report from this investigation argued that race, religion and culture are viewed as sensitive issues and, therefore, have not been debated substantially. Britain was perceived to be made up of many communities but not one ‘meta-community’, which would gel those
communities together (Joppke, 2004). Cantle’s findings led the labour government in place at the time to stress the need to move ‘beyond multiculturalism’ (Joppke, 2004) to encourage ‘a greater sense of citizenship’ (Cantle Report, 2001) with ‘common elements of nationhood’ (Cantle Report, 2001), and the importance of the use of English language by all ethnic minority groups. It also called for the non-dominant culture to accept national institutions.

Multiculturalism again attracted public attention following the publication of this report, stimulating debates on cultural traditions and ethnic beliefs, such as arranged marriages and headscarves (Joppke, 2004). Measures such as introducing an oath at naturalisation ceremonies, strengthening English language requirements and requiring new immigrants to take citizenship education were all introduced, signalling a move towards civic integration. Joppke (2004) argued that this phenomenon has occurred in other countries, such as the Netherlands, and has caused state multiculturalism policy to become one-directional, with a focus more on national identity and away from the idea of integrated biculturalism.

Verkuyten (2007) added to the debate, stating that one of the problems with multicultural policy and acculturation research is that it doesn’t view religion as a distinct concern, but often groups it under cultural diversity. He discussed Islam as an example of a religion that entered the European diversity debate, including in Britain, with the Rushdie affair and the 7/7 London bombings. At the level of government, Britain has engaged in debates over Islamic practices and policies, although this debate has often been far more controversial in other parts of Europe.

The most recent series of debates on multiculturalism arose with the 2011 speech by the Conservative Party Prime Minister David Cameron, who criticised ‘the doctrine of state multiculturalism’ in Britain, stating it had ‘failed’ as a concept due to lack of civic integration and the ‘existence of segregated communities’ (Cameron, 2011). Religious beliefs, particularly those of Muslims, were discussed, and Cameron went on to argue that extremism was not being tackled effectively. Cameron’s speech provided further evidence of a move towards civic integration in the UK. He stated: ‘Frankly we need a lot less of the positive tolerance of recent years and much more active, muscular liberalism’ (Cameron, 2011). He focused on liberal beliefs, democracy and the rule of law as being at the heart of what it means to be British, and again pointed to a division in the private and public spheres of
British life, calling for the development among all communities of a common sense of identity.

Section IV: Important Contextual Factors in Family Life

Contextual factors relating to Indian and Pakistani ethnic groups will now be discussed. Contextual factors are defined as those factors that indicate the context in which parenting of children or adolescents occurs, and consider how gender and social class intersect with ethnicity (Stewart and Bond, 2002). Children are affected by multiple, and sometimes complex, factors.

A Snapshot of the Three Ethnic Groups Being Studied

A White majority of approximately 90% constitutes the greater part of the British population, making it a fairly homogenous nation overall (Equality and Human Rights Commission, 2010). The Indian group constitutes the largest ethnic minority (1.8% of the population), followed by Pakistanis (1.3%), Black Africans (0.8%), Black Caribbeans (1%), Bangladeshis (0.5%) and Chinese (0.4%). In 2001, the census began to measure population levels of the four main mixed groups in the UK and found that together they made up 1.2% of the population (Connolly and White, 2006).

Location of Immigrants in the UK

According to the 2001 census, most of the UK ethnic minority population was located in England (96%), with smaller numbers in Scotland (2%) and Wales (1%) and less than 0.5% living in Northern Ireland (Connolly and White, 2006). The large urban centres in Britain are the main areas where ethnic minorities are settled. In 2001, just less that 50% of the English population of Chinese and Indian groups lived in Greater London, and Black groups had
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20 This was 1.8% of the total UK population in 2001 (1,053,000 people).

21 This was 1.3% of the total UK population in 2001 (747,285 people).

22 See Appendix A
more than half of their population living there (Rees and Butt, 2003; Stillwell, 2010). Further, there is a high proportion of Bangladeshis living in London (between 50-60%) and, although London does not represent the highest concentration of Pakistanis, the population there has increased over the past 20 years. London hosts members from different biraderis and different areas of Pakistan, such as Mirpur and Gujarat. The north of England and cities in the Midlands hold the majority of those remaining. Due to the link between social deprivation and minority status in Britain, many of these groups live in poor neighbourhoods (Maughan, 2005). Indeed, more than two thirds of Britain’s ethnic minorities reside in its 88 most fiscally-deprived areas, as compared to 40% of the general population (Rutter and Tienda, 2005; Karlsen et al., 2002), and can therefore end up living in fairly segregated areas alongside other ethnic minorities. Nazroo (2006) argued that this residential segregation is an example of how ethnic disadvantage manifests.

Since the early days of immigration, certain groups have been able to achieve economic and social mobility. However, racism still exists within labour recruitment, particularly with reference to Muslims (Modood et al., 1997; Jones, 1993). Racism also continues to be a problem in other areas for ethnic minority groups in the UK. The Fourth National Survey of Ethnic Minorities showed that more than 1 in 8 ethnic minority individuals had experienced some form of racial harassment in the past year (Virdee, 1997).

The Indian and Pakistani Presence in Britain

The Indian community began to mass migrate to the UK in the 1950s and 1960s (Robinson, 1986). The population today consists of different groups, including Sikhs and Hindus from Punjab and a large number of Gujaratis, both Hindu and Muslim. The 1970s also saw a wave of migration from East Africa, specifically Uganda, Kenya and Tanzania. According to the 2001 census, approximately half of all Indians in the United Kingdom were born in Britain, and the Indian ethnic group held a more advantageous position in British society as compared to the Pakistani ethnic group. Almost 3 in 10 Indians of working age held managerial or professional occupations in 2001 (Connolly and White, 2006).
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23 A biraderi is an occupational caste.
The Pakistani community, unlike the Indian community, experienced two periods of migration. The 1960s marked the migration of male Pakistanis, but it was not until the 1970s and 1980s that Pakistani women and children migrated to be with their husbands and fathers. By 2001, 55% of the population was British-born and the majority was Muslim. Unlike the Indian community, Pakistanis are generally less socio-economically advantaged. Only 14% of the Pakistani working population in the UK in 2001 held a managerial or professional position.

One further feature of the Pakistani community in Britain is the extremely high proportion (69%) of working age Pakistani women who are not working, choosing instead to stay at home to look after their children. This is compared with 34% of economic inactivity among Indian women (Connolly and White, 2006). These levels of inactivity reflect a range of factors, including age and life stage. The greater proportion of Pakistani women in Britain are young and of child-bearing age, thus making them likely to have child-rearing responsibilities and dependent children. Religious factors may also play a role. Further, Pakistanis tend to have larger family sizes, with the average intended number of children being 3.6 (Connolly and White 2006).

The Millennium Cohort Study offers an important insight into the lives of babies born at the start of the twenty-first century and demonstrates patterns in different ethnic groups in the UK.24 Much can be learned about Pakistani and Indian families from these data: Pakistanis are more likely than Indians to live in high ethnic minority concentrations; in addition, with relation to partnership status, a very small proportion of Indians and Pakistanis with children are unmarried (3% of the weighted sample for Indians and 1% for Pakistanis); Pakistanis are more likely to have large, three-generational families (Hockley and Quigley, 2007), while Indian mothers tend to have a small immediate family, but differ from other groups in having a high proportion of grandparents in their homes.

Another aspect of Pakistani and Indian communities in Britain is the way they are classified in population surveys and by social and health care researchers. Sometimes the term ‘Asian’ is used in a pan-ethnic manner to refer to both of these groups (Aspinall, 2003). Yet doing so
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24 The study was designed as a research opportunity to examine the social conditions surrounding births and early childhood and their long-term impact. Drawing from the study, much can be learned about ethnicity, material and social circumstances and outcomes for mothers and other children from ethnic groups. Various factors, such as birthplace, area of residence, household size and structure were all explored in the study (Hockley and Quigley, 2007).
may potentially capture groups from the Indian subcontinent as well as continental Asia. In Britain, this term was first used in the 2001 census. Due to historical processes of colonialism, migration and discrimination, the term ‘Asian’ in British literature tends to refer to South Asian groups. However, Aspinall points out that the term Asian is often used in a different context in US and Canada, where it refers more to individuals from continental Asia. This is related to the history and process of ethnogenesis in the US and Canada (Aspinall, 2003).

Combining Pakistanis, Indians and Bangladeshis under the category of ‘Asian’ is problematic. Each is a very heterogeneous group and by using one term to classify them, generalisations are made and important differences in the groups are ignored. Further, South Asian communities in Britain do not tend to have a far-reaching allegiance to a pan-Asian identity (Aspinall, 2003, p. 95), although bicultural terms such as ‘British Asian’ seem to be gaining popularity. According to Aspinall, the terms ‘South Asian’ and ‘Indian Subcontinent’ should be used more widely in research.

Non-immigrant White British

In 2001, Britain was comprised of 50 million White British people. This group has historically been the indigenous population of the United Kingdom and shares the common religious background of Christianity (Connolly and White, 2006). Although most non-immigrant White individuals classify themselves as belonging to the White group, their notions of national identity are a reflection of their country of origin (i.e. British, English, Scottish, Welsh, Irish, etc.). According to the 2004 annual population survey, some groups choose more than one identity. Fifty-eight per cent of individuals from the White British group described themselves as English, with 9% stating they were Scottish and 5% Welsh. There is huge socio-economic variability within the White British population, as well as a diversity of experience and circumstances within the different socio-economic groups (Connolly and White, 2006).  

25 The White Irish population began migration to Britain starting mainly after the Irish potato famine in the 19th and 20th centuries and represents another important White ethnic group (further highlighting diversity). In 2001, this group composed 1.2 % of the United Kingdom’s population and were geographically distributed across the country.
Family formation, family relationships and family life all have implications for a child’s psychological well-being (Shaw, 2003). According to Lau (2000), most South Asian families can be located on a continuum with the ‘traditional, hierarchical family on the one hand and the “Western”, contemporary, nuclear family on the other’. She argued that a large number of British South Asians tend to hold traditional values and, thus, are located more towards that end of the spectrum. Berthoud (2000) furthered this argument by comparing family structures among different ethnic groups and showing that, overall, families in Britain are moving away from ‘old fashioned values’ and towards ‘modern individualism’. Pakistani (and to a lesser degree Indian) families are moving at a slower pace than other ethnic groups, with high rates of marriage, large family sizes and low rates of economic activity among female Pakistanis (Berthoud, 2000). Others have shown that Pakistanis in Britain are more traditional in family life compared with other groups, including Indians (Robinson, 2009; Imtiaz, 2002). The generational position of group members is likely to have an impact on this. However, overall, it is difficult to offer a definitive description of British Pakistani and Indian parenting practices, due to contextual factors and intergroup and intragroup differences, such as education, class and geographical location.

The following contextual factors, which may influence parenting and child development in Pakistani and Indian families in Britain, will be discussed: (1) kinship and extended family, (2) mental health, (3) gender, (4) respect and family hierarchy, (5) education, (6) acculturation and language, (7) religion, and (8) demographics.

**Kinship and Extended Family**

The extended family system, also known as the ‘joint family system’ (Anwar, 1981), includes grandparents, aunts, uncles and cousins (Lau, 2000), and is often made up of three or more generations. Numerous studies have shown the centrality of kin to social life among South Asian families in Britain (Barn, 2006; Bose, 2000; Jackson and Nesbitt, 1993). Extended family and other family members often socialise with each other in their spare time and provide a support system (Rout, Sixsmith et al., 1996; Marshall et al., 1998; Bhopal, 1998).
Studies have shown that extended family members often share housework, childcare, emotional guidance and advice. Such a system of shared support has its advantages, and as Sonuga-Barke and Mistry (2000) have demonstrated, children and grandmothers from extended families tend to fare better than those from nuclear families. Yet, such support varies and it is important to take into account the decrease of extended family structures among South Asian ethnic groups in Britain (Roschelle, 1997; Brown, 1984; Shah, 1992). Further, Sonuga-Barke and Mistry (2000) also showed that Indian and Pakistani mothers, in some cases, fare badly from this system, displaying health problems such as anxiety and depression as a result of the high demand placed on them to live up to their roles as mother, wife and daughter-in-law. Muslim mothers were found to display higher rates of mental health problems than Hindu mothers. Even so, the links between family members were shown to be strong in most Pakistani and Indian households in Britain. The research further showed that the grandmothers’ mental health has an influence on the child that is thought to be related to the direct and constructive involvement by the grandmothers in the form of practical care, moral guidance or cognitive and emotional stimulation (Sonuga-Barke and Mistry, 2000). Grandparents play an important role in British South Asian families, with 36% of Indian families in the UK having a paternal grandmother living with them as compared to 1% of White families (Rutter et al., 2005). However, it is important to point out that the study conducted by Sonuga-Barke and Mistry (2000) comprised of a sample made up of mainly first-generation Hindu and Muslim families living in Britain.

Mental Health

Dogra et al. (2000) argued for better provision of information on the prevalence of mental health problems in ethnic minority children in Britain, arguing that few studies exist on this issue. One such study has been recently conducted by Goodman, Patel and Leon (2010), which disputes the findings of Sonuga-Barke and Mistry (2000), finding no mental health advantages of living in an extended family household. Goodman et al. (2010) found, in a sample of 13,836 White children and 361 Indian children between the ages of 5 and 16, that Indian children had significantly lower levels across all measures for disorders and externalising problems. Their study utilised the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire as well as interviews with parents, teachers and children, and made every effort to control for
contextual factors, such as the school attended. They found that some of the difference could be explained by Indian children being less likely to have academic difficulties and more likely to be living with both parents. Yet, after adjusting for these as covariates as well as socio-economic status, a larger advantage remained, mainly in low-income Indian families, which could not be explained by other risk factors. Goodman et al. (2010) also found that Indian children showed similar levels of internalising problems as the White children in the sample. One drawback of the study was that the researchers did not distinguish between participants from different generations within the Indian group. This study supports evidence from another study by Goodman et al. (2008), which compared 31 populations-based and 18 clinic-based studies on mental health in children, and showed Indian children to enjoy better overall mental health problems than White and Pakistani children, who showed no differences in overall mental health.

Their findings also contradict the work of Atzaba-Poria, Pike and Deater-Deckard (2004), which stated that Indian children show higher than average levels of internalising problems. Atzaba-Poria et al. (2004) examined the risk factors associated with problem behaviour in ethnic minority and majority children. The children studied were between 7 and 9 years old and were recruited in the UK from White English and Indian ethnic groups. They were examined within an ecological framework in order to assess whether risk factors originated from specific ecosystem levels. The behaviour constructs of internalising and externalising were found to be associated with specific ecological levels. Externalising behaviours include delinquent and aggressive behaviour, which are more likely to be outwardly expressed and have an impact on the child’s environment. These were found to originate due to problems at the microsystem level. Internalising behaviour includes withdrawn, anxious and depressed behaviour and somatic complaints. Internalising problems affecting the child directly were found to originate from risk factors at the exosystem and individual levels (Atzaba-Poria et al., 2004). Atzaba-Poria et al. (2004) suggested that the higher levels of internalising problems found in Indian children could point to an important influence of individual and exosystem levels in ethnic minority groups.
Gender

South Asian families in Britain have been described as being more favoured towards males. Rout and Sixsmith (1996) showed that the eldest male relative in South Asian families has a central role in decision making and family life, and that families are organised through the male line, with the father acting as head of the household (Rout and Sixsmith, 1996). Further, the overall tendency is for women to move into the husband’s household after marriage. However, as Henley (1986) reported, due to changes in family patterns and lack of space in houses in Britain, more and more South Asian families are choosing to live in their own homes. Traditional South Asian beliefs hold that women and men have socially demarcated roles influenced by religion and culture. Men are perceived as guardians of women, while women possess greater responsibilities towards home life and are less independent. The preservation of *izzat* (family honour) still remains an important aim when parenting girls, particularly when they reach puberty. In Pakistani households, modesty in clothing and practice of religion are two ways in which *izzat* can be maintained (Werbner, 2002). *Sharam* refers to shame or dishonour, which is placed on the family by the actions of family members that are deemed to be in conflict with cultural and religious standards (Becher and Husain, 2007).

With the decrease in extended family household structures, Bose (2000) discussed how South Asian women in Britain have been increasingly involved in other activities; yet housework and chores still tend to fall on women and girls (Beishon et al., 1998). Even still, Dosanjh and Ghuman (1996) argued that this may be changing. They found that second-generation South Asian mothers are more likely to expect boys and girls to help out equally, compared with first-generation South Asian mothers. One important distinction between Pakistani and Indian communities is that Indians in contemporary Britain are less likely to have such marked differences in gender roles. Social class was found to be a mediating factor for this (Beishon et al., 1998). Young children have been found to show awareness of gender roles at a young age (Bhatti, 1999), and Becher and Husain (2007) suggested that one way in which this gender difference manifests itself is in the types of spaces that girls and boys move in, with boys often having more freedom in the public sphere.
Respect and Family Hierarchy

Studies have shown that age, gender and relatedness influence the hierarchal nature of Indian and Pakistani families. Rout and Sixsmith (1996) examined the central nature of respect for elders in family life, with support towards parents being offered throughout their lifespan, particularly in old age. Obligations and duties are tied to this notion of respect and hierarchy (Holm, 1984) and these duties continue to exist in Indian and Pakistani immigrant families even if in a modified form (Becher and Husain, 2003).

The importance of respect for elders is emphasised in both Pakistani and Indian families in the UK (Barn, 2006; Jackson and Nesbitt, 1993; Sugirtharajah, 1996) and is linked to close family structures and other factors, such as economic interdependence. Children are often encouraged to use ‘kinship names’ to address family members. Amongst Indian Hindi speaking families these include ‘dada’ (for the father’s father), ‘dadi’ (for the father’s mother), ‘nana’ (for the mother’s father) and ‘bhai’ (for the brother). Other naming conventions exist, including the term ‘ji’ after titles or names to show respect. Such naming terms are also used by Pakistani families. The notion of respect goes beyond naming and is also demonstrated through other behaviours. Children, in particular, are expected to behave in a very respectful way towards elders (Sugirtharajah, 1996).

Education

Studies have shown that both British Pakistani and Indian families place much emphasis on education and school-work (Lau, 2000). Academic excellence is thought to reflect well on the family name. Education is viewed as a means for children to achieve social mobility, overcome racial discrimination and prevent social exclusion (Barn et al., 2006). However, studies show that minority students in the UK are more likely (as compared to White students) to attend extremely segregated and low-performing schools with lower educational opportunities (Rutter and Tienda, 2005). In addition, there is a contrast between the academic performance rates of Indian children (which are high) and Pakistani children (which are lower overall) (Rutter et al., 2005).

Dustmann, Machin and Schonberg (2010) explored ethnicity and educational achievement in compulsory schooling by using national exam test scores (key stages) at ages 6 to 7 (key
stage 1) and 15 to 16 (key stage 4). They showed that at the start of school, most ethnic group pupils lag substantially behind non-immigrant White pupils, yet these gaps narrow for all groups through compulsory schooling. While the development of language skills is the main factor that they found to contribute to the improvement of some ethnic minority pupils in relation to non-immigrant White students, poverty was not found to contribute to improvement. They also found that in some schools, better than average improvement of some ethnic minority pupils in poor areas is linked to incentives for teachers to focus on certain pupils. At key stage 1, the Pakistani group was found to be amongst the worst-performing ethnic minority group in both English and maths exams; the raw scores for tests were more than 50% of a standard deviation lower than the mean performance scores across all groups. The Indian group, on the other hand, although still lagging behind the Chinese and White groups, was found to be one of the better performing ethnic groups in the UK. Yet, at key stage 4, the Pakistani group had shown a large improvement, closing the achievement gap by more than 80%, with relative progress being more pronounced in Pakistani girls than boys. For Indians, with already higher achievement scores, this gap improved by 30% in both English and mathematics (Dustmann et al., 2010).

Dustmann and his colleagues (2010) also suggested that the segregation of ethnic minority pupils and White pupils may be a reason for different performance levels at state schools. At key stage 1, 93% of White British pupils had White British classmates, but by key stage 4, this had changed, with a 5% increase in the number of White schoolmates for Bangladeshi, Indian and Pakistani pupils. The researchers argued that transitions to less segregated secondary schools may explain some of the progress ethnic minority children made. They also showed that White and ethnic minority pupils attending the same school had closer academic achievement levels than schools that were more segregated, possibly due to the higher proportion of English-speaking students or lower poverty levels in such schools.

With regards to parents’ involvement in children’s education, one study revealed that Pakistani families felt the school curriculum did not encompass sufficient detail on religious teachings and, in some cases, physical education, swimming and other such gender-mixing activities were not viewed as acceptable, due to the lack of modesty perceived in such activities. They also reported that their religious requirements, including a prayer room, prayer timings and head scarves, were sometimes not met by schools (Becher and Husain, 2003). Some South Asian children attend extra classes after school hours, including cultural
or religious ones (Beishon et al., 1998; Parker-Jenkins, 1991). Indeed, Barn et al. (2006), in their study of ethnic minority children in the UK, found that there is a trend in the South Asian group to provide educational assistance to their children in the form of study aids, computers and personal tutors. Even parents with low educational levels are more likely to ensure that their child has a private tutor. They also found that South Asian parents are more than three times more likely to allow children access to a computer in their bedrooms, as compared to Black and White populations. The fact that children from the South Asian group are more likely to work independently as compared to Black and White children, who are least likely to work independently, was suggested to be a result of all of this educational help provided (Barn et al., 2006).

**Acculturation, Language and Parenting Among the Pakistani and Indian Diaspora in the UK**

It has been argued that differences in acculturation between parents and their children results in higher levels of parent-child conflict (Lee and Liu, 2001). In American South Asian families, for example, parents with a separated or marginalised acculturation style report higher levels of family conflict than those who have an integrated or assimilated style (Farver et al., 2002). When there is no acculturation gap between parents and adolescents, adolescents report higher self-esteem, less anxiety and less family conflict. Generational status, time of immigration and identity as well as social, economic and political factors must be taken into account when examining acculturation amongst Indian and Pakistani families. Language is another key area relating to maintenance of culture for South Asian parents (Barn et al., 2006). Barn highlighted (2008) that many second-generation Indian parents still place importance on the transmission of their heritage languages to their children, in order to secure their ethnic identity.

Ghuman (2003) conducted a large study in Australia, the UK, US and Canada exploring acculturation among South Asian diasporic groups. Acculturation was found to be complex and bidirectional, influencing members of the host country as well as immigrants, and not simply the opposite of traditionalism. While family values and religion remain important for
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26 This is a continuation of work on acculturation in the South Asian community conducted by Ghuman. He first developed the Aberystwyth Biculturalism Scale to measure biculturalism among South Asian adolescents in Britain in 1975. He found in subsequent studies (1991; 1999) that the integration strategy is most popular among young South Asians.
the South Asian diasporic community, second-generation individuals born or educated in the host country find interaction with White peers important. Girls feel more strongly about integration, and Indians, as opposed to Pakistanis, are keener to acculturate, as are South Asian professionals. Biculturalism is considered the most popular acculturation strategy among South Asians, with some tension resulting between parents and children in regards to dating and marriage. Such tension is exacerbated for Sikhs and Muslims, as compared to Hindus (Ghuman, 2003; Brah, 1996). Islamic values and traditions are especially important to the Pakistani diaspora (Shaw, 2000), and intergenerational problems are resolved through compromise. Another study, by Stopes-Roe and Cochrane in 1990, found that first-generation Indians and Pakistanis feel more association with India and Pakistan than second-generation members of these groups, among which 43% of their sample identified as feeling more British. Yet, this study has been criticised for only offering participants two choices: British or Indian/Pakistani, and with no option of selecting a bicultural identity.

A more recent study by Robinson (2009) of adolescents between 13 to 18 years old, which formed part of a larger thirteen-nation study, found that the majority of Indian adolescents use integration strategies, while most Pakistanis partake in separation strategies. Further, Pakistani adolescents find ethnic identity to be more important than national identity, in contrast to the Indian group, who find national identity to be more important. Yet, both groups score highly on ethnic identity scores. These studies all increase understanding about acculturation in South Asians. However, none focus specifically on British-born third-generation samples or on pre-adolescent children.

The perception of the host culture by South Asians is another important aspect of acculturation. Marshall et al. (1998) found that parents feel that they have few values or parenting practices in common with White parents. They believe White parents are not as committed as they are and, as a result, White children tend to be undisciplined and lack respect for elders. Such beliefs tie into ‘racialised constructions’ and emphasise how informal segregation within British neighbourhoods can affect larger perceptions of parenting (Marshall et al., 1998).

---

27 The International Comparative Study of Ethnocultural Youth (ICSEY) was carried out in thirteen Western countries to increase knowledge of integration of second- and third-generation immigrants.
Religion

Few studies have been conducted on parenting and religion in Indian and Pakistani families, and little is known about the positive or detrimental influences of religion in the household (Mahoney and Pargament et al., 2001). In other research on religion and the family, Shor (1998) found that religiosity in parents is linked to protective factors, which have positive influences on the family structure. In comparison to nonreligious parents, religious parents have been shown to possess different values and parenting goals, organise their time differently and sometimes involve their children in social networks linked to a specific religious community (Bartkowski et al., 2008; Wilcox, 2002).

Rutter et al. (2005) showed that South Asians in Britain tend to use religion as a form of identification, and that many report that their faith identity holds a greater importance in their lives than their ethnic identity. According to Barn et al. (2006), more than 75% of mothers and fathers reported that their child attends a place of worship, as compared to 20% of White mothers and fathers. Barn et al. (2006) argued that for minority ethnic groups in general, religious places often represent more than simple areas of worship, fulfilling important social and communal needs, as well. This theory ties into similar arguments made by Bartkowski et al. (2008) and Wilcox (2002).

Pakistani Muslims have been found to display more outward signs of religious and cultural practice, and parents often highlight the importance of their child understanding prayer and learning to read the Quran (Barn et al., 2006). Further, Robinson (2009) found that religion is more important for Pakistani Muslim adolescents than Indian Hindu adolescents, with religion forming an important part of their ethnic identity. These findings support those from other studies (Anwar, 1998; Modood, 1997). Recent research on Muslim youth found that some Muslim young men view Islam, on a global level, as a brotherhood in which traditions, family values and gender are important (Phoenix and Husain, 2007; Glynn, 2002; Kahani-Hopkins and Hopkins, 2002; Nagel, 2002; Archer, 2003).
Demographics

Parents from different socio-economic and educational backgrounds may hold different ideas about race and ethnicity and the experiences associated with them (Hughes et al., 2006a). For example, Williams (1999) found that Blacks with higher education and income levels report more experiences of discrimination and prejudice than lower-income and educated Blacks. Rutter and Tienda (2005) argued that variation in parents’ socio-economic status is an essential aspect to examine when understanding racial and ethnic difference. With regard to the impact of social class and markers of income poverty on ethnic minority children’s school achievement in Britain, they discuss three findings: (1) the degree of variation resulting from class background tends to be higher than that resulting from ethnic group membership, (2) the inclusion of indicators of class background and of resources reduces to a large extent, but seldom eliminates, differences in school achievement among ethnic groups, and (3) despite socio-economic status differences in achievement usually found in every ethnic group, this is somewhat less pronounced in minority groups as compared with White majority groups.

Section V: Parenting and Ethnicity

At present, a gap exists in the research literature with respect to issues faced by ethnic groups from a psychological and familial context, particularly in the UK (Purewal and van den Akker, 2007; Bornstein, 1991; Rogoff et al., 1991). Much of research on different ethnic groups has been conducted in the US (García Coll and Pachter, 2002; Harwood et al., 2002). Yet academics recognise that empirical understanding of normative developmental and family processes in ethnic minority groups is still limited, and more research is needed in this area (Fisher et al., 1998; García Coll et al., 1996; Garcia Coll, Mayer and Brillon, 1995; García Coll and Vazquez García, 1995; Harrison et al., 1990; McLoyd et al., 2000; Swanson et al., 2003; Parke, 2004). Furthermore, the available research sometimes fails to examine ethnic groups as heterogeneous entities. Indeed, many of the studies specifically focused on Indian and Pakistani ethnic groups tend to group first- or second-generation immigrant families together. Although a gap in the literature still exists, it is promising that in the past ten years there has been a surge in studies about ethnic minority and family life. This surge may be related to the increase in globalisation, immigration and interaction of different cultural groups across the world, as well as a need to understand more about these various
cultural groups. This section will begin by discussing studies relating to parenting and ethnicity on a broad level. Where relevant, studies of parenting styles and practices relating to the Indian and Pakistani ethnic groups will be discussed.

**Ethnicity, Parenting Styles and Practices**

As Phoenix and Husain (2007) pointed out, over the past ten years, one approach to the study of parenting and ethnicity has been to distinguish between parenting ‘style’ and parenting ‘practice’. They define parenting styles as ‘behaviours that are consistent across a range of situations and create the ethos within which parents and children interact’. Some theorists describe these as being universal, or etic in nature, thus remaining consistent across different cultures. Parenting practices, however, vary according to the situation and carry different meanings according to different cultures, and are thus emic in nature. An example of such a practice, described by Rohner and Pettengill (1985), is parenting in Korean families. They found that Korean children who were parented with a high amount of permissiveness felt rejected when compared with children from Western countries.

This method of distinguishing between parenting styles and practices allows for a more appropriate approach to research on parenting across cultures, and the development of parenting scales (Stewart and Bond, 2002). However, before such scales are developed, more research needs to be carried out across different cultures to understand various parenting practices. One problem with these studies is that studies on parenting style are often quantitative, while those on practices are qualitative. Therefore, literature for the two categories is difficult to compare (Phoenix and Husain, 2007).

In the UK, there is a lack of studies that look directly at parenting style and ethnicity. However, there have been studies that examine different parenting practices in relation to different ethnic groups. A major finding in many of the British studies is the importance of socio-economic factors in determining which types of parenting practice are used among ethnic groups (Kotchick and Forehand, 2002). One important, and recent, study of parenting in Britain is that of Ravinder Barn and her colleagues (2006), which examined the opinions and experiences of ‘ordinary parents’ from diverse ethnic backgrounds in England. They argued that four key theoretical concepts have to be recognised and addressed in order to
fully understand parenting in Britain today: (1) acculturation, (2) racial, ethnic and cultural identification, (3) racial and ethnic socialisation/dual socialisation, and (4) collectivism. These concepts act as broad markers and highlight factors associated with parenting, child development and ethnicity in Britain (2006).

**Parenting Styles: A Look at Diana Baumrind and Further Developments**

The study of children’s psychological development in relation to psychological processes in families is fairly extensive.28 For example, it is generally concluded that parents who display sensitivity and warmth towards their children, combined with moderate levels of discipline, will have better-adjusted children than those who are more distant or more controlling (Steinberg et al., 1989; Durkin, 1995). This finding derives from Diana Baumrind’s work on parenting style (1967), which has become one of the most influential approaches within developmental psychology towards understanding the role of parents in influencing the behaviour and outcomes of children (Darling, 1999). Baumrind constructed a typology that categorised normative parenting styles into the four types of authoritative, authoritarian, permissive and withdrawn. These categories were based on the degree of parental responsiveness and behavioural control. The majority of this work has been based on White families and from a Western perspective.

Authoritative parenting has been found to be the most positive style of parenting, based on a range of studies on parenting style and child outcomes. Children of authoritative parents have shown better social skills and more instrumental competence than other children (Baumrind, 1991). Authoritarian parenting, on the other hand, which involves controlling parents with demanding behaviour and low responsiveness, has been associated with children with lower social competence, low self-esteem and greater tendencies towards depression. Permissive parents, who are responsive and make few demands, tend to have children who, although high in self-esteem, have problematic social skills and depression rates. Such children are also less successful at school. Finally, withdrawn parenting is considered the poorest parenting style, with children displaying low social skills and low success rates at school (McLoyd and Smith, 2002).

---

28 See Bornstein, 2002.
Although these categories work well with White American middle class families, and in some cases with American ethnic groups (Steinberg et al., 1992), they do not always hold in other cultures. Factors such as socio-economic status, ethnicity and gender are also found to affect predicted outcomes. For example, authoritative parenting is not related to higher educational achievement among African and Asian American children, who tend to fare better with authoritarian styles of parenting (Darling, 1999). Furthermore, in studies by Chao (2001) and Chao and Tseng (2002), it was found that authoritative parenting among Chinese children in the US was not related to the children’s school grades, whereas in European American children, authoritative parenting was related to higher school grades.

When McLoyd et al. (2000) probed into cross-cultural research on parenting styles, they found researchers from different ethnicities sometimes understood the various styles of parenting differently. They referred to a study in which parenting methods of African American parents were perceived as stricter by a European American researcher, as opposed to an African American one (Gonzales et al., 1996). This shows that categories of parenting style may not always be effective in explaining parenting and child development, as they are not always universal across cultures. One means of overcoming this problem with Baumrind’s parenting style typology, is to divide the typologies into separate constituents such as ‘warmth, responsiveness, regulation and non-coercive democratic discipline’ (Phoenix and Husain, 2007). Yet, as Stewart and Bond (2002) pointed out, the problem associated with this approach is that there is no overall agreement on how to standardise measures for the various constituents in order to allow for studies and comparison across different ethnic and cultural groups (Whiteside-Mansell et al., 2001).

Much work has been conducted on the bidirectional influence between parenting and children’s psychological development, focusing mainly on the quality of the parent’s marriage, the psychological adjustment of the parents and the child’s personality or temperament. For example, parental anxiety and depression (Downey and Coyne, 1990) and marital conflict (Cummings and Davies, 1994; Grych and Fincham, 1990) constitute risk factors for child functioning, both in a direct and indirect manner, by negatively affecting the parent-child relationship (Harold and Conger, 1997; Zahn-Waxler et al., 2000).

---

29 Chinese
When understanding the impact of marital state on parenting and child development in relation to Pakistani and Indian families, it is traditionally thought that, in these groups, marriage partners are arranged by the family. However, findings from the British Fourth National Survey of Ethnic Minorities (Modood et al., 1997) show that South Asians (including Bangladeshi, Pakistani, Indian and African Indian) who are British-born, or who came to the country at a very young age, are less likely to feel that their marriage partner should be selected by their family, as compared with first-generation South Asians who move to Britain as adults (Berthoud, 2000). It appears, therefore, that British-born Indian and Pakistani parents are more likely to have more say in their partner choice, which may influence parental marital quality, an important predictor of child outcome.

Lack of social support for parents from family and friends has also been shown to influence the quality of parent-child relationships (Crockenberg, 1981). Furthermore, it has been demonstrated that children’s behaviour towards their parents affects their parents’ behaviour towards them (Bell, 1986; Collins et al., 2000), so that infants with easy temperaments experience a different pattern of interaction with their parents than do infants who are difficult to manage (Putnam et al., 2002; van den Boom and Hoeksma, 1994). This leads to the importance of attachment theory in understanding parent and child development.

**Attachment**

Attachment theory asserts that the psychological functioning of the child is related to the security of the child’s attachment to its parent (Bowlby, 1969; 1982). Secure attachment relationships in infancy are associated with more positive outcomes for children in the preschool and early years (Sroufe, 1988; Belsky and Cassidy, 1994). Attachment has been shown to develop through interaction between the parent and the child, and to be influenced by aspects of the parent’s behaviour (including sensitive response, emotional availability, affection and level of simulation), as well as characteristics of the child (Bowlby, 1982; de Wolff and van Ijzendoorn, 1997). Pivotal to Bowlby’s theory is the idea of internal working models that are built up through experiences with attachment figures. Children are thought to develop internal representations of their relationships with parents, and in a securely attached child, these representations will reflect available and responsive relationships. Likewise, parents are also thought to develop internal representations of their relationship with their
child, which are believed to influence their thoughts and feelings in relation to that child and, consequently, their parenting behaviour and child outcomes (Bowlby, 1988; Solomon and George, 1999; Slade et al., 1999).

Despite attachment theory emerging through field observations and experiments, particularly with rhesus monkeys (Harlow and Harlow, 1962), the main means of assessment in humans is the Strange Situation (Ainsworth, Blehar, Walters and Wall, 1978). The Strange Situation comprises a series of steps that take place in the laboratory. The child is first present with their mother, and after some time, a stranger enters. Subsequently, the mother leaves, the stranger then exits, and, finally, the mother re-enters. The child’s reactions are observed during each of these steps. Amongst one-year-olds, securely attached children go to the mother when she re-enters and accept comfort from her, while insecurely attached children show avoidance or anger when the mother returns. Further subcategories of insecure attachment also exist.30

Yet, how equivalent is attachment as a construct when it is studied across cultures? It has been argued that Bowlby’s assumption of the mother as the main carer for infants does not hold true for all groups. Lamb’s (1986) work on fathers across cultures has highlighted the important role fathers play as carers in some cultures. The Aka Pygmies of Congo, who spend much time with their young, are one example of such a culture (Hewlett, 1991). Furthermore, findings emerging from primate and human behavioural ecology have highlighted the importance of other group members in the development of primate infants (Berry et al., 2011). These findings extend to human infants also, with many societies having important figures, such as siblings, grandparents and other relatives playing a key role in the care of the infant. The role of the mother as primary carer may vary from society to society. The degree of body contact between infant and mother can also vary between societies, and is another factor that may influence attachment patterns across cultures. For instance, mothers from some nomadic hunting and agricultural societies hold close body contact with their infants for long hours during the day, with their infants being held in a vertical position. This phenomenon is not often found in urban Western settings. Berry and colleagues (2011) also discussed the role of daycare in urban settings as another recent aspect of family life that may affect attachment patterns. Therefore, it is important that the cultural and environmental

30 See Main and Solomon, 1990
factors of the group being studied are considered when interpreting the results of the Strange Situation.

**Discipline and Punishment**

A great deal of debate has surrounded the issue of ethnicity and disciplinary measures used by parents. Different groups adopt different disciplinary practices. For example, physical discipline is more likely to be used by African American families as compared with European American families (Deater-Deckard et al., 1996), and a more restrictive approach to parenting has been found in Chinese parents as compared with other ethnic groups (Chao and Tseng, 2002).

Furthermore, different parenting styles result in different child outcomes in different ethnic groups. For example, unlike European American children, for whom the use of physical punishment by parents has been associated with higher conduct problems, within African American families, physical punishment is not related to conduct problems (Deater-Deckard et al., 1996). According to Rutter (Rutter and Tienda, 2005), possible explanations for this discrepancy include: (1) children’s interpretation of parenting in the African American group, (2) parental warmth in other areas, and (3) children’s attitudes about discipline. These factors are important to keep in mind when coming to an understanding of why this result is found in the US.

Contrary to research in the US, recent findings in the UK have shown that the use of physical punishment by ethnic minority parents is no more likely to occur than in families of the dominant group (Barn et al., 2006). Therefore, it is not possible to generalise findings from American ethnic minority samples across countries. Parenting practices need to be examined according to the specific cultural context and alongside child outcomes, to fully understand differences in parenting amongst different ethnic groups.

Despite these findings, there remains a general impression in the UK that ethnic minority groups tend to resort to harsh strategies of discipline. This is heightened by statistical evidence, such as reports of high representation of certain minority groups in child protection services (Gibbons et al., 1995; Barn et al., 1997; Thoburn et al., 2000; Brophy, 2003, in Barn et al., 2006). National statistics point to higher levels of Black and mixed-race children in
child protection service as opposed to under-represented levels of White and Asian children. High profile deaths of children such as Jasmine Beckford, Tyra Henry and Victoria Climbie heighten this false belief (Barn et al., 2006).

When coming to an understanding of discipline and child development, it is important to recognise the concept of parental warmth, which refers to the ‘emotional tone or quality of the parent-child relationship’ (Rutter and Tienda, 2005) and is a factor that may influence children’s understanding of their physical punishment. Indeed, the child’s perception of parental rejection is a crucial and universal mediator that is associated with parenting behavioural problems. In relation to this, Rutter (2005) stated: ‘Children show problems in development if they come to believe that their parents are rejecting them because physical and emotional security is essential to healthy physical development.’

Rutter (2005) also discussed the need to take cultural influences into account when understanding the psychological mechanisms linking children’s actual experience with their beliefs. Indeed, in cultures where physical punishment is common, spanking tends to reinforce the utility of physical discipline in children and adolescents’ minds, despite its often painful nature and the possible feeling of parental rejection at the time of punishment (Rutter and Tienda, 2005).

A study by Nobes and Smith (1997; 2002) conducted in the UK to establish the baseline for punishment used by parents, showed that amongst some White English parents, certain punishments are taken for granted whereas other parents see them as abusive. Barn et al. (2006) carried out a study across the ethnic groups of White, Asian, African and Afro-Caribbean and probed into the type of physical punishment used by parents. They noted that physical punishment is frequently the last measure taken by parents, and that parents change their disciplining strategy over the course of their child’s development. For example, many parents stated that they hit their child when the child was younger, but as the child grew older they stopped using this as a disciplinary measure, as they viewed it as ineffective and undesirable (Barn et al., 2006).
Cross-cultural Psychology and Parenting Styles

Cross-cultural developmental psychology has offered its own theories on parenting styles. Some of the most prominent studies have been conducted by Heidi Keller and her colleagues (2007; 2003; Keller et al., 2000; Keller et al., 2004; Keller et al. 2005; 2005a; 2005b), who link early parenting experiences (during infancy) to the concept of self. They suggest that the different meaning and understanding of the self across cultures leads to different parenting styles and strategies and results in different child outcomes (Keller et al., 2004). This may explain why children from different cultures achieve universal developmental tasks and milestones at different time points.

When examining the concept of the self, Keller et al. use the work of Cigdem Kagıtcıbasi (1996; 1996a; 2004), who discussed how interpersonal distance, which refers to the ‘degree of distancing self from others’ (or degree of connectedness) (Kagıtcıbasi, 2005), is dimensional in nature, ranging from separatedness to relatedness. Kagıtcıbasi also spoke about agency, which is dimensional (running from autonomy to heteronomy), and refers to it as ‘motivated action with a self of efficacy (non-coercion) towards a desired outcome’ (Kagıtcıbasi, 2005).31 Kagıtcıbasi developed her work based on the groundbreaking model of the self first theorised by Markus and Kitayama (1991) which stresses the centrality of culture in human development. This model postulates a person’s construction of the self is influenced by different combinations of these dimensional poles. Three patterns of the self develop from these pole combinations, namely independence, interdependence and autonomous relatedness. These patterns of self-construction are culturally constrained, meaning that different cultures display different incidences of these patterns.

Independence is described as a combination of autonomy and separatedness. The independent self is an ‘individual agent’ who is ‘bounded, self contained, unique and separated from others’ (Keller, Lohaus et al., 2004). Kagıtcıbasi’s (1996; 1996a) research in Western urban, educated, middle class families, describes this further. The interdependent self is described as a combination of heteronomy and relatedness and such individuals see themselves as part of a community, ‘interconnected with others, role oriented and compliant’ (Keller et al., 2004). Kagıtcıbasi found this ‘self’ more frequently in rural families with low SES and educational backgrounds. In the interdependent self, agency is viewed as being externally regulated.

31 Taken from Bandura’s (1989) definition
Families are very connected and often hierarchal in nature. Lastly, autonomous-relatedness is a combination of autonomy and relatedness. This is found more in urban, educated, middle class families, in traditionally interdependent societies (Keller et al., 2004). The self is seen as autonomous in relation to agency and respect is linked to interpersonal distance. Such families stress closeness within the family on a psychological level, yet at the same time individual autonomy.

In order to understand the type of societies in which these various concepts emerge, Kagitçibasi combined her ‘autonomous related self theory’ with a model of family change (1990; 1996b; 2005). This model viewed the family as a system and placed it in a cultural and social structural context. Parenting, parent-child relationships, generational differences and child values were all taken into account. Three typical family patterns emerged. Firstly, traditional families, which focus on interdependence across generations. These are found in rural, agricultural, poorer societies and urban, low socio-economic status contexts. Children of traditional families grow up in a hierarchical system and provide support to parents in old age, and also often contribute economically. Fertility tends to be higher in such groups. Secondly, individualistic families, which focus more on independence. Finally, a combination of the two, involving material independence but also psychological interdependence across generations.

Parenting therefore occurs differently in each of these groups. Kagitçibasi (1990; 1995) argued that globalisation and urbanisation have caused a global shift from interdependence to more independent styles of parenting. However, she also stated that such research is simplistic and argues that there is a need to distinguish material and psychological interdependence in families (Kagitçibasi, 1990; 1996b; 2005). For example, increasing affluence may cause less dependence and allow more autonomous parenting, yet psychological interdependence and relatedness may remain. The theory of the autonomous–relatedness self highlights the different parenting styles that emerge across different groups.

Keller (2004) used this theory when studying three groups from different socio-cultural backgrounds. These included families from a Greek middle class sample, which represented an independent-based group, families from the Cameroonian Nso, a traditional farming community, which represented an interdependence-based group, and lastly, a Costa Rican sample, which represented families from an autonomous-related group. The children were
between the ages of 18-20 months and the study examined whether there were differences in parenting styles, developmental outcomes and behaviour of the children.

Keller and colleagues identified three parenting styles that reflected different socio-cultural orientations in early maternal behaviour: (1) proximal parenting style, which emphasises body contact and body stimulation and is linked to interdependent socio-cultural practices focusing on heteronomy and relatedness, (2) distal parenting style, which emphasises face-to-face exchange and ‘object stimulation’ and is linked to independent socio-cultural practices focusing on autonomy and separatedness, and (3) a combination of distal and proximal parenting, linked to an autonomous-related orientation. This model has become known as the component model of parenting (Keller, 2007).

Keller and her colleagues found differences in child behaviour and development patterns across the three groups, based on these parenting styles. Greek children displayed more self-recognition (using the rouge test32) compared with Cameroonian Nso toddlers, while Cameroonian Nso toddlers displayed more self-regulation. Costa Rican children lay between the two groups for these traits. They concluded that the development of self-recognition and self-regulation is linked to early parenting experience. Children who show more self-regulation at 18-20 months experience greater proximal parenting, with body contact being the main predictor (Keller et al., 2005). Self-recognition in toddlers was found to be linked to distal parenting among families with higher independence and eye contact levels. Keller (2007) also discussed other aspects of development, which may be influenced by parenting style. For example, dyadic body stimulation, which involves mothers stimulating their infants through touch and movement (Berry et al., 2011), can vary across cultures and impact motor development. Studies have shown that the early development of motor functions in Indian infants is linked to bathing and massage techniques used with the baby (Landers, 1989; Walsh Escarce, 1989). Therefore, Keller’s work offers an alternative to mainstream psychological theory and seems to show that the style of parenting varies across cultures and, in turn, affects child development.

32 A self-recognition test that assesses a child’s ability to recognise a reflection a mirror as his/her own.
AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

From the available literature on ethnic minority families, there is a dearth of in-depth studies on the psychological well-being, daily routines and family life of South Asian communities. Much of the research that does exist falls into the trap of offering ‘generalised’ accounts (Becher and Husain, 2003). The few studies of minorities that have been conducted are often in the form of reports or subsections of larger studies (Phoenix and Husain, 2007). There are still fewer studies of British-born South Asian parents and their experiences.

The aim of the present study is to examine normative samples of British-born mothers and children from Pakistani, Indian and non-immigrant White families to establish similarities and differences in parenting practices, parent-child relationships and child psychological adjustment between the three largest ethnic groups in contemporary Britain. The term ‘child psychological adjustment’ refers to the child’s psychological development and well-being, including the measures of emotional difficulties, conduct problems and self. The research also aims to explore the social experiences of mothers from each of these groups living in highly multicultural areas in the UK and the association between mothers’ experiences and parenting behaviour.

These particular ethnic groups were chosen for a number of reasons. Firstly, both Indians and Pakistanis began migration to Britain around a similar time, and both groups have established large ethnic minority groups. The non-immigrant White group has also experienced this migration and has, in turn, been affected in the public and private spheres. Secondly, English as a shared language between non-immigrant White and second-generation onwards Indians and Pakistanis, has reduced cross-cultural distance between these communities and made comparison easier. Thirdly, the changing nature of Britain, due to increased cultural diversity, has affected the parenting and family life of British-born mothers from each of the three communities being studied. Finally, my own personal interest in researching these groups, because of my background as a British South Asian, has also contributed to the selection of these groups.

Fathers are not included in the study, but information about the role of father in family life was collected from mothers during the interview. Further, a small proportion of fathers from the Indian and Pakistani families were not born in the UK but migrated here at a young age.
The overall research question of this study is as follows:

What are the similarities and differences in parenting practices, parent-child relationships, child psychological adjustment and parental social experiences in British-born Pakistani, British-born Indian and non-immigrant White families living in ethnically diverse regions in the UK?

This thesis is organised according to two aspects of family life in British Indian, Pakistani and non-immigrant White groups:

1) Parenting and child adjustment: a quantitative approach was used to investigate parents’ marital and psychological states, parenting and mother-child relationships and child psychological adjustment.

2) Cultural and contextual factors: a mixed-methods approach, using both quantitative and qualitative analyses, was used to examine the broader social environment of the mother and child, exploring family life in relation to surrounding cultural and contextual factors.

The results of the study are divided accordingly. The parenting interview used in the study also reflects these two levels of analysis of family life. In using such a holistic approach, a thorough understanding of the range of family experiences of British Indians, British Pakistani and non-immigrant White mothers and children living in highly culturally diverse areas could take place. In essence, this thesis offers a snapshot of what it means to be a British-born Indian, Pakistani or White mother and child living in the UK today.
HYPOTHESES OF STUDY

The study is comparative in nature and focuses on normative, rather than disadvantaged, samples of ethnic minority families in the UK. The hypotheses have been derived from the well developed literature on parenting and child development and relevant theories from cross-cultural psychology, namely bioecological theory and the PPCT model (Bronfenbrenner, 1979; 1999), acculturation theory (Berry, 2003) and the theory of ethnic-racial socialisation (ERS) (Hughes et al., 2006a; Hughes et al. 2008). The hypotheses also take into account the two aspects of family life being examined in the study: (1) parenting and child adjustment, and (2) cultural and contextual factors in family life.

The study hypotheses are as follows:

**Parenting and Child Adjustment**

1) Within each ethnic group, positive parent-child relationships (e.g. high levels of warmth, interaction and supervision and low levels of aggression and rejection) will be significantly associated with positive outcomes for children (e.g. low levels of emotional difficulties and conduct problems and high levels of self esteem).

2) Based on acculturation literature, there will be similarities in parenting practices and parent-child relationships between groups. This is due to participants across each group being born and raised in Britain. For example, it is hypothesised that parents from each group will show similar levels of maternal control such as control of bedtime.

3) Differences between ethnic groups will exist in the nature of parent-child relationships. For example, it is hypothesised that British Indian and British Pakistani parents will show significantly higher levels of supervision and discipline of their children than non-immigrant White parents due to their more collectivist nature.

3a) These differences between ethnic groups in parent-child relationships will be associated with differences in outcomes for children. For example, it is hypothesised that children from British Indian and British Pakistani groups that implement high levels of supervision and discipline will show significantly lower levels of conduct problems than non-immigrant White children.
Cultural and Contextual Factors in Family life

4) Based on ecological systems theory, child adjustment will be influenced by different contextual and immediate environmental factors and their interaction across the microsystem, exosystem and mesosystem levels. These factors will be different for each of the ethnic groups. For example, it is hypothesised that a significantly higher level of extended family involvement will be found in British Indian and British Pakistani families than in non-immigrant White families.

4a) Differences between ethnic groups in family and community life will be associated with differences in outcomes for children. For example, it is hypothesised that a high level of extended family and community involvement in British Indian and British Pakistani groups will be associated with higher levels of child psychological well-being in these ethnic groups.

5) The diverse communities in which families live will influence parenting strategies and how parents talk to their children about ethnicity and race. It is hypothesised that the second-generation British Indian and British Pakistani groups will experience more racial prejudice than the non-immigrant White group and subsequently engage in particular ethnic-racial socialisation practices with their children. It is also hypothesised that a high level of prejudice will be associated with significantly lower levels of child psychological well-being.

6) It is hypothesised that religion will have a greater influence on parenting practices in the British Pakistani group as compared with the British Indian and non-immigrant White group. Religion has been shown to be an important form of identification over other forms of identification, such as ethnicity among British Pakistanis. It is hypothesised that religiosity in parents will be associated with positive influences in the child's life, such as involvement in religious communities and social networks.

7) Feelings about living in a culturally diverse environment, of children growing up in Britain and perceptions of parenting in other ethnic groups were explored in British Indian, British Pakistani and non-Immigrant White families. This set of analyses is exploratory and descriptive in nature, and hence no hypotheses will be tested.
Chapter 2
METHODOLOGY

Section I includes a discussion of the methodological aspects of conducting cross-cultural research. This is followed by a description of the methods used to reduce bias in the present study. Section II describes the experimental design and methods of the study, including details of the recruitment of families, sample characteristics and the procedure of data collection. Section III describes the quantitative parenting and child adjustment measures used. This is followed by Section IV (a) which describes the quantitative cultural and contextual measures used, and Section IV (b) which includes a description of the qualitative cultural and contextual measures used in the present study.

Section I: Methodological Aspects of Research Across Cultures

Methodology must be developed carefully in cross-cultural research, as this type of research brings with it a range of methodological issues that would not arise in monocultural studies, including those relating to translation, equivalence of measurement, sampling, data analysis and presentation (Matsumoto and van de Vijver, 2011). Bias and lack of equivalence in studies can affect the way cross-cultural differences are interpreted. A good cross-cultural study needs to keep these in mind in addition to the aim of the research, the use of contextual factors and the cultural distance of participants. Cultural distance refers to the extent of difference between the cultures being studied. When groups have a larger difference, it is more likely that significant cross-cultural differences will be found. However, uncontrolled variables are also more likely to influence the results and offer alternative non-cultural explanations for the differences. Therefore, when groups with a large cultural difference are studied, bias and inequivalence are likely to cause problems. In order to measure cultural difference in a study, participants should be assessed for the difference they feel towards a set of other countries, or towards different ethnic groups and the dominant culture (Matsumoto and van de Vijver, 2011). The inclusion of contextual factors as variables in a study is also important, as they help to explain cultural differences, increase the validity of a study and diminish the influence of bias and inequivalence by providing information about their importance to the group. Contextual factors are variables that describe the characteristics of
participants and their culture, such as socio-economic status and religious affiliation (Poortinga and van de Vijver, 2009). Finally, the aim of a study will also impact cross-cultural research methodology. Exploratory studies that aim to increase understanding of cultural differences through highlighting similarities and differences between groups, are less likely to be prone to bias and inequivalence than studies that are hypothesis-testing in nature and attempt to advance a theory. Of course, hypothesis-testing studies offer more information about the causes of difference and, thus, a trade-off exists that must be considered when conducting cross-cultural research (Matsumoto and van de Vijver, 2011).

**Ethnic and Language Matching**

The identity of the researcher may have an important impact on the outcome of social research, particularly when studying ethnic groups. To improve responses from participants, it has been argued that ethnic and language matching should occur at all stages of the research process, from design to analysis (Grewal and Ritchie, 2006). Achieving complete ethnic matching is very difficult, considering the complex nature of ethnicity. Therefore, matching can be thought of on a scale from not matched to perfectly matched (Grewal and Ritchie, 2006). A researcher would then lie somewhere along the scale, depending on the extent to which they are matched.

There is evidence that the impact of ethnic matching is both productive and potentially obstructive (Zinn, 1979; May, 1993; Phoenix, 1994; Egharevba, 2001). The main advantage of ethnic matching is a shared identity, which allows the researcher to be considered an insider during the interview and allows for rich data collection. Rapport and trust between an ethnically matched researcher and participant may develop more rapidly and thus increase depth of response. Elam et al. (1999) examined how the content of the interview or the sensitivity of questions may be influenced by ethnic matching. Sensitive issues, such as racism, sexuality and religion, were found to be discussed more openly with ethnically matched interviewers. Further, a researcher from a similar ethnic group to the participants being studied may offer expertise and insight to the study design and may help in the recruitment of participants. Grewal and Ritchie (2006) discussed the disadvantages of ethnic matching. Participants may assume that researchers who share a common ethnicity already know the answers to questions. Further, respondents might not open up to those researchers,
as they may be afraid of being judged or gaining a reputation, particularly in small communities. Researchers, similarly, may not fully probe respondents on issues with which they are familiar, and may make assumptions about the respondent.

Language matching, too, is important across all stages of research, including design, data collection and data analysis. Shared language aids communication, and allows the respondent to fully present their views (Hughes et al., 1995; Bradby, 2001; 2002; Fallon and Brown, 2002). However, in some cases, the impact of using a shared language may be less positive. Respondents may consider the status of a researcher interviewing in a language other than English to be lower, and subsequently judge their performance negatively (Grewal and Ritchie 2006). Thus, in both ethnic and language matching, pros and cons exist. Yet there seems to be a general consensus that the benefits of ethnic and language matching outweigh the disadvantages.

**Equivalence in Cross-cultural Research**

Cross-cultural studies use comparison between groups at their core. In order to effectively measure group differences, methodological issues associated with equivalence and bias should be considered during the design and analysis phase of the study. Equivalence refers to the degree of comparability of measurement outcomes (Matsumoto and van de Vijver, 2011), while bias occurs when participants from different cultures do not give the exact same meaning to a measurement instrument (van de Vijver and Leung, 2011). The two concepts are directly linked in any study; bias reduces the equivalence of measurement outcomes across cultures, and only those instruments that are free from bias will carry the same meaning to participants within and across cultures.

There are different types of equivalence, all of which are important to take into account when conducting any study. These include construct equivalence, structural equivalence, measurement unit equivalence and full score equivalence (scalar equivalence).
Construct Equivalence

Before any comparison between cultural groups can take place, it is essential for researchers to check that the constructs being measured are equivalent. Equivalence occurs when each of the groups being studied share the same meaning for the construct being measured. In some cases, construct equivalence can never be met (e.g. where culturally specific psychological constructs exist). An example of this is seen in the case of Amok, which is present among some East Asian men (particularly among Malay men), and is a sociopathic syndrome characterised by a short period of hostile and destructive behaviour often triggered by an insult. Under Amok, men show automatic behaviours and feelings of persecution and, afterwards, are left exhausted and with no memory of the incident having occurred. Although aggression among young men is a universal trait, the various aspects associated with Amok mean it is highly culturally specific to this group (van de Vijver and Leung, 2011). In other cases, construct inequivalence occurs when comparisons are made between constructs that do not show evidence of comparability across cultures. An example of this is found in research on achievement bias. In a Western setting, achievement is shown to be an individualistic quality; however, ‘individualism’ is not always replicated in other cultures. In fact, McClelland et al. (1985), in their study of achievement motivation, were criticised for not taking contextual and cultural factors into account. Studies have shown that in some non-Western societies, achievement is more socially orientated and associated with the collective (Doi, 1982; Kagan and Knight, 1981; van di Vijver, 2009). In Chinese culture, for example, actively aiming for self-betterment and putting oneself first are not universally positive traits (Winter, 1996). Instead, their culture values a more socially driven approach, with individuals aiming to meet the expectations of important people and groups, such as families or peers. Therefore, researchers must consider different understandings of constructs across different groups to avoid construct inequivalence.

Structural Equivalence

When a measurement instrument assesses the same construct across cultural groups, structural equivalence is said to occur (van de Vijver et al., 2009). The instrument should show similar patterns of relationships to theoretical variables or, in other words, similar factor structures in all groups (van de Vijver and Leung, 2011). Various personality tests, such as
the five-factor model of personality (McCrae and Costa, 1997), have been assessed for structural equivalence. Functional equivalence is a special case of structural equivalence that occurs when the instrument measuring a particular construct, such as depression, measures the same construct in each cultural group with high validity, showing similar patterns of convergence and divergence. In other words, the measure is correlated with other related measures of the construct, and not correlated with non-related measures of the construct (van de Vijver and Leung, 2011).

**Measurement Unit Equivalence**

Measurement unit equivalence occurs when instruments have the same measurement units in their measurement scales across cultures, but with different origins (van de Vijver et al., 2009). A non-psychological example of this is temperature measurement and the Celsius and Kelvin scales. Measurement unit equivalence is present in instruments with scale intervals or ratio-level scores, which maintain the relative scores of individuals in each cultural group (i.e. the same ranking), irrespective of sources of bias that differentially shift scores of the different cultural groups as a whole (van de Vijver and Leung, 2011). An example of a source of bias is stimulus familiarity, which can affect scores on questionnaires in some cultures more than others, but individuals from a cultural group may be affected in a similar way. Measurement unit equivalence should be assessed in order to achieve clear understanding of the results of between-group comparison using such instruments. This can be achieved through the use of statistical methods such as factor analysis. For a construct to have measurement unit equivalence, factor loadings for measurement items should be equal across groups. This implies the questionnaire or test item is understood in a similar way across cultures (Kankaras and Moors, 2010).

**Full Score Equivalence**

Direct cross-cultural comparisons of measures should ideally take place only when an instrument shows full score equivalence. When measures have the same ratio or scale unit of measurement and the same scale origin in the cultural groups being studied, full score
equivalence is present and the mean scores between groups can be directly compared (van de Vijver and Leung, 2011).

**Causes of Inequivalence in Cross-cultural Research**

Bias refers to factors that arise during cross-group comparison and affect the outcome of measurements between groups. The effects of bias should be accounted for and minimised when measurement instruments are used cross-culturally. Examples of bias include construct bias, method bias and item bias.

*Construct Bias*

Construct bias can cause construct inequivalence, and occurs when a particular construct is studied across groups, despite having a different meaning to the various cultural groups being studied.

*Method Bias*

Method bias refers to bias that results from methodological and procedural aspects of a study. It can be of different types, including administration bias, sample bias and instrument bias (van de Vijver et al. 2009).

*Administration Bias*

Administration bias takes place at the time of test administration and can occur due to a range of factors, such as different test environments, use of novel equipment for the participants, unclear instructions for participants, unclear guidelines for researchers and communication issues.
Sample Bias

Sample bias relates to differences in sample characteristics that can affect results. It is important to take these into account when groups from different cultures are being studied, to account for background variables. For example, factors such as socio-economic status and level of education, if not matched between groups, can result in such bias. Therefore, matching cultural samples is very important, as is assessment of contextual factors that are likely to explain difference.

Instrument Bias

Instrument bias occurs when there is a problem with the characteristics of instruments, causing a cross-cultural bias. This can take place when participants have different levels of experience and familiarity with test material, such as instructions.

Item Bias

This type of bias occurs at the item level and may cause full score inequivalence (Holland and Wainer, 1993). Item bias occurs when participants with the same level of understanding of a particular construct (for example, participants with the same intelligence) have different mean scores on the item because of different cross-cultural backgrounds (van de Vijver and Leung, 2011). An example of how this can occur is through poor translation, wording of items or adaptation of items. Items may not be fully understood by specific cultural groups, as they might see them as unclear or irrelevant.

Methods of Countering Bias

The literature that examines bias in cross-cultural research has focused on various approaches to countering bias in measurement. Two of these methods are the judgmental approach and the statistical approach (van de Vijver et al. 2009). The judgmental approach uses the knowledge of cultural experts to identify items that may cause bias. Using ethnically matched researchers to help in the design and analysis stage is one example of this. The statistical
approach uses statistical techniques to reduce bias. Depending on the measurement method, sample size and number of groups being studied, different techniques are selected. Often, the statistical approach is used at the data analysis stage in cross-cultural studies. Techniques such as exploratory factor analysis and confirmatory factory analysis are used to assess whether different types of equivalence, such as structural equivalence and measurement unit equivalence, have been achieved across the cultural groups being studied (van de Vijver and Leung, 2011). Van de Vijver et al. (2009) suggest that a combined approach of statistical and judgment methods during research is the most effective.

The type of bias should inform the techniques used to counter it. The presence of construct bias, for example, may be assessed statistically by techniques used to compare data structures between groups, such as comparing factor structures. The existence of construct bias indicates dissimilarity in the construct being measured across cultures and would result in a need to reassess the measures being used in the study (van de Vijver and Leung, 2011). Culturally tailored measures developed within the cultural groups being studied reduce construct bias by ensuring participants from each group understand the context being measured. Cultural decentering can also be applied (Tanzer, Gittler and Ellis, 1995). This technique involves trying to ensure that all groups being studied understand the items being measured by removing cultural details from stimuli (van de Vijver and Leung, 2011).

Method bias can be reduced by intensively training administrators, preparing thorough manuals for assessment and administration across cultural groups, having straightforward instructions and matching samples by balancing them according to demographic and contextual variables. Analysing response styles is another technique for minimising method bias. This includes checking to see how participants from different cultures answer questions (e.g. whether they select end points of a response scale (extreme-response style) or if they agree with questions irrespective of the question (acquiescence bias)). The choice of response style may be associated with characteristics in the specific culture, such as sincerity (Johnson et al., 2005).

Item bias can be minimised by ensuring that items have been correctly translated and are used in an appropriate context. A combination of the judgment approach, in which specialists in the group being studied assess the suitability of the items being used, as well as statistical
measures, such as differential item functioning analysis, can be used to combat this type of bias (van de Vijver and Leung, 2011).

**Methods Used to Reduce Bias in the Present Study**

A combination of judgmental and statistical approaches for countering construct, method and item bias was used across all phases of the study. In order to check for construct inequivalence, the measures were piloted to assess relevance and shared meaning for the different ethnic groups.\(^{34}\) Representatives from the British Indian, British Pakistani and non-immigrant White ethnic groups were interviewed and asked to describe what they understood each question to mean. These representatives were selected through convenience sampling and came from a range of socio-economic statuses. Due to the use of universal measures between groups, cultural decentering was then applied to many of the interview questions and questionnaire items, if meanings were found to be unclear. Both construct bias and item bias were reduced through the use of the judgmental approach, which relies on cultural expertise on the groups being studied. This was achieved through the ethnic matching of the principle researcher (who was of British South Asian origin) to British Indian and British Pakistani groups. Ethnic matching also facilitated the recruitment of participants and increased the validity of the information obtained from the British Indian and British Pakistani groups. Further, it ensured that particular topics in the interview, such as racism, were approached in a culturally sensitive way. Item bias was reduced by the use of questionnaires, which had been used in previous studies across different cultural groups so that the items had previously been checked for relevance and applicability. An example of this is the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ), used to measure children’s psychological adjustment, which has been applied across a wide range of ethnic groups and has shown clinical utility and good psychometric properties at the item level and as a whole (see Woerner et al., 2004).

A great deal of effort was made to minimise the effects of method bias. Administration bias was reduced by the further development of an already detailed manual for administration and coding of interview data, which had clear instructions and guidelines for each section of the interview. The researcher was trained in the administration and scoring of the interview.

\(^{34}\)According to the procedures outlined by Bernstein et al., 2005; Krishnakumar et al., 2004; van de Vijver and Tanzer, 2004
Interrater reliability analyses conducted during the data collection stage further ensured administration bias was minimised. As all of the mothers were British-born and English was their native language, the need for language matching was minimised. However, in some sections of the interview, certain group-specific cultural terms were used to refer to specific practices and beliefs. An example of this was the use of the word *biraderi* (occupational caste) for the British Pakistani group, which was used to understand more about the background of participants.

Every attempt was made to reduce sample bias. The balanced nature of the sample with respect to the key socio-demographic variable of educational level ensured that sample bias was reduced. The sample was also matched for other socio-demographic variables, including child’s age and child’s educational level. The population census for the London area was used to help with matching. Details were obtained of the educational levels of Indian, Pakistani and White populations living in London. Based on these levels, corresponding grids of educational levels for the three ethnic groups were derived for the study. These detailed the number of participants at each educational level that would be required to create a matched sample. The inclusion and measurement of many contextual variables in the study design also helped obtain a clear picture of the sample. In addition, to ensure participants understood the testing procedure and were comfortable with filling in questionnaires, clear instructions were given to mothers, and the researcher was available to answer any questions participants had.

Finally, cultural distance was minimised in the sample being studied, as all participants were born in the United Kingdom and lived in multicultural areas. An acculturation scale that measured how the British Indian and British Pakistani groups felt towards the dominant culture was included to find out more about cultural distance. Also, the non-immigrant White group was asked how they felt about the British Indian and British Pakistani groups during the interview. In this way, any cross-cultural differences were more likely to be a result of actual ethnic differences rather than confounding variables.

35 These were obtained directly from the Office for National Statistics.
Section II: Experimental Design and Methods

Recruitment

Thirty-one British Pakistani families, 26 British Indian families and 33 non-immigrant White families took part in this study. All of the mothers were British-born, and the target child in each family was between the ages of 5-7 years. Fathers did not take part in this study although mothers were asked questions about their partner’s role in the family, parenting and marital relationship.

Mothers and children were recruited mainly through state primary schools in London. Following ethical approval from the Cambridge University Psychology Research Ethics Committee, primary schools which were located in boroughs with high concentrations of Indian and Pakistani ethnic minorities as well as sizable non-immigrant White populations were contacted. The choice of London as a location for data collection was a popular one for researchers and a large number of the schools contacted were already involved in research studies and declined interest. The recruitment process was therefore lengthy and ongoing through the duration of data collection. Emails were initially sent to head teachers and deputy-head teachers, and meetings were then set up with schools that expressed interest. Following the meetings, a set of dates was agreed on for the researcher to visit the school during the school morning and home time when parents were present. In each school, letters were sent to all parents of children in year one and year two informing them of the purpose of the study and that a researcher would be visiting the school for recruitment purposes. On the day of recruitment, the researcher directly approached parents who were waiting to collect their children in the playground, and informed them of the nature of the study. The researcher stressed that participation in the study was voluntary. Participants did not receive any monetary compensation for taking part. Those who expressed interest were asked to fill in a recruitment booklet\textsuperscript{36}. Phone numbers were collected of those parents who were still unsure and the researcher called them up at a later date to give them further details of the study. Following the parents’ agreement to participate in the study, a date was arranged by phone for a home visit. The exclusion criteria were the presence of severe psychological problems, developmental problems, or learning difficulties in children.

\textsuperscript{36} See Appendix B for recruitment booklet
The main boroughs in which recruitment took place were Walthamstow, Newham, Redbridge and Waltham Forest, Harrow, Brent and Hounslow, Ealing and Croydon. Due to practical constraints, some of the mothers were contacted through snowballing and this resulted in a few children from private schools and two families being interviewed outside of London. In total, children were recruited from 40 schools. Thirty-five of these were through direct contact with the school and 5 were through mothers recruited via snowballing.

The sample was matched and selected according to strict criteria. Data from the population Census 2001 for the London area was used to achieve this. Details of the educational breakdown of Indians, Pakistani and White families living in London were obtained from the Office for National Statistics (ONS). A grid was then developed specifically for the study, which included the corresponding proportion of participants required for each education category based on a sample size of 30 participants per family type. These education categories were based on modified versions of the National Qualifications Framework (NQF) and the Qualifications and Credit Framework (QCF). Following the creation of this grid, participants were selected based on their education level, in order to achieve a representative sample according to the actual population of the ethnic groups in London. The education level of the parent with the highest qualifications was used for matching purposes. The selection criteria were as follows: the child was between the age of 5-7 years old and was British born, the child attended primary school and both the child’s mother and father were British born.

The study was conducted in London, as it represents the most multicultural city in the UK, being home to almost half (49 per cent) of ethnic minority groups in the country (Scott et al., 2001). It was important for the study that an area in which communities were in close proximity to one another was selected in order to explore the impact cultural and ethnic diversity on family life.

37 See Appendix C
38 Parents qualification were separately reported for mothers and fathers on 6 levels: (1) 1 or more O levels/ NVQ Level 1 (2) 5 or more O levels (A-C)/ 1 A level, 1-3 AS levels/NVQ Level 2 (3) 2 or more A levels/ 4 or more AS levels/ NVQ Level 3 (4) First Degree (e.g. BA, BSc)/ NVQ Levels 4-5 (5) Higher Degree and (6) no qualifications. The 6 response categories were collapsed into 3 categories (1) primary (2) secondary and (3) higher. The category ‘no qualifications’ was coded as (1) primary. When parents had different qualification levels, the higher one was used for categorisation. See Appendix D for further details of the qualification scheme used.
39 The recruitment of low income ethnic minority groups is a particularly challenging aspect of recruitment. Past literature also discusses this (McManus, Erens and Bajekal, 2006).
Sample Characteristics

There were similar proportions of boys and girls in each ethnic group, and as shown in Table 1, the *Child’s Age* did not differ between groups. There was no significant group difference in the *Mother’s Age*. However, there was a significant difference in the *Father’s Age*, $F(2,80) = 5.33$, $p < .01$. The British Pakistani and non-immigrant White fathers were the oldest with mean ages of 41 years and 42 years respectively, and the Indian fathers had a mean age of 37 years.

Table 1: Age of Child, Mother and Father by Family Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>British Indian</th>
<th>British Pakistani</th>
<th>Non-immigrant White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>6.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SD</strong></td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age (years)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>35.23</td>
<td>37.00</td>
<td>38.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>37.32</td>
<td>40.52</td>
<td>41.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>5.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SD</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>5.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F$</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td></td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Social class was assessed by the *Educational Level* of parents, using modified versions of the National Qualifications Framework (NQF) and the Qualifications and Credit Framework (QCF). The modified framework ranged from 1 (Primary) to 3 (Higher)$^{40}$. No significant group differences were found for mothers or fathers for *Education Level* (see Table 2).

There was a significant difference between groups in *Mother’s Working Status* $\chi^2 = 17.00$, $p < .01$. This was assessed according to a set of options which ranged from 1 (not currently working), to 3 (working full time) and showed a higher proportion of Pakistani mothers not currently working and a higher proportion of non-immigrant White mothers working part

$^{40}$ See Appendix D
time. No difference was found for Fathers’ Working Status. The Number of Siblings in the family did not differ between groups. However, the Number of Other Adults in the Household did, \( \chi^2 = 12.47, p < .01 \), reflecting a higher number of adults in the household for the Indian group as compared with Pakistani and non-immigrant White groups. Current Marital Status was also assessed between groups according to a set of options which ranged from 1(married to child’s father) to 3 (new partner/cohabiting). This showed no significant difference between ethnic groups (see Table 2). Aside from the three differences which were small between groups (i.e. Father’s Age, Mothers Working Status, and Number of Other Adults in the Household), all other contextual factors showed close matching between groups.
### Table 2: Socio-Demographic Information by Family Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>British Indian</th>
<th>British Pakistani</th>
<th>Non-immigrant White</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Child’s Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boy</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girl</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Father’s Educational Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mother’s Educational Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mother’s Working Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not currently working</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>p &lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working part time</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working full time</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Siblings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.44</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-three</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than three</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Other Adults in the Household</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12.47</td>
<td>p &lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-two</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three or more</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married to child’s father</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated/divorced</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New partner/cohabiting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Procedure

The researcher (H.I) was trained in the study techniques and visited the families at home. Each visit lasted approximately 2 - 2.5 hours. Mothers were first handed information sheets and given the opportunity to ask questions about the study in general, and what their participation would entail. They also had the option of opting out of any part of the study (e.g. the parent-child observation task) if they wished to. Following this, the mothers were asked to complete consent forms for their own participation as well as their child’s participation in the study.

The home visit procedure involved the following:

- Conducting an interview with the mother on parenting and family life, which lasted approximately 1.5 hours (of this, about 40 minutes involved the quantitative section of the interview and 40 - 60 minutes involved the qualitative section)

- Administering an observational measure to measure mother-child interaction. This took approximately 10 - 15 minutes to complete.

- Administering a questionnaire booklet to mothers which took approximately 15 minutes to complete.

- While the mother was filling in the questionnaire booklet, administering a family map task to the child, which took approximately 10 minutes to complete.

Standardised interviews with mothers were digitally recorded. A copy of the standardised interview can be found in Appendix G. These interviews were an adaptation of an investigator based interview designed to assess quality of parenting (Quinton and Rutter, 1988) and quality of marriage (Quinton, Rutter and Rowlands, 1976). This interview utilized a standardised approach to coding the mothers’ responses to the interview questions, rather than using self-report data which relies on the mothers’ understanding of what is being assessed. This parenting interview has been adapted by a procedure developed by Quinton.

41 See Appendix E
42 See Appendix F
and Rutter (1988), and has been validated against observational ratings in the home of mother-child relationships as well as child specific measures. It has shown a high level of concordance between global ratings of the quality of parenting by interviewers and observers (concurrent validity; r = .63) (Quinton and Rutter, 1988). Further, the marital relations section of the interview has been shown to demonstrate predictive validity for marital breakdown (Quinton, Rutter and Rowlands, 1976).

Extensive details were taken of the child’s behaviour and the mother’s response to it, particularly relating to mother-child interactions associated with warmth and control. The interview uses a flexible style of questioning in order to obtain sufficient information from the mother. This allows the researcher to rate variables according to a detailed, standardised coding scheme described in an accompanying interview manual. The researcher had also received extensive training in the administration and coding of the interview prior to the data collection stage.

Interrater reliabilities were calculated for the parenting interview in the following way: 24 randomly selected interviews were coded by a second researcher familiar with the study, who was unaware of the ethnic group type. Details of the measures used, as well as intra-class correlation coefficients between raters for the interview variables are given in the relevant sections below.

The section of the interview on cultural and contextual factors in parenting and family life was developed specifically for the present study. This section consisted of a quantitative part and a qualitative part. The quantitative part was developed based on the standardised approach discussed, and mothers’ responses were rated according to a specially developed coding scheme. The qualitative part used a more semi-structured qualitative approach to obtain details of the influence of culture and diversity on family life. Following the interview, the researcher made short notes about the interview. The purpose of this reflective practice was to help with qualitative analysis, in particular, with the coding of qualitative data.

Information gathered from the interview with mothers was rated according to the standardised coding scheme and the qualitative section of the interview was transcribed.

---

43 This represents approximately 27% of the total number of interviews conducted with mothers. Eight participants were randomly selected from each group type.
44 For the South Asian groups only
45 See Appendix H for an example of interview notes
Through the collection of extensive details on family functioning and family life, lengthy questioning, and assessment of non-verbal behaviours such as tone of voice and mothers’ facial expressions, socially desirable responding by mothers (which represents a challenge to this type of research), was minimised.

The observational measure was used to assess mother-child interaction. Approximately 10 minutes were given to the child and mother to complete a drawing task using an Etch-a-Sketch toy. With the mother’s permission, this was digitally video recorded. Such observational tasks allow for a detailed assessment of dyadic interaction between mother and child, which interview and self-report measures fail to provide. They also help overcome problems linked to socially desirable responding, as it is difficult for mothers to hide their actual behaviour (Kerig, 2001).

Following the interview and the observational task, mothers were administered a questionnaire booklet which took approximately 15 minutes to complete. While the mother completed this booklet, the child took part in a drawing task to assess closeness in family relationships using a procedure developed by Dunn and Deater-Deckard (2001). This took approximately 10 minutes to complete and the child was provided with coloured pens to help complete the task. Data were thus obtained from the mother and child using different types of measures.

At the end of the visit, participants received a gift of a box of chocolates, but were not aware of this prior to the visit. All interviews were conducted face-to-face with 90 (100%) mothers while questionnaire data was obtained from 85 (94.4%) mothers. In the observational joint mother-child play task, 80 (88.9%) mothers and their children took part. Eighty-one (90%) children completed a family map.

In order to ensure anonymity and confidentiality, each family was allocated an identification number. Details of the families’ identities were only accessible by the researcher, and all information collected from families was stored in a locked filing cabinet. Further, all databases and computer files were password protected to further ensure data protection.

---

46 n = 80 for the observational data (30 non-immigrant White, 25 British Indian and 25 British Pakistani). There were 6 British Pakistani mothers who asked not to participate in the observational task as they were not comfortable with being video recorded due to religious reasons.

47 n = 81 for the family map data (30 non-immigrant White, 24 British Indian and 28 British Pakistani)
Measures

Two aspects of family life were assessed in the present study. Firstly, parenting and child adjustment, which employed the following categories of quantitative measures: (1) measures of parents’ marital and psychological state, (2) measures of parenting and mother-child relationships, and (3) measures of child adjustment. Secondly, cultural and contextual factors in family life, which employed the following categories of measures: (1) quantitative measures of cultural and contextual factors and (2) qualitative measures of cultural and contextual factors in family life. These four aspects of family functioning were broken down further into different areas as summarised in Table 3. Each area described is discussed in greater detail in the next section.
### Table 3: Constructs, Measures and Variables used in the Analyses of Family Functioning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Type of Measure</th>
<th>Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parents Marital and Psychological State</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Relationship</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Mutual Enjoyment, Confiding, Arguments Partner’s Help in Care, Load Taking, Marital Choice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Golombok-Rust Inventory of Marital State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers Psychological State</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Parenting Stress Index, Trait Anxiety Inventory, Edinburgh Depression Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parenting and Mother-Child Relationships</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warmth and Closeness</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Expressed Warmth, Sensitive Responding, Mother-Child Interaction, Expressed Criticism, Child-Centredness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Maternal Control, Control of Bedtime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Outside Boundaries, Chaperonage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Overt Discipline, Frequency of Battle, Level of Battle, Resolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generational Parenting</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Generational Parenting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutuality</td>
<td>Observational Assessment</td>
<td>Mother’s Responsiveness to Child, Child’s Responsiveness to Mother, Dyadic Reciprocity, Dyadic Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Child Adjustment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Adjustment</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child School Adjustment</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Settled, Separation Pattern, Recontact Behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After School Activity</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>After School Class Attendance, Number of Times a Week, Number of Hours a Week, Type of After School Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother-Child Play</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Time Spent Playing, Type of Play</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Cultural and Contextual Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Index/Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family Relationships</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Index of Family Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Collectivism, Relationship with Mother-in Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Child Assessment</td>
<td>Child’s Family Map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiculturalism and Cultural Diversity</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Feelings about Multiculturalism, Feelings about Child Growing up in Contemporary Britain, Discussion of Racism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Identity and Socialisation</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Revised Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Cultural Socialisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acculturation</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Stephenson Multigroup Acculturation Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Child’s Knowledge of Language, Degree of Importance of Biraderi/Caste, Feelings of Britishness, Perception of Non-immigrant White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Religiosity, Religious Beliefs, Religious Practices, Child’s Knowledge of Religion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Section III: Parenting and Child Adjustment: Quantitative Measures

Parents’ Marital and Psychological State

Marital Relationship

Both interview and questionnaire methods were used to assess the quality of the marital relationship. In the interview, detailed information was obtained from mothers on their current marriage or cohabitation, including questions on the duration of their marriage/cohabitation, their age at marriage/cohabitation and about how they met their partner (arranged/ non-arranged). Ratings were made on the following variables according to a standardised coding scheme using the procedure developed by Quinton and Rutter (1988):

Mutual Enjoyment, was rated on a 4-point scale from 1 (a great deal) to 4 (none), and assessed enjoyment of shared activities with partner. The frequency of participation in shared activities was noted, but it was the amount of positive enjoyment experienced that was mainly considered. Mothers that described enjoying “just being together” were rated at least 3. Activities which were described with evident positive enjoyment (e.g. “we love going out for walks”) were rated at 1. When activities were described with a positive tone, but with less enthusiasm than for 1, mothers were rated 2, or this rating was given when activities were infrequent but enjoyed.

Confiding, was rated on a 5-point scale from 1 (all important matters discussed adequately) to 5 (no communication about matters of importance), and measured ease of discussion of important issues together. This rating assessed how much mothers felt they could share with their partner and how easily they felt they could do so. Confiding did not relate to who raised the issues, but rather how they were discussed when they were brought up.

Arguments, was rated on a 4-point scale from 0 (non or occasional) to 3 (more than 12 per year), and assessed the occurrence of conflicts involving shouting and / or violence and / or negative criticism of each other or each other’s families, and / or not speaking after an argument for longer than an hour.

Marital Choice, was rated as either 1 (arranged) or 2 (non-arranged), and assessed the type of marriage mothers had.
Inter-class correlation coefficients for Mutual Enjoyment, Confiding and Arguments respectively were found to be .72, .75 and .63.

The Golombok Rust Inventory of Marital State (GRIMS) (Rust et al., 1990), a 36-item questionnaire was also administered to mothers to assess the overall quality of the marital relationships between couples. Scores range from 0 to 84, with higher scores reflecting poorer marital quality. A score of 34 or more indicates marital dissatisfaction. The GRIMS has been shown to discriminate between couples who are about to separate and those who are not, and has a split-half reliability of .87 for women (Rust et al., 1998). The GRIMS has also been used cross-culturally\textsuperscript{48} to assess the quality of marital relationships.

Data on the mother’s perception of the father’s involvement in parenting was also obtained from the interview. Ratings were made on the following variables according to a standardised coding scheme:

*Father’s Help in Child Care*, was rated on a 6 point scale from 1 (passive/unhelpful) to 6 (takes major responsibility) and assessed the degree to which the mother saw the father as a help or a hindrance in parenting. A rating of 1 was given if the father simply let the mother get on with caring for the child without making any intervention of any sort, or was actively unhelpful. If the father came to the mother’s aid only during those times when she was finding caring for the child too stressful (e.g., if she had been unwell), a rating of 2 was given. A rating of 3 was given if the father assisted the mother in the day-to-day care of the child only if she asked him for help, but would not normally become involved otherwise. If the father usually helped with care activities (e.g. such as helping with homework), which was often in the form of following mothers instructions, rather than playing a more active role, a rating of 4 was given. A rating of 5 was given when father not only spontaneously assisted the mother in the day-to-day care of the child, but also was actively involved in taking responsibility for certain care activities. A rating of 6 was given when the father took the responsibility for the day-to-day care of the child.

\textsuperscript{48} Quek, Low, Razack, Chua and Low, 2002; Boddington, 1995; Zainal, 2008
Father’s Load Taking, was rated from 0 (none) to 4 (takes major load) and measured the degree to which the father looked after the child to give the mother time to rest and for other activities.

Inter-class correlation coefficients for Father’s Help in Child Care and Father’s Load Taking were found to be .68 and .71 respectively.

Mothers’ Psychological State

The short form of the Parenting Stress Index (PSI/SF) (Abidin, 1990) was completed by mothers. This 36-item questionnaire provides a standardised assessment of stress associated with parenting and comprises 3 subscales: Parental Distress, Dysfunctional Interaction, and Difficult Child. Scores of the 3 subscales are summed to produce a Total Stress score for mothers, with higher scores indicating higher parenting stress. Test-retest reliability for the total score was reported to be .96 over a 1-3 month period and .65 over one year (Abidin, 1990). The full length questionnaire has been shown to have concurrent and predictive validity, and the short version of the PSI has been shown to correlate with to the full scale version. The PSI has been translated into a number of languages and used across a range of cultural groups including collectivist based cultural groups.

The Edinburgh Depression Scale (Thorpe 1993) was completed by mothers to assess levels of depression. This 10-item measure produces a total score, which ranges from 0 to 30, with a higher score indicating a greater level of depression. It has been shown to be reliable and to differentiate well between clinical and non clinical groups. This scale was originally created for use with woman in the postpartum period. However, it has been shown to be applicable to mothers outside of the postpartum period (Matthey et al., 2001). It has also been used in previous studies with different cultural and ethnic groups.

The Trait-Anxiety Inventory (TAI) (Spielberger, 1983) was completed by mothers to assess levels of anxiety. The TAI is made up of 20 items measuring the individual’s general level of anxiety. Scores on the Trait-Anxiety Inventory range from 20 to 80, with higher scores indicating greater anxiety. This questionnaire has been shown to differentiate between

---

49 Anderson, 2008; Hutcheson and Black, 1996
50 Werret and Clifford, 2006; Montazeri, Torkan and Omidvari, 2007; Garcia-Esteve, Ascaso, Ojuel and Navarro, 2003
clinical and non clinical groups. It has been extensively used for measuring anxiety, appearing in over 3000 studies (Speilberger, 1989), and has also been used cross culturally.51

Parenting and Mother-Child Relationships

Interview with mother

Mothers were asked to give detailed descriptions of the child’s behaviour and their responses to the child’s behaviour. Particular attention was paid to mother-child interactions relating to maternal warmth, control and discipline. Global overall ratings of the quality of parenting were made immediately following the interview, according to a standardised coding scheme, using information from the entire interview on the following variables:

Expressed Warmth,52 was rated on a 6 point scale from 0 (none) to 5 (high). Tone of voice, facial expression and gestures when speaking about the child, spontaneous expressions of warmth, sympathy and concern about the child’s difficulties (if any) and interest in the child as a person were all taken into account during coding. Where definite clear-cut warmth, enthusiasm, interest in and enjoyment of the child were apparent in mothers, ratings of 4 or 5 were made depending on the amount of warmth and enthusiasm expressed. When mothers showed definite understanding, sympathy and concern but only limited warmth, ratings of 2 or 3 were made. When mothers showed little or no understanding, sympathy or concern and no warmth, enthusiasm, interest and enjoyment of the child, ratings of 0 or 1 were made.

Sensitive Responding, was rated on a 5 point scale from 0 (none) to 4 (very sensitive responding), and measured the mother’s ability to read the child’s fears and anxieties and respond appropriately to them through discussion and dialogue. Mothers who had little sympathy for any difficulties experienced by the child, and showed limited ability to recognise anxiety or worry in their child, were given a rating of 1. The child in this instance would often be left to resolve difficulties on their own. Mothers were given a rating of 2 when they appropriately responded to their child’s worries, fears and anxieties in a systematic

51 Quek, Low, Razack, Loh and Chua, 2004; Hishinuma et al., 2001
52 See Appendix I for a sample of the coding scheme for Expressed Warmth from the accompanying coding manual.
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and comforting manner. For this rating, mothers often responded in the same style, irrespective of the problem. A rating of 3 was given to mothers when they recognised anxieties and worries from non-verbal cues and were able to anticipate situations which caused this anxiety in the child. A rating of 4 was made when mothers showed the same behaviours as 3, but also recognised the child as an individual, helping them actively deal with problems and trying to ensure that their child would learn from the experience and would be better placed to cope in the future.

Child-Centredness,\textsuperscript{53} was rated on a four point scale from 0 (little or none) to 3 (enmeshed), and measured the degree to which family life and the emotional functioning of the mother were centred on the child, the degree of over-protectiveness or over-concern the mother had towards the child and the degree to which the mother had interests other than the child. It also took into account the extent to which the mother was willing to leave her child with other caretakers or be separated from the child, the ability to see the child as an individual with separate needs and desires, the extent to which the mother inhibited the child from age-appropriate independent activities, as well as any comments from the mother e.g. referring to how the child could not manage without the mother or the mother could not manage without the child, or suggesting the child could not easily be cared for by anyone else.

Mother-Child Interaction, was rated on a 5-point scale from 0 (very low) to 4 (very high), and measured how much time the mother and child spent in each other’s company and enjoyed spending time together. The ratings were also based on the extent of affection the child and mother showed to one another and the extent to which the mother took responsibility for the child.

Expressed Criticism,\textsuperscript{54} was assessed on a 4 point scale from 0 (considerable) to 3 (no criticism), and measured the degree to which the mother was critical of the child. A rating of 3 was made when mothers showed criticism towards their child throughout most of the interview.

Maternal Control, was rated on a 5 point scale from 0 (little or no control) to 4 (over controlling), and measured the extent to which the mother was in control of the child’s behaviour and how much authority she used in parenting. Mothers were given a rating of 0

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{53} Originally labelled Emotional Over-Involvement in the Quinton and Rutter, 1988 interview
  \item \textsuperscript{54} Expressed Criticism was re-coded from Criticism and reversed in order. The new scale became: 0 (considerable criticism through interview), 1 (moderate), 2 (some) and 3 (no criticism)
\end{itemize}
when the mother-child relationship was dominated by the child, with the child getting their own way and the mother making little parental attempts at control in or outside the home. A rating of 1 was made when the mother made intermittent attempts at control, but these were irregular and ineffective. A rating of 2 was made when mothers used authority when it was needed, but this tended to be reactive rather than anticipatory. Mothers who exerted flexible control both inside and outside the home, handled disputes with give and take whilst maintaining a consistent but flexible posture, and who clearly set boundaries in a way that helped the child control his/her own environment without being reactive were given a rating of 3. A rating of 4 was made when mothers were over controlling and restrictive, such that the child had little opportunity for exercising initiative, or to developing control over their environment and relationships.

**Overt Discipline**\(^{55}\) was rated on a 5 point scale from 0 (none) to 4 (aggressive), and measured the extent to which the mother lost her temper and was likely to raise her voice in a disciplinary situation. Mothers who never smacked, shouted or lost their temper with their child were given a rating of 0. A rating of 1 was made when parents showed not more than occasional irritability and loss of temper only in extreme and atypical circumstances. A rating of 2 was made when mothers showed fairly frequent low level irritability with occasional loss of temper. When irritability most often associated with a loss of temper and shouting, mothers were given a rating of 3. In this instance, mothers often showed anger with an element of short term loss of control. A rating of 4 was made when mothers showed an assertion of authority usually associated with a loss of control of temper and often with threats of physical punishment towards their child.

Intra-class correlation coefficients for *Expressed Warmth, Sensitive Responding, Child-Centredness, Mother-Child Interaction, Expressed Criticism, Maternal Control* and **Overt Discipline** respectively were .68, .52, .65, .68, .56, .77 and .86.

The interview was also coded for aspects of mother-child relationship relating to supervision, control and discipline according to a standardised coding scheme. When the mother allowed the child’s exploration of the outside world while still maintaining safety and control, this was considered optimum supervision. Supervision included the following variables:

\(^{55}\) Originally labelled Disciplinary Aggression in the Quinton and Rutter, 1988 interview
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Chaperonage, was rated on a 7 point scale from 0 (not allowed to play with other children) to 6 (allowed to play with unknown children, territory undefined), and assessed the mother’s rules for the child concerning playing with other children (known or unknown). A rating of 0 was made when mothers were over concerned about their child’s whereabouts and did not allow their children to play with other children outside of school. Mothers who permitted their children to play with other children only in their own home were given a rating of 1. A rating of 2 was made when mothers were more flexible, allowing their children to play in their own home as well as in a well known other child’s home. Mothers who permitted their child to play outdoors on a well known patch, with other known children, were given a rating of 3. However, when the child played on a well known patch with children unknown to the mother, a rating of 4 was made. When the child was allowed to play in undefined territory, with known children, mothers were given a rating of 5. A rating of 6 was made when the child was permitted to play with unknown children in undefined territory. In this instance, mothers were unconcerned about the child’s companions when the child was outside the home, and the child had no clear time to be home.

Outside Boundaries,\textsuperscript{56} was rated on a 5 point scale from 0 (not allowed out) to 4 (no specified territory), and assessed the mother’s rules for their child with regards to playing outdoors. Mothers who did not permit their child to play outdoors were given a rating of 0. When mothers permitted their child to play only on a known territory, a rating of 1 was made. However, a rating of 2 was made when the child occasionally played on unknown territory. When the child frequently played on unknown territory, a rating of 3 was made. A rating of 4 was made, when mothers did not specify any territory for their child to play on. In this instance the mothers were unconcerned about their child’s whereabouts when outside of the home.

Intra-class correlation coefficients for Chaperonage and Outside Boundaries were found to be .68 and .73 respectively.

\textsuperscript{56} Originally labelled Playing Out in the Quinton and Rutter, 1988 interview
Control included the following variable:

*Control of Bedtime*, was rated on a 5 point scale from 1 (controlled by child) to 5 (parents inflexible), and assessed whether it was the parent or the child who was in control of bedtime, and decided bedtime rules. A rating of 1 was made either if child was left to decide when he/she went to bed, or if the child effectively got his/her own way following parental attempts to enforce an earlier bedtime. For this rating to be made it was necessary that the parents necessarily gave up attempts of trying to get the child to go to bed. When parents made consistent attempts to get child to bed and appeared to have some influence on the time of the child going to bed, a rating of 2 was made. In this instance, the general impression was that the child still controlled bedtime. A rating of 3 was made if the parents were generally in control of the time the child went to bed, but exercised a substantial degree of flexibility over this during weekdays in term time, as well as during the holidays. Substantial flexibility would involve the parents often allowing the child to stay up beyond a defined bedtime, for example, in order to watch a particular television programme. When this pattern involved the child being up regularly more than an hour beyond the stated bedtime, then a rating of 2 rather than 3 was made. When parents gave this permissiveness, during term-time only on Friday or Saturday nights, or during holiday periods, a rating of 4 was made. A rating of 5 was made when the parents provided a set bedtime for the child and this was adhered to, not only during school days but also during holiday times as well. The intra-class correlation coefficient for *Control of Bedtime* was found to be .74.

Discipline included the following variables:

*Frequency of Battle*, was rated on a 4 point scale from 0 (never) to 4 (all the time), and assessed the frequency over the past three months that confrontations occurred between the mother and child.

*Level of Battle*, was rated on a 4 point scale from 0 (no confrontations) to 3 (major battles), and assessed the type of confrontation between mother and child. A rating of 0 was made when there were no confrontations between mother and child. When mothers reported minor episodes of confrontation, (i.e. control incidents not lasting in total more than 5 minutes), a rating of 1 was made, regardless of the frequency of these confrontations or disciplinary interchanges. A rating of 2 was made when the confrontations continued for longer than 5 minutes or if they usually involved loss of temper, or some definite disciplinary activity (e.g.
sending the child to his/her room). When incidents lasted for half an hour or longer and involved loss of temper on one or both sides, a rating of 3 was made.

Resolution, was rated on a 3 point scale from 0 (full) to 2 (none), and assessed the degree to which both parties made an effort to sort out the problem in question. Resolution was assessed independently of the general outcome of the interaction in terms of who got his or her own way. It was indicated by the degree to which both parties made an effort to sort out the problem in question. A rating of 0 was made when both parties apologised and/or the mother and the child satisfactorily worked out their differences (i.e. a compromise was reached). The argument subject was not brought up again soon after resolution. When the outcome of the argument was somewhat mixed (e.g. the child may have said sorry but this may have been of mixed emotions), or only aspects of the argument were resolved, or if the topic of the argument was suddenly changed, a rating of 2 was made. In these instances the problem in question was not dealt with properly and issues were not faced adequately by the mother and the child. A rating of 3 was made when the fighting continued and neither mother nor child made any attempt to apologise or work out the differences they were experiencing to reach a satisfactory compromise (e.g. one party may have stormed out of the room or given the other the silent treatment).

Intra-class correlation coefficients for Frequency of Battle, Level of Battle and Resolution respectively were found to be .78, .82 and .81.

A generational parenting variable was developed for the present study and incorporated into the mother’s interview.

Generational Parenting, was rated on a 4 point scale from 0 (mother does not distinguish) to 3 (parents differently than parent), and assessed the extent to which the mother parented her child similarly to the way in which she was parented. A rating of 0 was made when the mother did not compare or contrast her parenting from her own parents during the interview. When mothers adopted the same parenting style/method based on the way they were parented, a rating of 1 was made. In this instance mothers strived to parent similarly to their parents. A rating of 2 was made when mothers adopted and adapted only some parenting methods from their parents (e.g. choosing to discipline them in a similar manner). When mothers intentionally parented differently from their parent, a rating of 3 was made. The intra-class correlation coefficient for this variable was found to be .82.
Mother-Child Observational Assessment

The *Etch-A-Sketch Task* (Stevenson-Hinde and Shouldice, 1995), in which the parent and child are required to cooperate on a drawing task, was used with the mother and child to produce a structured observational assessment of dyadic mother-child interaction. This assessment was used as it was age-appropriate for the children in the study and has shown to be a reliable for use in the home. Furthermore, it has been used previously in observational assessments in different ethnic groups.\(^{57}\) The Etch-a-Sketch is a toy used for drawing in which two dials can be moved to produce vertical and horizontal lines. If the dials are moved at the same time, diagonal lines can be drawn. A picture of a house was placed before the mother and child and they were instructed to work together to copy it with clear instructions that each was allowed to move one dial only, and not to touch the other’s dial.\(^{58}\) The mother-child dyads were first given unlimited time to replicate a practice picture of a square before moving on to the picture of the house. The task was digitally video recorded (with the mother’s permission). A high level of cooperation between mother and child was needed to draw this house, particularly the slanted roof that required both dials to be moved simultaneously. Further, the observer informed both mother and child at the start of the task that they were would personally not be able to offer any assistance with the task, to ensure that as far as possible pure dyadic mother-child interaction was recorded.

The task was coded using the Parent-Child Interaction System (PARCHISY) (Deater-Deckard and O’Connor, 2000; Deater-Deckard and Petrill, 2004) to assess the construct of Mutuality. Mutuality refers to the degree to which the mother and child are involved in positive dyadic interaction comprised of warmth, mutual responsiveness and cooperation. Studies have shown that the PARCHISY predicts individual differences in children’s social adjustment and discriminates well between mothers of ‘difficult’ children and control children (Deater-Deckard and Petrill, 2004;), and is therefore a valid measure of parent-child interaction.

The Mutuality score included the following 4 global variables, rated on a 7-point scale from 1 (no instances) to 7 (constant interaction throughout):\(^{59}\)

\(^{57}\) See Deater-Deckard, Atzaba-Poria and Pike, 2004.
\(^{58}\) See Appendix J
\(^{59}\) See Appendix K for details of the coding scheme for the Mutuality variables.
*Mother’s Responsiveness to Child,* assessed the degree to which the mother responded to the child’s comments, questions or behaviours.

*Child’s Responsiveness to Mother,* assessed the degree to which the child responded to the mother’s comments, questions or behaviours.

*Dyadic Reciprocity,* assessed the extent to which mother and child together demonstrated shared positive affect, eye-contact and a ‘turn-taking (conversation like) quality of interaction.

*Dyadic Cooperation,* assessed the extent of agreement between mother and child about how to proceed with the task.

The researcher (H.I) as well as a research assistant familiar with the study coded the observations. As discussed, global ratings which require subjective estimates of quantities as opposed to direct accurate counts of behaviour are employed by the PARCHISY system. Therefore, due to the subjective nature of this coding system, coders received a series of comprehensive training sessions on how to use the PARCHISY coding system. Once good interrater had been achieved, each coder was assigned 50% of the videos to code which were selected at random. Regular meetings were held throughout the coding process to minimise rater discrepancy. To establish interrater reliability, 27 randomly selected observations\(^6\) were double coded. There was good agreement between coders. Intra-class correlation coefficients for *Mother’s Responsiveness to Child, Child’s Responsiveness to Mother, Dyadic Reciprocity* and *Dyadic Cooperation* respectively were found to be .87, .81, .80 and .89.

\(^6\) This represents just over 30% of the total observations. The second researcher coded equal number of observations from each group type.
**Child Adjustment**

The presence of child psychological problems was assessed with the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ), which has been shown to have good internal consistency, test-retest reliability and interrater reliability (Goodman, 1994; 1997; 2001; Stone et al., 2010). This was completed by the mother. The SDQ produces an overall score of the child’s adjustment, *Total Difficulties*, along with five subscale scores; *Conduct Problems*, *Hyperactivity*, *Emotional Symptoms*, *Peer Problems* and *Prosocial Behaviour*. The questionnaire has been shown to discriminate well between psychiatric and non-psychiatric samples, and the instrument’s concurrent validity is evidenced by the high correlations between the total score of the SDQ and other assessments of child psychiatric disorder (Goodman, 1994; 1997; 2001; Stone et al., 2010).

A section of the interview with the mother focused on the Child’s School Adjustment. The following categorical variables were coded according to a standardised coding scheme:

*Child Settled*, was rated as 1 (very settled), 2 (moderate) or 3 (unsettled), and assessed how settled the child was at school.

*Separation from the Mother*, was rated as 1 (unconcerned) or 2 (apprehensive), and assessed how the child behaved when separated from the mother in order to attend school.

*Recontact Behaviour*, was rated as 1 (well connected), or 2 (some connection) and assessed the child’s reaction towards their mother after school had ended for the day.

Mothers were questioned about After-School Activities, which included the following variables:

*After School Class Attendance*, was scored as 1 (no) or 2 (yes), assessed whether the child attended after school activities.

*Number of Times a Week*, was rated on a 4 point scale from 1 (none) to 4 (more than five times a week), and assessed how many times a week the child attended after school activities.

*Number of Hours a Week*, was rated on a 5 point scale from 1 (none) to 5 (more than 5½ hours per week), assessed the total duration of the child’s after school activities per week.
Types of After School Activities, was rated as yes (1) or no (2) for the following: Religious Classes, Language Classes, Dance Classes, Homework Clubs, Tuition/Extra Learning, Music Lessons, Art Classes and Sports.

Mothers were also asked about Play with their child which included the following variables:

Time Spent Playing, was rated on a 4 point scale from 1 (1-3 hours) to 4 (more than 8 hours), and assessed duration of mother-child play during a week.

Type of Play, was rated as yes (1) or no (2) for the following: Playing with Toys, Playing with Games, Reading Together, Drawing/Crafts, Rough and Tumble Play, Domestic Play (e.g. cooking, chores for fun), Imaginative/Creative Play and Religious Play (e.g. religious stories).

Section IV (a): Cultural and Contextual Factors in Family Life: Quantitative Measures

Information relating to cultural and contextual factors was obtained through a section of the mother’s interview on cultural and contextual factors, through questionnaires and through a family-relationship measure administered to the child. The cultural and contextual section of the interview was semi-structured, developed specifically for the study and had been piloted prior to use. It allowed for both a standardised quantitative culture specific coding scheme, as well as a more qualitative open ended discussion with mothers. This use of mixed methods allowed for a more holistic understanding of cultural and contextual factors between groups. The quantitative research methodology will first be discussed. Five main areas were examined in the quantitative portion of the interview: (1) Family Relationships, (2) Multiculturalism and Exposure to Diversity, (3) Ethnic Identity and Socialisation, (4) Acculturation, and (5) Religion.

Family Relationships

Mothers were administered the Index of Family Relations (IFR) (Hudson, 1993). This 25-item questionnaire provided a standardised assessment of the severity of family relationship...
problems. It produces a *Total Intra-Familial Stress* score ranging from 0 to 100 with higher scores indicating higher intrafamilial stress. Thirty is the cut-off score, above which individuals are considered to have a potentially clinically significant problem. The alpha coefficient for this measure was reported to be .95, indicating high internal consistency. The IFR has been shown to differentiate well between clinical and non clinical groups and has been used extensively across cultures.\(^{61}\)

Data on aspects of family and extended family relationship were obtained from the interview.\(^{62}\) The following variables were assessed according to a standardised coding scheme:

*Collectivism*, was rated on a 5 point scale, from 1 (strongly nuclear) to 5 (extremely collective), and assessed the mother’s relationship with the extended family and child’s grandparents.

*Relationship with Mother-in-Law*, was rated on a 5 point scale from 0 (negative relationship) to 4 (positive relationship), and assessed the mother’s relationship with her mother-in-law.

Intra-class correlation coefficients for *Collectivism* and *Relationship with Mother-in-Law* respectively were found to be .72 and .77.

*Child’s Family Map*: Children’s perceptions of the emotional closeness of family members was examined through ‘maps’ of their relationships using a procedure utilized by Dunn and Deater-Deckard (2001) in their study of family relationships. In this procedure, children placed their family members in a series of concentric circles representing the emotional closeness of each relationship. The relative distance between the child and the mother, the child and the father, and the child and the extended family in the various ethnic groups was measured.\(^{63}\)

\(^{61}\) Harden, Lloyd, McDermott, Potter and Sayeed, 2009

\(^{62}\) These measures were developed specifically for the present study.

\(^{63}\) See Appendix L
Multiculturalism and Cultural Diversity

The following variables relating to the mother’s feelings about multiculturalism and cultural diversity were rated from the interview material:

*Feelings about Multiculturalism*, was rated on a 3 point scale from 0 (predominantly negative feelings) to 2 (predominantly positive feelings), and assessed the mother’s feelings about her family living in a multicultural and diverse environment.

*Feelings about Child Growing up in Contemporary Britain*, was rated on a 3 point scale from 0 (predominantly negative feelings) to 2 (predominantly positive feelings), and assessed the mother’s feelings about her child growing up in Britain in terms of opportunities, safety and education.

*Discussion of Racism*, rated on a 4 point scale from 0 (no discussion) to 3 (active discussion), assessed the extent to which the mother talked to her child about issues around discrimination and racism.

Intra-class correlation coefficients for *Feelings about Multiculturalism*, *Feelings about Child Growing up in Contemporary Britain* and *Discussion about Racism* were found to be .74, .74, and .71 respectively.

Ethnic Identity and Socialisation

The revised shorter version of the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure-Revised (MEIM-R) (Phinney and Ong, 2007) was completed by mothers. This 6-item questionnaire has been shown to be a valid, reliable measure for assessing ethnic identity by distinguishing between two related yet separate components of ethnic identity (i.e. exploration and commitment). The MEIM-R provided scores for *Total Ethnic Identity* which assessed the mother’s overall ethnic identity, and comprised 2 subscales: *Commitment* and *Exploration*. *Commitment* was an affective component that examined the tendencies of mothers to feel psychologically attached to their ethnic group, and *Exploration*, was a developmental and cognitive
component that examined the tendencies of mothers to spend time understanding more about the ethnic group of which they were a member. The measure uses a 5-point Likert scale from 1 (strongly agree) to 5 (strongly disagree), and produces a mean score between 1 and 5 which represents Total Ethnic Identity, with higher scores indicating higher levels of identification with ethnic identity. A mean score of 1 or 2 would be considered as a low level of ethnic identity. A mean score of 3 would be considered a moderate level of ethnic identity, while a mean score of 4 or 5 would be considered a high level of ethnic identity.

The following variable from the interview provided a measure of ethnic identity and socialisation:

Cultural Socialisation, was rated on a 6 point scale from 0 (none) to 5 (high), and assessed the degree to which the mother socialised her child about culture and ethnicity. The intra-class correlation coefficient for this variable was found to be .78.

**Acculturation**

Mothers from the British Indian and British Pakistani groups completed the Stephenson Multigroup Acculturation Scale (SMAS) (Stephenson, 2000). This 32-item questionnaire comprises two subscales: Ethnic Society Immersion, which assesses the extent to which respondents are immersed in the non-dominant culture and Dominant Society Immersion, which assesses the extent to which respondents are immersed in the dominant culture. Both subscales measure the domains of language, interaction, media and food, and respondents are asked questions about their knowledge, behaviour and attitudes within the domains. The SMAS was chosen as it measures acculturation as a bidimensional process and has had widespread use across many ethnic groups. This measure has been shown to be reliable for both the non-dominant and dominant culture scales with the internal consistency for each subscale ranging from .86 to .97 in past studies (Stephenson, 2000). It has also shown convergent validity with generational status (Stephenson, 2000) which is particularly important for the present investigation where second generation mothers are being studied.
The following individual variables relating to acculturation were rated from the interview from the British Indian and British Pakistani mothers only:

*Child’s Knowledge of Language*, was rated on a 4 point scale from 0 (none) to 3 (fluent), and assessed mothers’ feelings about how well their child knew their traditional language.

*Degree of Importance of Biraderi/Caste*, was rated on a 3 point scale from 0 (not important at all) to 2 (extremely important), and assessed how important the traditional caste system (religious or occupational) was to mothers.

*Feelings of Britishness*, was rated on a 6 point scale from 0 (none) to 5 (extremely high), assessed the degree of attachment mothers felt towards British culture.

*Perception of Non-Immigrant White*, was rated on a 5 point scale from 0 (negative perception) to 4 (positive perception), and assessed how British Indian and British Pakistani mothers perceived non-immigrant White parenting and family life.

Intra-class correlation coefficients for *Child’s Knowledge of Language*, *Degree of importance of Biraderi/Caste*, *Feelings of Britishness* and *Perception of Non-Immigrant White* respectively were found to be .75, .68, .82 and .85.

**Religion**

The following variables relating to religion were derived from the mother’s interview:

*Religiosity*, was rated on a 4 point scale from 0 (none) to 3 (active discussion and participation), assessed the extent to which mothers discussed religion with their child and incorporated religious rituals and practices into the child’s life.

*Religious Beliefs* and *Religious Practices* of the mother were directly rated based on mothers’ responses when asked how strong their religious beliefs and practices were on scale of 0 (none) to 4 (extremely high). These variables assessed the mother’s feelings towards her faith.
Child’s Knowledge of Religion, was rated on a 4 point scale from 0 (none) to 3 (high), and assessed the mothers description of how informed their child was about religion.

The intra-class correlation coefficients for Religiosity and Child’s Knowledge of Religion were found to be .62 and .75 respectively.

To summarise, the quantitative variables relating to family functioning were categorised as follows: (1) parents marital and psychological state, (2) parenting and mother-child relationships, (3) child adjustment, and (4) cultural and contextual factors.
Section IV (b): Cultural and contextual factors in family life: Qualitative Measures

The qualitative section of the semi-structured interview was designed for in-depth interviews with mothers from the three ethnic groups. The interview set out to explore the meaning and purpose attached to various parenting practices and aspects of family life in relation to cultural and contextual factors. In total, the qualitative part of the interview with the mother lasted approximately 40 – 60 minutes. As shown in Appendix G, the interview schedule focused on: feelings about multiculturalism, ethnic-racial socialisation, parenting and perceptions of family life and religion.

Feelings about Multiculturalism

This encompassed a broad range of issues relating to ethnic identity, cultural diversity and belonging. Mothers were asked to describe their feelings about Britain and how they felt about their child growing up in Britain. They were also asked how they felt about multiculturalism in relation to their child. For example, mothers were asked: “How do you feel about your child growing up in a multicultural environment?” Mothers were then probed about their identity and were asked to describe their ‘culture’. The British Indian and British Pakistani mothers were asked whether they felt more Asian or British.

Ethnic-Racial Socialisation (ERS)

In order to explore ethnic-racial socialisation practices used, Mothers were asked how they felt about their child’s knowledge of their culture, how they taught their child about their culture, and how they felt about their child’s knowledge of their traditional language. Information was then obtained from mothers of all groups about racial discrimination. The questions about racism were of a sensitive nature and aimed to understand how often mothers or their families had been victims of discrimination, the severity of it and the type of discrimination they experienced. For example, mothers were asked: “Could you give me an example within the
past five years of a time where you experienced or you felt you experienced racial discrimination?” Mothers were also asked whether they ever felt like lesser citizens in Britain and whether they still felt racism was a problem in the UK. Additionally, mothers were asked which groups in British society they felt were most prone to experiencing discrimination. Mothers were also questioned about how often and how they spoke to their child about racism.

**Parenting and Perceptions of Family Life**

Mothers from each group were asked what they thought made a good parent and how they felt they were getting on as parents. Next, mothers were asked to describe how they felt parents from their ethnic group were getting on and how they behaved with their children. The second generation British Pakistani and British Indian mothers were then asked about their perceptions of parents and children from the non-immigrant White group. For example, Pakistani mothers were asked: “How do you think a Pakistani mother is different from a White English mother?” Following this, the British Pakistani mothers were asked how they felt parents and children from the British Indian group were getting on, while the British Indian mothers were asked about their perceptions of British Pakistani mothers and children. Similarly, the non-immigrant White mothers were asked how they felt Indian and Pakistani parents and children were different from each other and also different from their own group. For example, non-immigrant mothers were asked: “How do you think an English child is different from a South Asian (Indian/Pakistani) child?”

**Religion**

In each group, mothers were asked to elaborate on their religious beliefs and practices. They were then questioned about how they talked to their child about religion, whether their child went to religious classes and how they felt about their child’s knowledge of religion. For example, mothers were asked: “How do you feel about your child’s knowledge of religious
practices/rituals?” Finally, mothers were asked to describe their feelings about their child learning about other religions at school.
The analytical strategy and data preparation techniques used in the present study are described. This is followed by the results, which will be presented in two sections. The first section comprises the quantitative findings on parenting and child adjustment, which consists of 3 sub-sections: (1) parents’ marital and psychological state, (2) parenting and mother-child relationships, and (3) child adjustment. The second section presents findings specifically relating to cultural and contextual factors in family life. This is divided into: (1) quantitative findings on cultural and contextual factors and (2) qualitative findings on cultural and contextual factors.

Section I: Analytical Strategy and Data Preparation

Family functioning and family life was compared between British Indian families (n = 26), British Pakistani families (n = 31) and non-immigrant White families (n = 33).

The statistical software package PASW version 18, (PASW, 2009)\textsuperscript{64}, was used in the analyses of data. The analysis aimed to determine whether groups differed on an underlying construct (e.g. whether there was a difference between British Indian, British Pakistani and non-immigrant White families in child psychological adjustment). When outcome variables were multivariate, multivariate analyses of variance (MANOVAs) were conducted. This statistical technique allows for the simultaneous entry of more than one dependant variable into a particular analysis. The Wilks’ $\lambda$ statistic was used because it is considered to be an accurate and robust test of significance (Field, 2009). Where MANOVAs could not be applied, (i.e. because outcome variables were univariate or they did not hang together in a construct), univariate analyses of variance (ANOVARs) were conducted. T-tests were used when a two-way group comparison was needed. Categorical data were analysed using Chi-square tests to conduct comparisons between groups.

\textsuperscript{64} Formally known as SPSS
When the MANOVA was statistically significant, one way analyses of variance (ANOVAs) were carried out for each variable included in the MANOVA, in order to fully explore the dataset. The MANOVA-ANOVA technique has been justified by researchers as a means of controlling for the inflated Type I error rate (the probability of falsely rejecting the null hypothesis).

Before data analysis was carried out, the data were explored to examine whether the following assumptions were met:

1) Normal distribution: In order to check this assumption, histograms were examined and z-scores were calculated for kurtosis and skew for each variable in each group. Values greater than 1.96 were considered problematic (Field, 2009).

2) Homogeneity of variance: the variance in each group should be roughly equal for each dependant variable. In order to check this assumption the Levene’s Test was utilised.

The violation of the assumption of multivariate normality has been reported to have mild effects (Finch, 2005). Further, the Wilks’ $\lambda$ statistic is considered to be robust to violations of normality (Field, 2009). Thus, MANOVAs were conducted where data violated the distribution assumption, but upheld the homogeneity assumption. Where univariate data was non-parametric (i.e. it violated both assumptions), the Kruskal-Wallis test was used to examine group differences. This procedure allows for the testing of differences between several independent groups using non-parametric data. When a significant group difference was found, follow up Mann-Whitney tests were applied using a Bonferroni correction, to control for the inflated Type I error rate (Field, 2009). The Mann-Whitney test allows for non-parametric data comparison by examining the differences in ranked positions of scores in different groups (Field, 2009)

When MANOVAs were significant, post-hoc tests were performed to determine where differences lay between groups. Post-hoc tests were applied rather than contrast analysis in accordance with the differing research hypotheses relating to different aspects of family functioning. The Gabriel or the Games-Howell post-hoc tests were used. Both of these tests are robust and can and used when group sizes are unequal as was the case in the present study (Field, 2009). The Gabriel post-hoc test was used where the data was parametric, while the
Games-Howell post hoc test was used when data did not uphold the normal distribution assumption (Field, 2009). Post-hoc tests were carried out to address specific questions as follows: (1) British Indian mothers versus non-immigrant White mothers (BI vs. NIW), (2) British Pakistani mothers versus non-immigrant White mothers (BP vs. NIW), and (3) British Indian versus British Pakistani mothers (BI vs. BP).

British Indian, British Pakistani and non-immigrant White families were recruited with the intention of minimising differences between groups in demographic variables such as the educational levels of parents. Indeed, aside from small differences in three areas between groups (i.e. Father’s Age, Mother’s Working Status and Number of Other Adults in the Household), all key contextual factors (including Child’s Sex, Father’s Educational Level, Mother’s Educational Level, Number of Siblings and Current Marital Status) showed close matching between groups. For this reason, a decision was taken not to enter any contextual factors into the analyses as covariates when assessing group differences (see Methodology, Sample Characteristics).

In the following quantitative analyses, the inter-correlations between variables within each construct are reported as recommended by Huberty and Morris (1989) as well as the \( \alpha \)-coefficients of the overall constructs, in order to demonstrate the internal consistency of the constructs. Significance values have been reported at the alpha values of .05 and .01.

There were a number of variables measuring religion in family life. In order to condense the religion variables into a more robust measure, a single Religion variable was created using Principle Components Analysis (PCA). This statistical method identifies groups or clusters of variables. In the case of religion, quantitative variables from the interview with the mother (Religiosity, Religious Beliefs, Religious Practices and Child’s Knowledge of Religion), were combined to form a Religion variable. Although it is unusual to conduct PCA in small samples, Field (2009) recommends that there are over 10 times as many subjects as variables for each index. This condition was met for the Religion construct used in the analysis.

**Controlling for Type I and Type II Error**

The rejection of a true null hypothesis is known as a Type I error, while a failure to reject a false null hypothesis is known as a Type II error. Type I error leads a researcher to conclude a
finding exists when it actually does not, while Type II error leads a researcher to conclude no finding exists when it actually does, and thus represents a false negative (Field, 2009). In the present study every attempt was made to minimise the chances of error. Steps taken to minimise Type I error include:

1) Inter-correlations between variables within each group of measures were first examined. Where correlations were high, an aggregate (composite) score was created (by conducting PCA). Where correlations were low to medium, each variable was used as an independent predictor within a measurement construct and multivariate analysis was conducted (followed by ANOVA and post-hoc tests). ANOVA were conducted as the only form of analysis when the variables were univariate and did not hang together in a construct.

2) The Type I error rate is linked to the statistical power of a test and a trade-off exists between Type I and Type II error. Conservative tests have a lower probability of Type I error but are likely to lack statistical power and have a higher probability of Type II error rate (Field, 2009). Therefore, choosing the particular type of multiple comparison test to use is important. In the present study, great care was taken in the choice of multiple comparison tests, such that they would control the Type I error rate without a major loss in power. Importantly, MANOVA were followed up with ANOVAs (and post-hoc tests) only when the effect was significant. No further analysis was conducted on the data when it was not significant.

In this way the data was effectively analysed (while always keeping the risk of Type I error in mind) as the minimal number of effects were examined. Thus, there was a greater likelihood that the significant values found represented true effects as opposed to ‘accidental significants.’

The risk of Type II error (i.e. the chance of missing an effect and thus stating that there is no significant effect, when in reality there is) is increased with a small sample size. In the present study, the sample size of 90 mothers (distributed among the three ethnic groups) was fairly small, and this may mean that some effects could be found to be non-significant because of lack of power. Therefore, care was taken in the types of analyses performed on the data such that under-powered analyses were avoided. Also, caution was also taken in the interpretation of results.
Section II: Parenting and Child Adjustment: Quantitative Findings

Parents’ Marital and Psychological State

Marital Relationship

A construct measuring quality of the marital relationship was created from the mother’s interview and included the following variables: Mutual Enjoyment, Confiding, Arguments and the GRIMS total score. The adjusted correlations between each variable and the overall construct ranged from .53 to .77 and the \( \alpha \)-coefficient for the construct was .32. The variables were entered into a MANOVA and Wilks’ \( \lambda \) was significant \( F(6, 170) = 2.44, p < .05 \), indicating an overall group difference (see Table 4). Subsequent one way ANOVAs showed a group difference for Confiding \( F(2, 81) = 5.03, p < .01 \). Games-Howell post-hoc tests revealed that British Pakistani mothers confided less in their partner when compared with non-immigrant White mothers (BP vs. NIW, \( p < .01 \)). No differences were found between groups in level of Mutual Enjoyment, Number of Arguments or the GRIMS total score.

The variables measuring partner’s support were next examined. Using one way analysis of variance, no differences were found between groups for the Partner’s Help in Care or Load Taking as rated from the mother’s interview.

A Chi-square test was used to compare the nature of Marital Choice between the ethnic groups and revealed a significant difference in the relative proportion of arranged marriages and non-arranged marriages \( \chi^2 (2, N = 90) = 28.87, p < .001 \). Of the non-immigrant White mothers, 97% (n = 32) had a non-arranged marriage only one mother, (3%) described meeting their partner in an arranged manner. In contrast, 46% (n = 12) of the British Indian mothers described meeting their partner in a non-arranged way, while 53% (n = 14) had an arranged marriage. Among the British Pakistani mothers, 35.5% (n = 11) described having a non-arranged marriage while 64.5% (n = 20) had a more traditional arranged marriage (see Table 4).
Mothers’ Psychological State

The maternal psychological state construct was composed of scores on the Parental Distress, Parent-Child Dysfunctional Interaction and Difficult Child subscales of the Parenting Stress Index as well as total scores on the Trait Anxiety Inventory and Edinburgh Depression Scale. The adjusted correlations between the variable scores and the overall construct varied from .14 to .72 and the $\alpha$-coefficient for the construct was .79. The variables were entered into a MANOVA and Wilks’ $\lambda$ was significant $F(10,158) = 1.99, p < .05$, indicating an overall group difference (see Table 4). With one-way ANOVAs, a significant difference between groups was found for two of the PSI subscale scores, namely, Parent-Child Dysfunctional Interaction $F(2,83) = 4.21, p < .05$ and the Difficult Child subscale $F(2,83) = 3.38, p < .05$. Games-Howell post-hoc tests revealed that for Dysfunctional Interaction there was a significant group difference between the British Indian and the British Pakistani mothers (BI vs. BP, $p < .05$) with Indian mothers reporting lower levels of Dysfunctional Interaction. The group difference for the Difficult Child subscale indicated that British Indian mothers rated their child as being less difficult than both British Pakistani mothers (BI vs. BP, $p < .05$), and non-immigrant White mothers (BI vs. NIW, $p < .05$). No group differences were found for Parental Distress, the Trait Anxiety Inventory or the Edinburgh Depression Scale.
Table 4: Means, SD, F and p values for comparisons of Marital Relationship and Maternal Psychological State between British Indian (BI), British Pakistani (BP) and non-immigrant White (NIW) families

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>British Indian</th>
<th>British Pakistani</th>
<th>Non-immigrant White</th>
<th>Post-hoc tests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean  SD</td>
<td>Mean  SD</td>
<td>Mean  SD</td>
<td>F  p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BI vs. NIW</td>
<td>BP vs. NIW</td>
<td>BI vs. BP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital relationship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual Enjoyment</td>
<td>2.04 0.91</td>
<td>2.13 1.11</td>
<td>2.00 0.83</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confiding</td>
<td>1.63 0.93</td>
<td>2.27 1.29</td>
<td>1.43 1.63</td>
<td>4.75 p &lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arguments</td>
<td>1.08 1.14</td>
<td>1.13 1.07</td>
<td>0.87 0.97</td>
<td>0.63 n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers psychological state</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSI: Parental Distress</td>
<td>23.29 6.93</td>
<td>25.40 7.16</td>
<td>23.28 6.13</td>
<td>0.69 n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSI: Parent-Child Dysfunctional interaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSI: Difficult Child</td>
<td>20.21 5.23</td>
<td>25.03 8.94</td>
<td>24.00 6.16</td>
<td>3.26 p &lt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait Anxiety Inventory</td>
<td>36.13 9.42</td>
<td>37.70 7.98</td>
<td>37.22 9.31</td>
<td>0.22 n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinburgh Depression Scale</td>
<td>5.96 4.34</td>
<td>7.83 3.94</td>
<td>5.78 4.09</td>
<td>1.96 n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n  %</td>
<td>n  %</td>
<td>n  %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Choice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arranged</td>
<td>14 53.8</td>
<td>20 64.5</td>
<td>1 3</td>
<td>28.87 p &lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-arranged</td>
<td>12 46.2</td>
<td>11 35.5</td>
<td>32 97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Parenting and Mother-Child Relationships

**Warmth and Closeness**

The maternal warmth/closeness variables were derived from the interviews with mothers (Expressed Warmth, Sensitive Responding, Mother-Child Interaction and Expressed Criticism). The adjusted correlations between each variable and the overall construct varied from .41 to .64 and the \( \alpha \)-coefficient for the construct was .80. The variables were entered into a MANOVA and Wilks’ \( \lambda \) was not significant. (see Table 5).

The Child-Centredness variable was found to violate conditions of normality. Therefore the Kruskal-Wallis non parametric test was used to compare groups on this variable. As shown in Table 5, a significant difference in Child-Centredness was found between groups, \( H(2) = 6.30, p < .05 \). Mann–Whitney tests were then carried out. A Bonferroni correction was applied and thus a .02 level of significance was used. Once again, there was a significant difference between the non-immigrant White and British Pakistani group, with the British Pakistani group showing higher levels of Child-Centredness (\( U = 344, z = -2.51, p < .02 \)) (See Table 5).

**Control**

The maternal control variables were derived from the interview with mothers (Maternal Control and Control of Bedtime). A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted for each of these variables\(^{65} \). No between group difference was found for Maternal Control or Control of Bedtime.

**Supervision**

Variables from the mother’s interview (Outside Boundaries and Chaperonage) formed the supervision construct. The between item correlation was .61 and the \( \alpha \)-coefficient for the construct was .75. When these variables were entered into a MANOVA, Wilks’ \( \lambda \) was

---

\(^{65}\) The variables were not found to significantly correlate, thus individual ANOVAs were conducted.
significant, F(4, 172) = 3.44, p < .01 indicating an overall group difference, as shown in Table 5. Univariate ANOVAs showed a group difference for both Outside Boundaries F(2,87) = 4.94, p < .01 and Chaperonage F(2,87) = 5.94, p < .01. Games-Howell post-hoc tests revealed that British Pakistani mothers showed tighter supervision rules with regards to their children playing outdoors compared with non-immigrant White mothers (BP vs. NIW, p < .01). There was also a significant group difference for Chaperonage, with British Pakistani mothers again reporting tighter rules in relation to their children playing with other children (either known or unknown) compared with non-immigrant White mothers (BP vs. NIW, p < .01).

Discipline

A multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted for the discipline variables from the mother’s interview (Overt Discipline, Frequency of Battle and Level of Battle). The adjusted correlations between each variable and the overall construct varied from .27 to .36 and the α-coefficient for the construct was .58. Wilks’ λ was significant F(6, 170) = 2.17, p < .05 indicating an overall group difference (see Table 5). One-way ANOVAs showed a group difference for Overt Discipline F(2,87) = 6.07 p < .01. A Gabriel’s post-hoc test was conducted on this variable, and revealed that British Indian mothers showed higher levels of Overt Discipline when compared with non-immigrant White mothers (BI vs. NIW, p < .01). British Pakistani mothers also showed higher levels of Overt Discipline compared with non-immigrant White mothers (BP vs. NIW, p < .05). No difference was found in levels of Overt Discipline between Indian and Pakistani mothers. Moreover, no differences were found between groups for Frequency of Battle or Level of Battle.

A Chi-square test was used to compare Resolution between the ethnic groups. No difference in resolution following a battle was found.
Table 5: Means, SD, F and p values for comparisons of Maternal Warmth, Child-Centredness, Maternal Supervision and Maternal Discipline between British Indian (BI), British Pakistani (BP) and non-immigrant White (NIW) families

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>British Indian</th>
<th>British Pakistani</th>
<th>Non-immigrant White</th>
<th>F/H</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>BI vs. NIW</th>
<th>BP vs. NIW</th>
<th>BI vs. BP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maternal Warmth/Closeness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressed Warmth</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitive Responding</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother-child Interaction</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressed Criticism</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child-Centredness</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>p&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>p&lt;.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal Supervision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>p&lt;.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside boundaries</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>p&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>p&lt;.05</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaperonage</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>p&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>p&lt;.01</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal Discipline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>p&lt;.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overt Discipline</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>p&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;.01</td>
<td>p&lt;.05</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of Battle</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Battle</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Generational Parenting

The variable relating to generational parenting (Generational Parenting) was derived from the mother’s interview and was entered into a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). A significant group difference was found for Generational Parenting $F(2,82) = 3.99, p < .05$ (see Table 6). Gabriel’s post-hoc tests showed that British Indian mothers were more likely to parent differently from their parents when compared with non-immigrant White mothers (BI vs. NIW, $p < .05$).

Table 6: Means, SD, F and p values for comparisons of Generational Parenting between British Indian (BI), British Pakistani (BP) and non-immigrant White (NIW) families

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>British Indian</th>
<th>British Pakistani</th>
<th>Non-immigrant White</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>Post-hoc tests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generational Parenting</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>2.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Mutuality**

The Mutuality variables derived from the Parent-Child Interaction System (PARCHISY) ratings were: *Mother’s Responsiveness to Child, Child’s Responsiveness to Mother, Dyadic Reciprocity* and *Dyadic Cooperation*. The four items showed medium to strong inter-item correlations ranging from .30 to .69 and the $\alpha$-coefficient for the construct was .77. The variables were entered into a MANOVA and Wilks’ $\lambda$ was not significant (see Table 7).

**Table 7: Means, SD, $F$ and $p$ values for comparisons of Mutuality between British Indian (BI), British Pakistani (BP) and non-immigrant White (NIW) families**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>British Indian</th>
<th>British Pakistani</th>
<th>Non-immigrant White</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mutuality</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother’s</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child’s</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyadic Reciprocity</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyadic Cooperation</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 7**: Means, SD, $F$ and $p$ values for comparisons of Mutuality between British Indian (BI), British Pakistani (BP) and non-immigrant White (NIW) families.
Child Adjustment

The Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ) comprises a Total Difficulties score and the following subscale scores: Emotional Symptoms, Conduct Problems, Hyperactivity, Peer Problems and Prosocial Behaviour. A univariate ANOVA was conducted for the Total Difficulties score. As shown in Table 8, no difference was found between groups for Total Difficulties. A multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was then conducted for the SDQ subscale scores. The adjusted correlations between each subscale and the overall construct varied from -.05 to .47 and the α-coefficient for the construct was .33. Wilks’ λ was not significant (see Table 8). The analyses of the SDQ data indicate that overall the children in the different family types were well adjusted lying within the normal range and similar to the UK population for 5-7 year old children (Green, et al., 2000)66.

Table 8: Means, SD, F and p values for comparisons of SDQ Scores between British Indian (BI), British Pakistani (BP) and non-immigrant White (NIW) families

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>British Indian</th>
<th>British Pakistani</th>
<th>Non-immigrant White</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SDQ :Total Difficulties Score</td>
<td>7.65</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>8.93</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>6.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Adjustment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDQ: Emotional Problems</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDQ: Conduct Problems</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDQ: Hyperactivity</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>2.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDQ: Peer Problems</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDQ: Prosocial Behaviour</td>
<td>8.78</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>8.40</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>8.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

66 Recent studies (Goodman et al., 2008) have shown no difference between Pakistani and White children for overall mental health. Indian children were shown to have overall better mental health than White children.
**Child School Adjustment**

The variables relating to child school adjustment were derived from the mother’s interview (Settled, Separation Pattern and Recontact Behaviour). Chi-square tests found no difference between groups for any of the child school adjustment variables.

**After School Activity**

A Chi-square test showed no significant difference between groups in After School Class Attendance. However, Chi-square tests\(^67\) identified a significant difference in the Number of Times a Week children attended classes \(\chi^2(6, N = 90) = 16.49, p < .01\) and in the total Number of Hours a Week children attended classes, \(\chi^2(8, N = 90) = 29.78, p < .001\) (see Table 9). When looking at the proportion of children attending classes five or more times a week, 25.8% \((n = 8)\) of British Pakistani children and 23.1% \((n = 6)\) of British Indian children compared with only 3.0% \((n = 1)\) of non-immigrant White children attended classes five or more times a week, indicating that Pakistani and Indian children were more likely to attend after school classes on a daily basis. A difference was found for the total Number of Hours a Week of after school activities attended by children. British Pakistani children \((51.6\%; n = 16)\) were more likely to attend after school activities for more than 4 hours per week compared with British Indian children \((26.9\%; n = 7)\) and non-immigrant White children \((12.1\%; n = 4)\). The findings indicate that British Pakistani children were more likely to partake in after school activities for a longer duration over the course of a week.

Multiple response analysis was used to measure the Type of After School Activity children attended. This statistical procedure was used as some mothers answered affirmatively to more than one type of activity. Therefore the numbers do not always add up to 100%. Table 9 shows the number of children in each group taking part in a range of activities. In the British Pakistani group, of those who took part in after school activities, the majority \((58.1\%; n = 18)\) attended religious classes. In contrast, only 12.1% \((n = 4)\) of non-immigrant White children and 7.7% \((n = 2)\) of British Indian children attended religious classes. Participation in sports classes also differed between groups. This was lowest for the British Pakistani children \((25.8\%; n = 8)\), higher among non-immigrant White children \((45.5\%; n = 15)\) and highest among British Indian children \((61.5\%; n = 16)\).

\(^67\) The categories indicating Number of Times a Week and Number of Hours a Week were not collapsed, despite there being low responses by mothers in some categories. The reason for this was to highlight the range of after school patterns of children reported by mothers from each family type.
**Mother-Child Play**

Mothers were asked about the *Time Spent Playing* with their child during the week (ranging from 1-3 hours to more than 8 hours), and the *Type of Play* that they engaged in. These included: Playing with Toys, Games, Reading, Drawing/Crafts, Rough and Tumble, Domestic Play, Creative Play and Religious Play. A Chi-square test showed that, there was no difference between groups in *Time Spent Playing*. In addition, there were no significant differences in type of mother-child play apart from religious play $\chi^2(2, N = 90) = 14.00$, $p < .001$. Religious Play occurred most in the British Pakistani group with 90.1% (n = 28) of British Pakistani mothers engaging in Religious Play with their child compared with 53.8% (n = 14) of British Indian mothers and 48.5% (n = 17) of non-immigrant White mothers (see Table 9). It was interesting to note that Reading was the most popular type of mother-child play between groups and all mothers (n = 90) read with their child.
Table 9: Chi-square values for comparisons of Children’s After School Activity, Mother-Child Religious Play and Multiple response values for comparisons of Type of After School Activity between British Indian, British Pakistani and non-immigrant White families

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>British Indian</th>
<th>British Pakistani</th>
<th>Non-immigrant White</th>
<th>χ²</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Times a Week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One to two</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three to four</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than five</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Hours a Week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5-1.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;5.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of After School Activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Classes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Classes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance Classes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homework Clubs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition (extra learning)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Lessons</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Classes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Play</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>90.3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section III (a): Cultural and Contextual Factors in Family Life: Quantitative Findings

Family Relationships

Using one-way analysis of variance (ANOVAs), no difference was found between groups for Total Intrafamilial Stress as assessed by the Index of Family Relations (see Table 10)

Levels of Collectivism (interaction with the extended family and child’s grandparents) and mother’s Relationship with Mother-in-Law were each entered into a one way analysis of variance (ANOVA). A significant group difference was found for Collectivism $F(2, 86) = 11.66, p < .001$ (see Table 10). The Games-Howell post-hoc test showed higher levels of Collectivism in British Indian families (BI vs. NIW, $p < .001$) as well as in British Pakistani families (BP vs. NIW, $p < .001$) when compared with non-immigrant White families. There was no difference between family types for Relationship with Mother-in-Law.

Table 10: Means, SD, F and p values for comparisons of Intrafamilial Stress and Family Relationships between between British Indian (BI), British Pakistani (BP) and non-immigrant White (NIW) families

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>British Indian</th>
<th>British Pakistani</th>
<th>Non-immigrant White</th>
<th>Post-hoc tests</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>BI vs. NIW</td>
<td>BP vs. NIW</td>
<td>BI vs. BP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Intrafamilial Stress</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>12.36</td>
<td>11.77</td>
<td>8.95</td>
<td>14.47</td>
<td>10.58</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>p&lt;.001</td>
<td>p&lt;.001</td>
<td>p&lt;.001</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collectivism</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>11.66</td>
<td>p&lt;.001</td>
<td>p&lt;.001</td>
<td>p&lt;.001</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship with mother-in-law</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>p&lt;.001</td>
<td>p&lt;.001</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Although group sample sizes are fairly small, a chi squared analysis was used as an exploratory exercise to understand the child’s perspective on family relationships. Chi-square tests were used to compare the relative positions of the Mother, Father and Maternal Grandmother in the family map. A Chi-square test was also used to compare whether grandparents were mentioned in the map by the child from each family type indicating the Overall Importance of Grandparents to them. As shown in Table 11, a significant difference between groups was found in the position of the Mother in the map $\chi^2 (6, N = 81) = 12.08, p < .01$. Fewer British Pakistani children (88.9%; n = 24) and British Indian (75%; n = 18) placed their mother in the innermost second circle compared with non-immigrant White children 100% (n = 30), all of whom placed their mother in the innermost second circle closest to themselves. British Indian and British Pakistani children were more likely to place their mothers in the surrounding circles indicating differences in emotional closeness. Only one British Indian child (4.2%) did not place their mother in the map. None of the children placed their mother in the fifth outermost circle.

Chi-square tests also showed significant between group differences in the child’s emotional closeness to their Maternal Grandmother $\chi^2 (6, N = 81) = 18.19, p < .01$ (see Table 11). Forty-two percent (n = 10) of British Indian children and 74% (n = 20) of British Pakistani children did not include their maternal grandmother in the family map. Of those that did, 16.7% (n = 4) of British Indian and the remaining British Pakistani children (25.9%; n = 7) placed their maternal grandmother in the innermost second circle closest to themselves. The British Indian children seemed to place their maternal grandmothers across a wider range of the map indicating differences in emotional closeness (see Table 11). In the non-immigrant White group, 50% (n = 15) of children did not include their maternal grandmother in the family map. Of those that did, 36.7% (n = 11) included their grandmother in the second circle closest to themselves. No differences were found between groups for Mention of Grandparents and for the position in the map of Fathers.
Table 11: Chi-square values for positions of family members on Child Family Map

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>British Indian</th>
<th>British Pakistani</th>
<th>Non-immigrant White</th>
<th>χ²</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mother</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second circle</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third circle</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth circle</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child did not mention</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Father</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second circle</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third circle</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth circle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child did not mention</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mention of Grandparents</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maternal Grandmother</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second circle</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third circle</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth circle</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child did not mention</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>74.1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

68 The categories indicating the circle number were not collapsed, despite there being low responses by children in some categories. The reason for this was to highlight the range of patterns reported by children in different family types.
Multiculturalism and Cultural Diversity

The variables relating to multiculturalism and cultural diversity derived from the mother’s interview were Feelings about Multiculturalism, Feelings about Child growing up in Contemporary Britain, and Discussion of Racism. With one-way ANOVAs, a significant difference between groups was found for mother’s Feelings about Multiculturalism, $F(2, 87) = 4.18, p < .05$. The Games-Howell post-hoc test revealed that mothers in British Indian families felt more positive about multiculturalism than non-immigrant White mothers (BI vs. NIW, $p < .05$), and that British Indian and Pakistani families did not differ from each other. Regarding the Discussion of Racism, a significant group difference was again found, $F(2, 87) = 3.31, p < .05$. The Games-Howell post-hoc test showed that non-immigrant White mothers were more likely to talk to their child about racism than British Indian mothers (BI vs. NIW, $p < .05$). There was no difference between family types for mothers’ Feelings about their Child growing up in Contemporary Britain (see Table 12a).

Ethnic Identity and Socialisation

Scores from the two subscales of the revised Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM-rev) (Exploration and Commitment) were combined to form an ethnic identity construct. The between item correlation coefficient was .53 and the $\alpha$-coefficient for the construct was .69. When these variables were entered into a MANOVA, Wilks’ $\lambda$ was not significant (see Table 12a). A one-way analysis of variance was then conducted for the Cultural Socialisation$^{69}$ variable from the mother’s interview, revealing a significant between group difference $F(2,84) = 15.20, p < .001$. British Pakistani mothers were found to be more dedicated to socialising their child with respect to their culture compared with the non-immigrant White mothers (BP vs. NIW, $p < .001$) and British Indian mothers (BI vs. BP, $p<.05$). British Indian mothers also socialised their children with respect to their culture more than the non-immigrant White mothers (BI vs. NIW, $p < .05$).

---

$^{69}$ In order to keep EI separate from ethnic behaviours, as recommended by Phinney et al., (2007), the cultural socialisation variable was not included in the Ethnic identity construct and was analysed separately.
Acculturation

Acculturation was measured only in the British Indian and British Pakistani groups, and was separated into two categories: overall ethnic society immersion and overall dominant society immersion.

Overall Ethnic Society Immersion

The variables relating to overall levels of ethnic society immersion included the score from the subscale of the Stephenson Multigroup Acculturation Scale (SMAS) (Ethnic Society Immersion) and variables derived from the mother’s interview (Child’s Knowledge of Language and Degree of Importance of Biraderi/Caste). Independent sample t-tests were used to compare differences between the British Pakistani and British Indian groups for overall ethnic society immersion. A significant difference was found between British Indians and British Pakistanis for Degree of Importance of Biraderi/Caste, \( t(55) = 2.50, p < .05 \), with British Indian mothers believing the caste system to still be important. No significant differences were found for Child’s Knowledge of Language or Ethnic Society Immersion. For the latter variable, this indicates that Indian and Pakistani groups show similar levels of interaction and involvement with aspects of their traditional culture (see Table 12a).

Overall Dominant Society Immersion:

The following variables were used to measure overall levels of dominant society immersion: the subscale score from the SMAS (dominant society immersion) and variables derived from the mother’s interview (Feelings of Britishness and Perception of non-immigrant White). Independent sample t-tests were used to compare interaction and immersion in the dominant society culture between groups. As shown in Table 12a, no significant differences were found for Dominant Society Immersion, Feelings of Britishness or Perception of non-immigrant White. The mothers from each group reported similar levels of involvement with the dominant society culture in terms of language interaction, food and media\(^70\). Mothers from both groups reported moderate to high feelings of being British (on a scale of 0 to 5). Further, mothers from both the British Indian and British Pakistani groups were rated as having neutral to somewhat positive feelings of non-immigrant White parenting and family life (on a scale of 0 to 4).

\(^70\) Stephenson, 2000
**Religion**

The variables relating to religion derived from the mother’s interview were *Religiosity, Religious Beliefs, Religious Practices* and *Child’s Knowledge of Religion*. The four items showed strong inter-item correlations ranging from .65 to .85 and the $\alpha$-coefficient for the construct was .93. Principle component analysis was used with the religion variables to produce a religion scale. All variables loaded on one factor with loadings of over .8 and the factor explained 82.1% of the variance (see Table 12b). A composite score was created from this factor, with higher scores indicating stronger religious beliefs and practices. This score was labelled *Religion*.

**Table 12b: Factor Loadings of a fixed factor principle component analysis for four Religion variables from mother’s interview N = 90**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable name</th>
<th>Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religiosity</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion: beliefs</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion: practices</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child’s knowledge of religion</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A one way analysis of variance (ANOVA) of the *Religion* variable revealed a significant group difference $F(2,87) = 32.48, p <.001$. A Games-Howell post-hoc test showed that British Pakistani mothers held significantly stronger religious beliefs and practices when compared with both British Indian (BI vs. BP $p < .001$) and non-immigrant White mothers (BP vs. NIW, $p < .001$) see Table 12a.
Table 12a: Means, SD, F and p values for comparisons of Multiculturalism and Cultural Diversity, Ethnic Identification, Acculturation and Religion between between British Indian (BI), British Pakistani (BP) and non-immigrant White (NIW) families

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>British Indian</th>
<th>British Pakistani</th>
<th>Non-immigrant White</th>
<th>F/t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Post-hoc tests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feelings about Multiculturalism</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feelings about Child growing up in Contemporary Britain</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion of Racism</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnic Identity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>n.s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploration</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Socialisation</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acculturation – Overall Ethnic Society Immersion:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Society Immersion</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child’s Knowledge of Language</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of importance of Biraderi/Caste</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>p&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acculturation – Overall Dominant Society Immersion:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant Society Immersion</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feelings of Britishness</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Non-immigrant White</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>-1.07</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>-1.71</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Parenting, Ethnic Identity and Child Outcome

The results so far have revealed a number of significant differences between ethnic groups with respect to parents’ marital and psychological state, parenting and mother-child relationships, and cultural and contextual factors. However, child psychological adjustment did not differ between groups with the majority of children in each ethnic group well below the cut-off for the presence of psychological problems as assessed by the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ). In order to examine the independent predictive value of specific parenting measures and ethnic identity in relation to child outcome (as assessed by the SDQ), regression analyses were conducted. Correlations were first calculated between the parenting and ethnic identity variables separately to ensure that it would be possible to perform the regression analyses on the variables.

Correlations between Parenting and Child Adjustment

The relationship between parenting and children’s psychological adjustment, was explored by examining the correlations between three parenting variables (Expressed Warmth, Frequency of Battle and mothers’ Total Stress score from the PSI/SF), and a child adjustment variable (Total Difficulties score on the SDQ). These parenting variables were selected as they represent a positive (Expressed Warmth) and a negative (Frequency of Battle) variable and also a maternal self report measure (Total Stress). The Total Difficulties score from the SDQ was chosen as it has shown to be a reliable and valid measure of child adjustment.

Significant correlations were found between each of the parenting variables and the SDQ scores as shown in Table 13. In line with the wider literature on parental influences on child adjustment, these reflected fewer emotional and behaviour problems in children whose mothers demonstrated greater expressed warmth \( (r = - .34, p < .01) \), fewer battles \( (r = .22, p < .05) \) and lower parenting stress \( (r = .55, p < .001) \).
Correlations between Ethnic Identity and Child Adjustment

The relationship between ethnic identity and children’s psychological adjustment was next explored by examining the correlation between a measure of strength of ethnic identity (Total Ethnic Identity score on the MEIM-rev) and a child adjustment variable (Total Difficulties score on the SDQ). The ethnic identity variable was selected as it represents a maternal self-report measure which incorporates both feelings of commitment and exploration of ethnicity and is therefore holistic in nature. The Total difficulties score on the SDQ was selected for the reasons mentioned above.

A significant correlation was found between ethnic identity and SDQ scores as shown in Table 14. This reflected higher emotional and behavioural problems in children whose mothers demonstrated stronger exploration of and commitment to ethnic identity ($r = .34$, $p < .01$).

Table 13: Pearson Correlation Coefficients for Parenting and Child Adjustment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>SDQ: Total Difficulties Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$r$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressed Warmth</td>
<td>-0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of Battle</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSI: Total Stress</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14: Pearson Correlation Coefficient for Ethnic Identity and Child Adjustment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>SDQ: Total Difficulties Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$r$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEIM: Total Ethnic Identity</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Regression Analyses of Parenting, Ethnic Identity and Child Adjustment

As shown above, the parenting measures (Expressed Warmth, Frequency of Battle and Total Stress) and the identity factor (MEIM-rev: Total Ethnic Identity) correlated with child adjustment (SDQ: Total Difficulties). Hierarchical regression analyses on these variables were carried out to explore the relationship between parenting, ethnic identity and child adjustment using a multilevel statistical model. Past literature and earlier analyses of the data served to guide the order in which variables were entered into the regression. The stepwise method was used. This method tests the addition of each variable in the statistical model, adding those variables that improve the model and repeating the process until none improves the model any further. Although the stepwise regression was being conducted on a medium number of cases as opposed to a large number of cases (which minimises the influence of possible sampling error), the recommendations of Tabachnick and Fidell (1996; 2001) on the prescribed ratio of cases-to-independent variables was followed to ensure the most accurate analyses possible were conducted.

The regression analysis assessed whether the parenting measures of Express Warmth, Frequency of Battle and Total Stress and the ethnic identity measure of Total Ethnic Identity as measured by the MEIM-rev explained unique variance in child adjustment as measured by the SDQ. The cases-to-independent variables (IVs) ratio was 21:1 (85 cases and 4 IVs)\(^7\), which is a satisfactory ratio for conducting regression analyses. Further, Tabachnick and Fidell (1996; 2001) recommend that a minimum of 50 cases plus 8 cases for each IV is required to conduct a hierarchical regression. Therefore this regression which uses 4 IVs meets the conditions of a minimum of \((50 + (8 \times 4), or 82). Moreover, multi-collinearity was not shown in the data (largest VIF = 1.30) which signified that the 4 independent variables were not too highly correlated to render regression analysis void.

At step 1 of the regression, mothers’ Total Stress score on the PSI/SF was entered, which accounted for 31% of the variance (adjusted R\(^2\) = .30, F (1, 83) = 36.60, p < .001). The inclusion of Ethnic Identity into the equation at Step 2 resulted in an additional 5% of the variance being explained (ΔR\(^2\) = .05). The independent variables Expressed Warmth and Frequency of Battle were not included in the stepwise regression as they did not significantly strengthen the model and were not found to be significant predictors of child adjustment as measured by the SDQ. Therefore the final model contained only two independent variables; Total Stress and Ethnic Identity which accounted for an

\(^7\) The SPSS multiple regression option was set to exclude cases listwise. Hence, although data was collected data from 90 participants, SPSS analysed the data from only the 85 participants who had no missing values.
overall variance of 35% (adjusted $R^2 = .34$, $F (6, 77) = 22.20$, $p < .001$) (see Table 15). Multivariate outliers were not identified (max Cook’s distance = 0.28), indicating each case had a similar influence on the regression coefficients. The result of the regression indicated that Parenting Total Stress, reported by mothers as well as the strength of their Ethnic Identity were most closely associated with child adjustment. Higher levels of maternal stress, and greater exploration and commitment to ethnic identity, were associated with greater difficulties in the child.

Table 15: Summary of Hierarchal Regression on Children’s SDQ Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SDQ: Total Difficulties Score</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE (B)</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step I</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSI Total Stress</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>p &lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model I Summary</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted $R^2 = .30$, $F (1, 83) = 36.60$, $p &lt; .001$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step II</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSI Total Stress</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>p &lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEIM Ethnic Identity</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>p &lt; .05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Expressed warmth and Frequency of battles were not significant predictors in the final model II*

| **Model II Summary**          | Adjusted $R^2 = .34$, $F (6, 77) = 22.20$, $p < .001$ |
Acculturation and Parenting in British Indian and British Pakistani Families

In order to further explore the relationship between acculturation and parenting in British Pakistani and British Indian families, correlations were first calculated between six parenting variables (Expressed Warmth, Mother-Child Interaction, Sensitive Responding, Overt Discipline, Maternal Control and Chaperonage) and an acculturation variable (Ethnic Society Immersion (ESI) as reported by mothers using the SMAS). These parenting variables were selected as they represent five important areas of parenting and include both negative and positive variables. Ethnic Society Immersion was chosen as it represents a reliable and valid maternal self report measure assessing the degree to which mothers are immersed in their ethnic culture in the realms of language, interaction, media and food. As shown in Table 16, no significant correlations were found between any of the parenting variables and mothers’ Ethnic Society Immersion as reported by the SMAS.

The same parenting variables (Expressed Warmth, Mother-Child Interaction, Sensitive Responding, Overt Discipline, Maternal Control and Chaperonage) were then correlated with a different acculturation variable (Dominant Society Immersion (DSI) reported by mothers using the SMAS). Dominant Society Immersion measures the degree to which mothers are immersed in the dominant society culture in which they live in the domains of language, interaction, media and food. As shown in Table 16, maternal Chaperonage showed a significant correlation with Dominant Society Immersion as reported by the SMAS, showing that British Indian and Pakistani mothers who immersed themselves more in the dominant society, had tighter rules concerning the chaperonage of their children. No other significant correlations were found between each of the parenting variables and mothers’ Dominant Society Immersion.
Table 16: *Pearson Correlation Coefficients for Parenting and Acculturation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>SMAS: Mothers’ Ethnic Society Immersion</th>
<th>SMAS: Mothers’ Dominant Society Immersion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$r$</td>
<td>$n$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressed warmth</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother-child interaction</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitive responding</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overt Discipline</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal Control</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaperonage</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As neither aspect of acculturation (*Ethnic Society Immersion* and *Dominant Society Immersion*) was found to be significantly related to the other five parenting variables (*Expressed Warmth, Mother-Child Interaction, Sensitive Responding, Overt Discipline and Maternal Control*), no further analysis was conducted on these measures.
Section III (b): Cultural and Contextual Factors in Family Life: Qualitative Findings

A purposive sampling approach was used to obtain a good cross-representation of the quantitative sample (which comprised 90 mothers). In total, 36 mothers were selected (12 British Indian mothers, 12 British Pakistani mothers and 12 non-immigrant White mothers). These mothers represented a broad spectrum of society. There was a balance in the range of socio-economic status as well as a reasonable balance of children’s gender between groups. By using a purposive sample, the range of viewpoints of mothers from the total sample was more adequately represented. Any identifying information has been removed or altered to protect the identity of participants and maintain confidentiality. Pseudonyms have been used throughout. These pseudonyms were reflective of the women’s ethnic group.

The qualitative semi-structured interview schedule focused on the broad topic areas of: (1) feelings about multiculturalism (2) ethnic-racial socialisation, (3) parenting, and perceptions of family life, and (4) religion. This allowed for a focus on specific aspects of parenting and parental beliefs, and helped the process of qualitative analyses. The qualitative sections of the interviews ranged in duration (on average) from forty to sixty minutes and were digitally recorded with the parent’s consent. None of the parents refused permission for the recording of the interview.

Responses were first transcribed verbatim. Transcripts were then read several times to establish familiarity with the mother’s responses and allow for preliminary coding. Data was then processed further using ATLAS-Ti in order to conduct a detailed thematic analysis. Relevant quotations in the data were first highlighted, and codes were generated from the data. Following this, the codes were revisited and themes were created based on data patterns. These themes were then reviewed and organised into families to help further organise the data. The thematic analysis approach allowed for the identification of emerging and comparative themes under each topic area (see Braun and Clarke, 2006).

Five main data themes were identified. Each theme was categorised into a number of sub-themes as well as into two larger categories. These categories were: (1) parenting beliefs and socialisation

---

72 This number was selected as the data seemed to approach saturation following analyses.
73 In the non-immigrant White group, 4 mothers had primary qualifications, 1 mother had secondary qualifications and 7 mothers had higher qualifications. In the British Indian group, 5 mothers had primary qualifications, 2 mothers had secondary qualifications and 5 mothers had higher qualifications. In the British Pakistani group, 2 mothers had primary qualifications, 4 mothers had secondary qualifications and 6 mothers had higher qualifications.
74 A qualitative software package
practices, and (2) events mothers reported or observed. Table 17 shows each of these themes and sub-themes and the corresponding categories in which they fall.

**Table 17: Themes and Sub-themes Identified Following Thematic Analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parenting beliefs and socialisation practices</th>
<th>Events mothers reported or observed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Culture and Identity</strong></td>
<td><strong>Multiculturalism and Contemporary Britain</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) British Indian Culture</td>
<td>a) Feelings about Multiculturalism and Diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) British Indian Religious Beliefs</td>
<td>b) Celebrating ‘Englishness’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) British Pakistani Culture</td>
<td>c) English as a Second Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) British Pakistani Religious Beliefs</td>
<td>d) ‘Informal’ Segregation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Non-immigrant White ‘English Culture’</td>
<td>e) ‘Imbalanced’ Multiculturalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Non-immigrant White Religious Beliefs</td>
<td>f) Growing up in Contemporary Britain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnic-Racial Socialisation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Religio-Cultural Socialisation</td>
<td><strong>Experiences with Racism</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Language</td>
<td>a) Racism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Egalitarianism</td>
<td>b) ‘Inverted’ racism and Perceived Unequal treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Preparation for Bias</td>
<td>c) Islamophobia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Promotion of Mistrust</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Silence about Race</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intergroup Perceptions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Perceptions of British Indians</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Perceptions of British Pakistanis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Perceptions of English (non-immigrant White)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Parenting Beliefs and Socialisation Practices

Culture and Identity

Different groups living in close proximity within diverse communities shared traditions, ideas and practices, and many mothers discussed incorporating the practices of other cultures into their own cultural beliefs. Culture was therefore viewed as being highly dynamic. Religion and culture in families were also found to be extremely intertwined, particularly in British Pakistani families, where it was difficult to separate the two. In addition to these similarities, mothers discussed a number of specific differences between cultures, which will be explored further below.

British Indian Culture

British Indian mothers varied in their levels of traditional beliefs and the extent to which they identified with British and Indian culture. Most families in this group were Hindu, but there were also some Sikh families. Some mothers equated culture mainly with religion, while others identified different elements of culture, such as language, music and food that were important to them. Many mothers discussed their identification with both British culture and Indian culture, feeling as one mother stated, ‘fifty-fifty’.

A bit of both, really. You know I like my music. I probably listen to more English music than Indian. Um. Clothes, I’ve always worn shalwar-kameez. You know, there’s certain things I like I doing, like programmes. Eastenders. Food-wise, uh, a mixture. I’d say there’d be times when I make Indian, and there’d be times when I make English.

Priti, British Indian mother

A number of mothers discussed feeling proud to be British as well as the importance of passing on those feelings of national pride to their children.

I’m very proud to be British. Yeah, I try and, you know, I try and make them understand that. I do refer to us as British Asians and things you know.

Madhu, British Indian mother

There was also discussion by mothers about differences in cultural maintenance in the generations before and after them. Many stated that their parents, who were first-generation immigrants, still identified with India, spoke traditional languages and watched Indian programmes, while their

Traditional dress
children identified much less with Indian culture and, thus, the current generation was losing its ‘Indian-ness’.

  *My Dad’s like that, and he just watches . . . you know Indian channels all the time. He watches the news in India, so he hasn’t got a clue what’s going on here, because . . . but ask him what happened in India yesterday and he’ll know everything, and I just think that’s quite sad actually.*

  Anita, British Indian mother

  *I feel very British Asian. I mean there’s part of me that’s Asian, that I never want to go away, but I can see in my kids that because they’re the next generation they’re going to lose it a lot faster, but I’m comfortable with that . . . I think that’s what’s to be expected.*

  Madhu, British Indian mother

Some mothers felt closer to one culture but were still identified with the other. One mother, Arthi, felt she was sometimes stereotyped because of the way she looked. Physically, she looked Indian, but she felt much more British. She narrated an example of an incident at her child’s school.

  *You know, um we have PTFA meetings, whatever, and I was part of it last year, and you know, it’s this: because I was Asian I was automatically asked [sic] to sort out the Indian food stall. Now, I come from . . . I was born and bred here. I don’t know any more than the next person. But it’s automatic . . . this stereotype image of whatever.*

  Arthi, British Indian mother

Others highlighted how they sometimes felt it was difficult to maintain a balance between traditional Indian beliefs and British culture; the latter, they felt, gave more freedom to their children. Priti, an Indian mother, discussed this with regards to clothes. She wanted her child to wear traditional clothes after a certain age, so she would demonstrate outwards modesty and prevent other community members from gossiping.

  *But even as in like my kids ... with her, I think there’d be a certain age where she’ll stop wearing it. You know as she grows up, then she’ll have to wear ...a salwar kameez. Um, just for some respect.*

  Priti, British Indian mother

A few mothers also spoke of their child’s partner choice as being important, and their worry that their child would marry outside the culture or caste.
British Indian Religious Beliefs

Religion was often discussed in terms of beliefs and practices. This section focuses on the respondents’ reported beliefs.77 British Indian mothers had a variety of responses towards religious belief. Firstly, there were a group of mothers who identified themselves as highly religious and spoke of the importance of passing on parallel beliefs to their children. Secondly, some mothers felt it was important for their children to know some Hindu/Sikh beliefs, but were happy for those beliefs to be fairly superficial. Some mothers felt their children were too young to understand faith, while others acknowledged that it was difficult to teach their child about faith due to their hectic lifestyles. A number of mothers stated they were not very religious but felt it was important for their child to have some basic religious knowledge so they would have a stronger sense of self. These mothers discussed visiting temples, mainly during important festivals or events, and of relying on their children’s school to teach them through religious education classes.

I think she’s a bit too young just yet. I want her to go a bit further with her education and when she’s old enough to. . . to you know, take a step further and learn about her religion, then I will do that. Even probably I don’t think I will send her to religious classes.

Priti, British Indian mother

A few mothers discussed the importance of choice. They ensured their child knew the basics of faith at a young age so that when they were older they could decide which beliefs they would like to follow. Other mothers stated that religion did not come up in day-to-day conversations with their child. Finally, none of the British Indian mothers described themselves as non-believers, or said that they actively discouraged their children from faith and spiritual beliefs.

British Pakistani Culture

All of the British Pakistani mothers were Sunni Muslim, with their parents having originally immigrated from different parts of Pakistan. Some held more traditional beliefs and wanted their children to understand what it meant to be Pakistani, which included clothing, religious beliefs, food and festivals.

77 The sub-theme of religio-cultural socialisation examines the religious socialisation practices mothers used with their children to help them understand their religion.
Our culture is obviously the dress and religion . . . When it comes to the food she does try to sit next me and she’s like, ‘What are you doing? Mum, what are you cooking?’ . . . It’s majority of Asian food at home. I mean we do have the odd fry-ups . . . and the roast and everything, but the majority of it is . . . they prefer the Pakistani curry . . . as to the English.

Fauzia, British Pakistani mother

Mothers also discussed being reflective about how they spoke to their children about culture, drawing from childhood experiences, thus pointing to the generational nature of cultural maintenance. In this group, discussions around culture tended to be complicated. Some mothers viewed culture as synergistic, being a mix of ‘Britishness’ and ‘Pakistaniness’. Others felt culture lay on a spectrum, with Pakistani culture on one end and British culture on the other. None of the mothers spoke about English culture, all referred to British culture.

‘Pick and mix’ was a term used by Zahra, a British Pakistani mother, to refer to the rejection of aspects of British culture that mothers believed to oppose their Pakistani beliefs. The amount of physical freedom mothers were willing to give children was offered as an example of this. Mothers felt White culture encouraged children to have more freedom, and this was incompatible with their Pakistani cultural beliefs. The picking and choosing from both cultures was something that mothers felt children would continue to do actively as they grew up, allowing them to be accepted into wider society.

Mothers held different beliefs about their children taking on aspects of both cultures. One mother, Parveen, spoke of wanting her child to have the ‘best of both worlds’. Another, Saima, considered ‘pick and mix’ identity a distinct advantage for her daughter, enabling her to have a rich understanding of difference. Compared with her own childhood, she felt that her daughter was lucky to grow up in a more multicultural society where she could easily practice both of her cultures. Jannat offered a further example of this, stating she felt very Asian in her beliefs and values, but British in many of her ways of thinking and understanding.

Um. I think things work-wise, education, the policies – that’s more British side. But um, with what I believe in, that’s more Asian side. That’s what I feel, you know. I think children should . . . should be able to get an education. They should go university, so all that side. You know . . . women’s rights. I believe all that side. The policies are mainly British I believe, but the values that I still have from being brought up, are beliefs.

Jannat, British Pakistani mother

Some mothers described how their children knew very little about Pakistan and, in that respect, seemed more British. This was linked to an idea that Pakistani culture was eroding. There were two types of arguments for this erosion. One was that it is a result of children being born and brought up
in Britain and identifying more with this country. The other was that it is due to religion being equated to culture and taking culture’s place, altogether.

Mothers felt that the erosion of traditional language is an example of Pakistani culture diminishing. One mother, Hira, spoke about her child having little knowledge of Pakistani culture, mainly ‘just knowing the chapatis’. She discussed how she felt clothes and food were the main remnants of Pakistani culture, and that these were very superficial.

*You know, culture to us, all that’s left of a culture is the food and the clothes . . . I don’t really follow any particular culture. Our language as well. Language is lost as well in a way, because my daughters don’t speak Urdu anymore even though I try my utmost best to speak Urdu.*

Hira, British Pakistani mother

While some mothers felt comfortable with this erosion, others were worried about the change. One mother, Parveen, discussed that she felt a ‘cultural crisis’ was occurring and that the next generation were losing values and had ‘no allegiance’ to Pakistan.

*Um, we have a bit of a cultural crisis, um, but I do try and instil Pakistani values . . . in children, because I think that they need to know where they’re from. Because ultimately they are brown, you know they’re Asian. They’re not white Caucasians. Um, but I think that’s purely because they’re third generation . . . British . . . Pakistani, born and bred in this country.*

Hira, British Pakistani mother

The cultural erosion argument took another dimension when religion was viewed as culture. Many Pakistani mothers felt they were replacing their Pakistani culture with Islamic culture and this religio-cultural overlap took a very complex form. There were a number of features relating to this phenomenon.

First, some mothers discussed that because their children felt limited identification with Pakistan, the propagation of Pakistani culture was not as important as ensuring the propagation of Islam. Islam was discussed as representing a whole way of life, rights, tenets and rituals as well as a worldview. Also, Islam, and the choice to be Muslim, was something that second-generation mothers felt they had more control over. They could chose how Islamic they wanted to be, and given that Islam could be understood and taught in English, this allowed British Pakistani mothers and children to grasp it more. Therefore, these mothers identified more with being British Muslims than British Pakistanis.
Islam . . . that really exists as a culture for us, do you know what I mean? I . . . I’ve rejected other culture. In favour of the . . . the religion. For me it doesn’t matter whether we have burger and chips every night or . . . or whatever. It doesn’t matter what clothes we wear. What language we speak . . . we still have things in common in our culture, like . . . respect for elders. And certain standards and stuff, but what binds us together is . . . is Islam.

Saima, British Pakistani mother

Being labelled a British Pakistani was also viewed as linked to how ethnic groups were categorised in Britain. Due to Muslims not being recognised as an ethnic group, Pakistanis who didn’t feel as connected to Pakistan as they did to Britain and Islam felt they were forced to tick this box. Given the chance, some mothers discussed wanting to define themselves as British Muslims

As I am getting older that is how I see myself as – a British Muslim. I can speak Urdu, Punjabi, I wear shalwar-kameez, I prefer Indian food more than others, I like cooking roti, chawal and all that. In terms of culture there are a lot of things about the Pakistani culture which just doesn’t really impact on me and if I have to describe myself, I am a Muslim first.

Shazia, British Pakistani mother

Describing themselves as a British Muslim meant that some Pakistanis felt part of a much larger group than just the Pakistani ethnic group. British Muslims could be Bangladeshi, Somali, Arab, Black and a range of other peoples. This was linked to the idea of the Muslim ummah, but also to globalisation. Some of the mothers argued that re-labelling their identity was a reactionary decision following September 11th, and that feelings of their faith being attacked led them to associate more strongly with their faith.

Some mothers also discussed trying to balance religion with traditional cultural beliefs. This meant following aspects of Pakistani culture only if they reconciled with their personal religious beliefs. However, this was not always easy, as one mother, Shazia discussed.

I try not to mix religion and culture, because I think a lot of damage has been done by mixing the two of these and a lot of untruths have come about, so I try not to do this. But I am a typical Punjabi at heart, and even though I think Islam frowns upon some things like music and dance, I love having a good dance when there is a mehndi or something, so I kind of pick and choose.

Shazia, British Pakistani mother

As shown, the understanding of culture and identity in the British Pakistani group seems much more complex than the simple idea of integration. Three main identities came to the fore in discussions; a Pakistani one, a British one and a Muslim one. Some mothers chose to separate all three, while others found a balance between two of them and still others seemed to balance all three.

78 Ummah is an Islamic term to describe the collective diaspora of Muslims across the globe.
British Pakistani Religious Beliefs

The significance of Islam as a cultural belief for British Pakistanis has already been discussed. This section further elaborates on mothers’ religious beliefs. First, there was a large group of mothers who discussed having strong Islamic beliefs and wanting their children to also uphold similar religious beliefs. Within this group, there were some mothers who emphasised Islam as a ‘way of life’ and felt it was impossible to separate beliefs and practices. They spoke about how they taught their children through example. Mothers who held this response engaged in much religious socialisation.79

I think as Muslims you can’t really separate your religion from who you are and the way . . . the way, you know it portrays you. Yeah, because we’re praying five times a day, you know they’ll have to pray their Quran. We try and make it fun, but sometimes religion isn’t fun. It’s something you have to do. . . . I think religion is important in a child’s life. I think it gives them boundaries. It gives them rules and regulations. And I think if a child doesn’t have that, they can become a bit lost I think.

Parveen, British Pakistani mother

There were also some mothers who spoke about having strong beliefs without practicing religious rituals. These mothers stated that they wanted their children to have knowledge of God and their cultural identity as Muslims, but that they were laid back in teaching their children about other aspects of Islam.

I’m quite religious because I believe and that, but I don’t practice it. I mean if somebody said to me, you know, if somebody said anything against the Prophet, I would actually defend it to the hilt. But I don’t practice it.

Fatima, British Pakistani mother

A few mothers believed their children were too young to understand about religion in-depth. These mothers were content with their children knowing merely the basics of Islam. One mother, Zahra, stated that her priority was that her children did well at school and she was ‘holding back’ from teaching them more about Islam. Another mother, Jannat, spoke about her child not being at the right developmental stage to really understand Islam in depth.

I don’t think she knows enough, but I don’t want to force too much information, I don’t think she’s ready for it. She just stands there. You know her mind’s going to go elsewhere if you start giving her a lecture, because their attention span isn’t that long, so I just want her to know the basics.

Jannat, British Pakistani mother

79 Discussed in the subtheme religio-cultural socialisation
Other mothers worried their children were behind in their understanding of Islam. Feroz was one example of a mother who felt this way. She spoke about how little her children knew compared with children in faith schools.

Overall, compared with British Indian and non-immigrant White mothers, there were a larger number of British Pakistani mothers who tended to discuss the importance of religion. Unlike the other two groups, no mothers believed religion to be an unimportant subject or gave their children an element of choice whether to practice Islam.

**Non-immigrant White ‘English’ Culture**

Compared with British Pakistani and British Indian mothers, non-immigrant White mothers found it difficult to define their culture. Some mothers were reluctant to state that they were English and much preferred to say they had a British culture. These mothers felt that calling themselves English came with a racist set of connotations due to organisations such as the British National Party (BNP) and past colonial history.

*I think a good example is the . . . the family that moved away from here. They moved to Epping, uh . . . further out. And it’s a little bit more, um, English flags in the window. There’s more sense of England. We are English. There’s a sense of that when you go up there and more inherent racism.*

**Charlotte, non-immigrant White mother**

Other mothers, such as Dianne, were proud to identify with being English.

*Um, I don’t see myself as British . . . You know, both of my parents were born in England. So technically I am English.*

**Dianne, non-immigrant White mother**

For mothers who did discuss the meaning of English culture, this encompassed Sunday lunch, Christmas and other festivals, St George’s Day celebrations, Christianity (as well as atheism) and family.

*Um . . . I don’t know that is a hard one! I would say I am quite a traditional British person. I mean we celebrate Christmas, Easter . . . the major holidays. As for religion, um, we don’t really go to church. I suppose I am trying to bring my children up to be good citizens really, and I am probably bringing them up in the same way I was brought up really.*

**Stephanie, non-immigrant White mother**
Some mothers felt that their culture was very cosmopolitan and mixed and comprised much more than just English culture. They felt their children would also pick up this mixed new culture due to their multicultural surroundings.

*Um, what are we? We eat a mixture of food . . . um, my partner’s very into, um, old English history, that’s what we do on lots of trips out, is go and look for henges and so we’re all quite interested in that . . . I don’t really have a . . . I don’t have a concept of what my culture is. I cook English Sunday lunch . . . but I easily cook, you know, um, curries and Italian food . . . So we sort of just do what feels . . . feels right. I mean say we go to festivals, we listen to . . . a whole range of music. Watch different films. It’s kind of . . . there’s nothing defining it. And we don’t have set patterns.*

**Emily, non-immigrant White mother**

The middle class mothers seemed to find it easier to define their culture. Claire, a non-immigrant White mother, was particularly clear about what her culture meant to her and her child.

*So I have got the religious sort of Anglican thing on the one hand and on top of that it is a sort of upper middle class English thing whereby we are quite family-oriented . . . um and then I suppose sort of quite traditional. I will try and do as much as I can for them, so sort of pass them on the best of British things, so like the museum world or um going to nice zoos and things. It’s quite outwards-focused sort of things.*

**Claire, non-immigrant White mother**

Non-immigrant White Religious Beliefs

Four main types of responses came from the non-immigrant White mothers regarding religious beliefs. The first was from mothers who identified themselves as Christians, felt strongly about their religion and wanted to ensure that their children learned about their faith. Within this group, some mothers talked about how they felt religion was a part of their day-to-day life and very much part of their child’s routine.

*Mmm. For us, we’re, you know, we’re Christians, but we’re not kind of just, oh, I’m just . . . that’s just what it says on my . . . you know. It’s a . . . yes, it’s a . . . it’s a real living relation with God. I think that really informs our values . . . Um, not just going along with the crowd . . . we’d encourage our children to have very good moral values.*

**Helen, non-immigrant White mother**

The second type of response came from mothers who felt it was very important for their children to have an element of choice in whether they wanted to identify with religion. They believed their children were too young to decide what religion meant to them. Therefore, these mothers refrained from offering religious guidance and although mothers did respond to their children’s questions on religion or God, answers were not given in great depth.
My beliefs I don’t put on my children. They’ve got their choice. They choose to believe or not to believe kind of thing. And as they do believe, yeah I am there to teach them what I can.

Tracy, non-immigrant White mother

The third type of response came from mothers who identified themselves as non-religious. Some were atheist and some didn’t believe in institutionalised religion. These mothers were keen for their children not to become ‘religious’.

It’s quite interesting, because if I ask them they . . . I suppose they just copy me. And they’ll both say they don’t believe in God. And . . . the other day [the child] said that the Vicar came, and she was just saying he was really boring. And . . . so I think she has got some kind of negative connotations of religion. Because I’m quite . . . I guess . . . and open about that.

Anna, non-immigrant White mother

Finally, some mothers responded by discussing how religion was not something that was important to them or came up in conversations with their child.

Ethnic-Racial Socialisation (ERS)

During the interview, mothers discussed a range of issues relating to ethnic identification, cultural practices and cultural maintenance that helped to uncover how race and ethnicity impacted their children, as well as their own lives. The four ERS themes of cultural socialisation, egalitarianism, preparation for bias and promotion of mistrust were identified in the parenting practices of the sample. Further, the category of cultural socialisation has been renamed as religio-cultural socialisation to highlight the fluidity between religion and culture, particularly in the British Pakistani group. Other related sub-themes will also be discussed within this theme, namely, silence about race and language.

Religio-Cultural Socialisation

Mothers discussed a range of motivations for the religious and cultural socialisation of their children. These included the desire to pass on knowledge of identity and ethnic pride, teach children about important moral values (such as respect for elders) and introduce children to faith. Other motivations included the desire to teach children about multicultural beliefs and encourage a sense of confidence in children so they could defend themselves, should they ever encounter intolerance.
Religio-cultural socialisation was found to be a complex area of parenting. Some mothers had specific agendas and strategies for how they socialised their children, but, often, mothers spoke to their children in implicit and unplanned ways. Sometimes mothers simultaneously used both explicit and implicit means of socialisation, depending on the religious or cultural message, and it was difficult to separate different strategies.

There were similarities and differences between groups in the content as well as mode of transmission. One similarity was that mothers from all groups reported using overt religio-cultural socialisation practices, which served to increase awareness of cultural and religious practices. These included celebration of festivals and religious holidays, visits to religious places of worship (such as churches, mosques and temples), travels back to the native homeland (for Pakistani and Indian mothers only) and family gatherings. These overt practices were deliberate on the part of the parents, and sometimes tied to cultural socialisation agendas.

_Quite traditional in a way, I am a believing Christian, so without going over the top I certainly celebrate the festivals. Um, I take the boys to Church when I can um so they, but I don’t say prayers with them every night, don’t read the Bible with them often so in a way um they know the tenets of their faith from me._

_E Claire, non-immigrant White mother_

_He knows a lot about his, like who’s Indian and who’s a Hindu. And he tends to ask who’s this and who’s that, and such, so I kind of like explain to him, oh this is a White, or this is a Hindu, and . . . I try to get books like through . . . about different cultures and like for his age, but it’s um . . . generally what’s on telly and when he goes to nursery, sort of thing, and . . . Yes, we take him to temples._

_E Divya, British Indian mother_

_I make a big deal of Eid. I ignore, um, non-Islamic festivals, especially pagan ones, like Halloween . . . I don’t discourage them. I just tend to ignore them, so the children don’t form an attachment to them. Take them to Mosque on Eid . . . sometimes they’ll go with their Dad in holidays, but it’s not like I’ll go weekly or anything like that. Talk about it quite a lot on a daily basis. [The child] goes to Arabic classes. I talk about stories of the prophet at night. She copies me sometimes when I pray. We talk about it. We practice it, and the children see that, and then we explain them._

_E Saima, British Pakistani mother_

Some groups relied on this overt means of socialisation more than others. In the British Indian group and non-immigrant White group, this was the main type of religio-cultural socialisation. However,

---

80 Overt types of cultural socialisation (e.g. identity-enhancing cultural socialisation occurring through special projects and events such as family celebrations and school projects)
British Pakistani families used covert, implicit means of socialising children about culture more frequently.

Another aspect of religio-cultural socialisation is the transmission from mothers to children of beliefs and practices of other cultures. This was found in all groups, but more in the White group. Mothers stated how growing up in diverse neighbourhoods and the impact of the media and globalisation influenced how they defined their culture. For example, one non-immigrant mother, Hannah, discussed growing up eating West Indian cuisine, and she continued to cook West Indian meals for her child.

*When I grew up, I had a lot of West Indian friends. And you know, I’d eat West Indian food, and like a lot of my Nan’s friends are West Indian, so . . . I grew up in that kind of environment. And you know our . . . one of the dishes I’ll make is like a West Indian dish, so we are, in our family, quite multi-cultural anyway. You know, and um always have been . . . Um, so I mean that’s . . . that’s how I was brought up, and that’s how my children are brought up.*

**Hannah, non-immigrant White mother**

Having looked at similarities between groups, differences between the groups will now be discussed.

**British Indian Religio-Cultural Socialisation**

It was most common for British Indian mothers to socialise children using more overt identity-enhancing means, which tended to be superficial in nature. Mothers who did use covert means of socialisation mainly limited these to meals and food preparation. However, some used covert socialisation to maintain their Indian identity. These mothers worried their children would lose all aspects of their Indian identity and become ‘too English’, and discussed teaching their child about religion.

*Yeah on a daily basis to temple and I take them to school. But other than that whatever Sikhs learn around prayer my husband does and he does. Yeah, books, writing . . . And like there’s a Sikh channel out on Sky and they watch that as well. Listen to prayers about and he’s at school now learning this curriculum and national curriculum, but I want him to learn Punjabi at home, exercise work and he does an hour of doing Punjabi with his dad.*

**Rani, British Indian mother**

---

81 Covert ethnic socialisation takes place when ethnic practices are deeply ingrained in group members’ daily routine and life. Examples may include food preparation and meals, the use of traditional language, music, dancing and the media (Hughes et al., 2008). Covert socialisation is often unintentional and not linked to an agenda, but just part and parcel of daily family life.
An important difference between the British Indian and the non-immigrant White group was that the second-generation British Indian mothers often spoke about the balance they felt must be struck between Indian traditions and British values. Mothers spoke about the celebration of Christmas, but also of Indian religious festivals and religious prayers. They also discussed preparing Indian meals but, at the same time, English and more international dishes.

[The child] started to . . . she’ll speak in English in a Punjabi accent. And she’ll think she’s speaking in Punjabi, um, I mean she goes to the gurdwara, every now and then. And, uh, she watches Om Shanti Om on the television, you know, and she wears the Indian suits you know. She likes the weddings and um the Bhangra music in the car, and I think that’s about the Asian . . . that’s about as far as it is, really for [the child], the rest is all British.

Shilpa, British Indian mother

Finally, only one mother in this group had explicit conversations with her child about his appearance. Her child wore a turban for religious and cultural reasons and the mother, Aasha wanted to instil a sense of pride in her son about the way he appeared, particularly as she worried about how others would react to the way he looked.

He knows he’s supposed to go to the gurdwara, and he’s got to cover his head. He knows that his . . . there’s only one God up there. We don’t say we’ve got a God . . . But, he knows the gurus. Not all the names yet, but he knows at the temple he’s got to say his saatnaam you know at the end of the day . . . they can’t cut their hair and I told him why . . . and [the child] he’s fine. He is proud to wear his turban.

Aasha, British Indian mother

British Pakistani Religio-Cultural Socialisation

Almost all of the British Pakistani mothers discussed using more covert ethnic socialisation practices, which were deeply ingrained in their everyday lives. It was apparent that mothers in this group held different perceptions of what ‘culture’ constituted. As a whole, Pakistani mothers engaged in more socialisation around religion. Mothers asserted that one of their main aims was to pass a sense of morality and conservatism in appearance and behaviour to children. Religious socialisation was also believed to helped foster trust between mother and child, which would be more important when the child was older. Another aim was to enable the child to understand religious prohibitions, such as eating pork. Covert practices used by mothers included food preparation, music, media and conversation.

Oh Islamic culture’s quite strong. Um. Asian culture, well she’s only five. It’s . . . it’s getting there. You know, it comes out when it comes to things like family gatherings. Extended family from Pakistan and stuff like that. She gets exposure to it, so in terms of Eid, weddings . . .
As was the case for the British Indian group, British Pakistani mothers spoke about how they had to reconcile their cultural and religious beliefs with their sense of being British. In some instances, mothers selected only some aspects of their Pakistani and British cultures and passed these values on to their children. However, in other instances, mothers claimed that this transmission happened naturally, as their children had less affiliation with Pakistan. Language was often mentioned as an example of how cultural continuity was dying. Further, a significant number of mothers argued that Pakistani culture was no longer relevant to them and it was more important for their children to incorporate Muslim culture and British culture.

Only two mothers spoke about having discussions with their child about their outward appearance. In both cases the children wore headscarves and mothers wanted to ensure the children understood why they wore the headscarf and instil an inner strength in their children. These mothers worried about intolerance from other groups.

Inshallah. Before like after summer sometime she’ll start. But its something, obviously I keep installing into her, um . . . Like I don’t say: ‘Oh you have to!’ It’s always like okay, you know, this is what . . . this is what, you know what Allah wants and you know . . . make them love it, and make sure that . . . make them show that it’s not a bad thing. But you know, Alhamdolillah, but a lot of people do cover in school who are even younger than her, so I don’t think it’s asking a lot.

Aisha, British Pakistani mother

Non-immigrant White Religio-Cultural Socialisation

A popular form of religio-cultural socialisation used by mothers in this group was socialisation that dwelled on culturally relevant activities, including museums and galleries, books and discussions about history. Mothers spoke about how these activities are an important way for their children to learn about history and appreciate British tradition and the legacy of historical figures and events, as well as to increase ethnic pride. This type of socialisation was mainly found in middle class mothers.

Although, as a whole, the non-immigrant White group used a more overt style of socialisation, some mothers discussed more intrinsic levels of socialisation that took place on a daily basis. These included conversations about culture, religion and media. Mothers described how these conversations

---
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allowed them to embed certain values into their children, often relating to morality and faith. Finally, non-immigrant White mothers, unlike the mothers of the other ethnic groups, did not tend to discuss outward physical characteristics such as skin colour and phenotype with their children as part of a cultural socialisation practice. Discussions of this kind only took place in reaction to specific events.83

Language

The use of traditional languages (Hindi, Gujarati, Punjabi and Urdu) was found to be a means of cultural continuity and came up frequently in discussions with mothers from the British Indian and British Pakistani groups. In these groups, language was considered part of religio-cultural socialisation. Mothers stated how knowledge of traditional language allowed their children to understand and watch ethnic films and music, connect with relatives, function in a multicultural community and communicate easily, should they travel to India or Pakistan. Knowledge of traditional language was also felt to be a means of bringing children closer to their religion.

You never know when she’s going to have to use it. She may be told she will have to go to India for some reason. And I think because we live in this multi-cultural society . . . you know a lot of people around her are speaking Gujarati, even in school.

Lajja, British Indian mother

Language was also important as a way for children to communicate with grandparents, who were often more comfortable speaking traditional languages. For many children, grandparents and great-grandparents served as a source of learning traditional languages.

It’s quite sad like when we’ve got [the father]’s grandma round, cause she doesn’t speak any English at all. She cannot understand anything. And when she’s around and [the child]’s in the room, and she’ll speak in English and . . . and Gran’ll be like: ‘I don’t understand you.’ And then Gran will talk about good Gujarati, and [the child]’ll be like: ‘I don’t get it.’ So that’s . . . you know it’s times like that I kind of think . . . you know I wish she could speak Gujarati you know.

Anita, British Indian mother

Other sources of learning included language classes and exposure to ethnic media. In both groups, many mothers spoke about how their child understood their traditional language but did not speak it because of lack of opportunity or confidence issues. Some mothers felt they had become complacent and rarely spoke to their children in their traditional languages, because it was easier to communicate in English. Within this group, a few mothers stated they were not fluent and didn’t feel confident
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about teaching their children. Others believed that their child would just pick up the language automatically, the way they had done.

> I think it would be good if she could speak it, and I keep saying that I’m going to have days where I’m just going to speak Punjabi at home, and not speak English, and that’s going to force the issue, but you kind of get a bit lazy. Uh, maybe next year, I might send her to a Punjabi . . . classes. You know, for an hour a week.

**Shilpa, British Indian mother**

A group of British Pakistani mothers spoke about how they felt learning Urdu was now redundant, and that they would be happier for their child to learn Arabic fluently, as this would be more useful for them in understanding their faith.

> It’s not absolutely vital. It’s probably the third language in . . . in terms of priority. I’d rather she learned Arabic . . . that’s more important. Urdu’ll help her to connect to her grandparents. But once that generation has passed on . . . I can’t see any long-term benefit in it for myself.

**Saima, British Pakistani mother**

Finally, there was a group of mothers who felt it was unimportant for their children to learn their traditional languages, because those languages would be of very little use to them since they were British. These mothers wanted their children to have a strong grasp of English, first.

> I’m happy that they’re confident more and they express themselves better in English, than having two languages which they neither can excel in. I quite like the fact . . . they’re . . . they’re getting quite good at speaking English.

**Feroz, British Indian mother**

**Egalitarianism: ‘—the insides of us is exactly the same to everybody’**

The above statement, made by a non-immigrant White mother named Tracy, summarises the ethos behind egalitarianism-based parenting strategies. Alongside religio-cultural socialisation, this was the most common form of ERS practice used by parents in the non-immigrant White and British Indian groups. It was mentioned less in the discussion with British Pakistani mothers, who spoke more about religio-cultural socialisation. The egalitarianism style of parenting was multifaceted. It was discussed in four main ways and these were similar in each group, although the extent to which they were shown was different.
The first egalitarian trait to be discussed was openness, which revolved around mothers’ statements about the importance of disregarding differences between groups and of not using race as a basis for making decisions. Such parenting was rooted in acceptance of diversity and involved mothers having diverse friendship patterns, community links, neighbourhoods and work environments. This was the most frequently discussed egalitarianism principle. Mothers stated it was ‘wrong to be unkind to someone because of the way they looked’, as well as that individuals were ‘all being human beings’ and ‘equal.’ These mothers viewed skin colour and religion as unimportant, and they transmitted these messages to their children. A number of mothers stated that their children had friends from different races and faiths, yet their children didn’t notice these differences. One British Indian mother, Deepa, felt it was more important to teach her child about what it meant to be a good person and friend.

*My kids are very accepting of all. I said to them, Chinese, Black, White, whatever. It’s the person. We all look different, it doesn’t make any, you know. It’s the person. If the person is nice. You know, has a good heart is honest. A good heart is important. And I always teach them if someone is a good friend if they like you for what you are, that is important.*

Deepa, British Indian mother

Another mother, Olivia, spoke about her child’s and her own friends.

*Yeah. So, and then [the child] has got um . . . uh . . . a lot of our friends we have are mixed . . . have got a mixed race, um . . . different races. Mixed Spanish, French, Afro-Caribbean.*

Olivia, non-immigrant White mother

A few British Pakistani mothers stated that their religious beliefs required them to have egalitarianism beliefs, thus they socialised their children using such messages. Others discussed using religion as a tool to explain equality and avoid complicated discussions about race and ethnicity. One practicing Muslim mother, Hira, stated that she chose to send her child to a state mixed school rather than a private faith school, as she felt her child would learn more about the importance of treating individuals equally and other valuable life lessons.

*With her . . . I say, you know, Allah made everybody. You know everybody in sight of Allah is equal. You know. We . . . we are not here to judge anybody. So with her, it’s always like be good to other people. Allah will be happy with you. It’s . . . she’s only seven.*

Hira, British Pakistani mother

The second way mothers used egalitarianism was in direct conversations with their children. These conversations could be either proactive or reactive in nature. Proactive conversations usually formed
part of an egalitarianism parenting agenda and represented more planned discussions. For example, one British Indian mother, Madhu, often had discussions about equality with her child when her own friends from different backgrounds visited, and she actively encouraged and often initiated such conversations. Another Pakistani mother, Shazia, felt it was her responsibility to ensure that her child was exposed to multiculturalism, in order for her child to understand that an individuals’ qualities are important, not the way they look. This type of egalitarianism was less common than reactive-based parenting.

That is my responsibility to make sure she has an idea of what multiculturalism is. I have a lot of friends who are not Muslim, who are not even Asian, who are Black, who are White, who are Catholic, who are Hindu, who are Sikh, and I make sure that she is aware of that, that I socialise, that we have friends over and she is aware that we live in a society which is not just Muslim. So it's my responsibility and my husband’s as well, and I have taken that on and I understand I have that responsibility.

Shazia, British Pakistani mother

Reactive egalitarian-based conversations occurred in response to mothers and children witnessing discrimination or being victims of discrimination, or children being exposed to media around this topic. One non-immigrant White mother, Helen, came to learn, in a conversation with her child, that a particular group was being targeted by other children at school. She discussed speaking to her child about the importance of equality and standing up to racism.

One of the things that the girls have told me at school. There’s quite a large Roma community now . . . and she said a lot of the children at school are really horrible. Calling them gypsies and things. Yeah. I know, so I said to [the child]. You really need to challenge people if they’re saying things like that.

Helen, non-immigrant White mother

Mothers also spoke about how they had reactive conversations with their children following gatherings with relatives, who sometimes had racist opinions about other groups. One example of this came from a discussion with a British Indian mother, Smita, who felt that her brother was being Islamophobic in front of her daughter. She discussed telling her child that his opinions were incorrect and how important it was to treat everyone the same.

To me I’ve got no problem, because, like, um, I’ve got loads of Muslim friends and like I’ve got people saying . . . ‘You sure you can trust them mate?’ and I’m like, well I can trust them . . . I’m, you know, I’m old enough to make decisions . . . but they make stupid snide remarks . . . and I just say, ‘Look just don’t do that in front of my kids’. Like even my brother, and I sort of look at him, and like, it’s just like . . . he’s going through this anti-Muslim cycle, but . . . I would never be like that with my daughter.

Smita, British Indian mother
Some types of ethnic-racial socialisation parenting were also found to occur simultaneously. Egalitarianism techniques sometimes occurred alongside preparation for bias and silence about race. Egalitarianism was also used as a means of instilling self-worth in children. This often occurred when individuals encountered discrimination directly. This type of dual socialisation was found in non-immigrant White families as well as British Pakistani families. An example of this was noted in a discussion with a non-immigrant White mother, Tracy, when she spoke of the racism experienced by her child and how she used egalitarianism-based discussions to make him stronger and prepare him for any further bias he may encounter.

_We’ve got a girl that lives on the top floor. Um she had some friends over and obviously they’re not White. And um, he was playing downstairs with some friends and they were calling them like ‘White rats’. And you know – the names. I just sit there and my attitude is . . . you’re no different, you are a different colour but you’re no different to us. You know so I do explain to him, you know, I won’t have it. I won’t have racism at all. So I don’t agree with it. Because I do believe we’re just all the same. It doesn’t matter where we’re from or who we are. We’re still human. We still have feelings, you know._

_Tracy, non-immigrant White mother_

Mothers were sometimes silent about race, and used their silence as an egalitarianism-based parenting strategy. One example was in the discussion with a British Pakistani mother, Saima, who felt that it was important not to highlight equality or differences to her child, as her child did ‘not see colour’ and she believed that discussing race would heighten differences in her child’s life.

_Never. I don’t even want her to be . . . aware of such a problem . . . because . . . she’s never actually questioned why some people are black and why some people are white. We talk about colour of skin . . . but it’s just seen as a matter of fact. Because it’s not an issue for me. You know, it . . . for her it’s . . . race . . . colour of skin. It’s not really an issue._

_Saima, British Pakistani mother_

Egalitarianism also occurred when mothers noted that their own children had been involved in discrimination. Mothers used discussions about equality to help children understand intolerance is wrong. This type of parenting was discussed by only non-immigrant White mothers. An example was found in the case of Anna.

_She . . . the teacher rang up the other day saying that [the child] made a racist remark, and she didn’t know where she’d got it from. She said something . . . about another child. And mentioned that she was Black . . . something like, I don’t like playing with little Black girls. I don’t know where she got that from, but um, and I was quite shocked . . . Well, I suppose . . . I can’t remember exactly what I said, but something along the lines of it . . . you know you can’t dislike somebody just because of the colour of their skin. Or because of what they believe in, or whatever._
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The fourth type of egalitarian socialisation was proactive in nature and found in many families. It occurred when mothers exposed their children to diverse practices, foods, cultural artefacts and other multicultural activities. Mothers spoke of the importance of learning about diversity, different religions and tolerance. One non-immigrant White mother, Emily, spoke about how she celebrated different festivals with her child and took her to different religious places of worship. Other families stated actively celebrating festivals from other religions.

Emily, non-immigrant White mother

I think she’s aware, that . . . in a class of Muslims, Sikhs, Hindus . . . and Christians . . . she is, um, a Sikh, but we have a Christmas tree up in the front room so you know I don’t think that causes confusion. It’s just Sikhs are quite good about sort of embracing other religions and learning from them anyway. So I don’t find that a contradiction or anything. Some people would find that really weird.

Madhu, British Indian mother

I think it is important to be exposed to different cultures. Different races, different faiths at . . . . So that you become, you know, um, respectful of other . . . other people and . . . and more aware of their, you know, I would him want him to know about Hinduism. I would want him to know about Judaism and Christianity and respect their faiths, festivals and things, because we were brought up like that.

Parveen, British Pakistani mother

Egalitarianism, therefore, occurred across different contexts and had numerous functions. The family, school and media were all shown to influence this type of socialisation. Schools, in particular, were found to play a strong role in encouraging egalitarianism, and many mothers spoke of this. School is a place where children are exposed to diversity though other pupils, but also an environment where children actively learn about other cultural practices and differences. One mother, Arthi spoke about how the process of making her child’s school a multicultural-friendly environment had been a slow but successful one. Another mother, Emma, found that the zero tolerance policy towards racism held by schools and lessons in equality helped her as a parent.

Emma, non-immigrant White mother

But their school’s very good. I think it . . . it’s always good, sort of mixture of kids and if . . . if anything’s heard by teachers, or anything . . . or anything’s reported, they do pick it up very quickly, which is great.

There were a number of reasons why mothers chose to use egalitarianism socialisation practices, including humanitarian reasons as well as more practical ones. Mothers spoke of the importance of their children learning tolerance and being exposed to different cultures and religions, and not having ‘a line of judgment’. Diversity was also seen to stimulate creativity in children. Further, the
importance of children being able to understand how to function well in diverse neighbourhoods when interacting with others, was mentioned. One British Indian mother, Shilpa, stated that being raised in a diverse neighbourhood made her a ‘tougher’ person. She wanted her child to also have the same ‘rough edge’. A number of parents expressed the desire to convey to their children that they should treat people the way they, in turn, want to be treated. Another reason for mothers teaching children about equality was because they believed it would allow their children to be confident and proud of their own culture, religion and beliefs, and this pride would enable them to maintain a strong identity and high self-esteem.

The egalitarianism-based parenting approach was therefore a very dynamic one, used often by parents to help their children understand the society in which they interacted. It also seems to be the method that is most in line with multicultural governmental policy. However, in the non-immigrant White group, a few mothers discussed finding it hard to parent this way, as they felt there was an imbalance in the communities in which their children grew up, in that they were minority dominated, and their children did feel very different from their neighbours.

*It does concern me a little bit. Um, that there aren’t . . . there isn’t more of a mixture in his school now. Um, we went through a stage a couple of years ago with my older son, when he came home and said he didn’t want blonde hair. Because everyone was dark . . . and he was the only one, so it was really like having the tide turn. And made you feel bad, because I’ve always said to them, it’s great that they’ve got so many different friends from different backgrounds.*

Emma, non-immigrant White mother

A number of mothers also found that political correctness was a hindrance in effectively discussing issues relating to race with their children, for fear that they would repeat things at school that may be taken the wrong way. For these mothers, egalitarianism based parenting strategies sometimes diverged from reality

*[The child] said the other day about . . . ‘Oh look at the Muslim in the long dress.’ And [the sibling] said, ‘Don’t say that, it’s not very nice!’ And I said, but it’s true . . . he’s just stating fact, being at his age, but that doesn’t mean you know, that’s wrong, because it’s true. You know a lot of the time, I find in schools, if a child was heard saying that . . . they would probably say, ‘Oh that’s a bit wrong.’*

Hannah, non-immigrant White mother
Preparation for Bias

Preparation for bias was found in all groups, illustrating that it is not only a minority parenting strategy, but also a majority parenting strategy. This reflected the highly multicultural nature of the neighbourhoods in which the families lived. Preparation for bias was complex, often existing alongside other parenting strategies, particularly egalitarianism and silence about race. Another aspect of preparation for bias was the form in which it took, with mothers acting either proactively or reactively. In proactive approaches, mothers tried to ensure that their children had all of the tools needed to cope with prejudice as well as the skills needed to avoid prejudice. Reactive parenting was less anticipatory in nature and was not part of a parenting agenda. As discussed above, it was often linked to a particular incident or series of incidents around race. Mothers used different approaches to guide and explain the event to their children, such as encouraging them to ignore the event, downplaying the race element of the event and equipping their children with emotional coping strategies.

In the British Indian group, there were fewer examples of this type of parenting. Mothers discussed incidents of their child being exposed to media images and spoke of how they encouraged their child to ignore what they had witnessed. A number of mothers in this group felt their child was too young to cope with understanding race and discrimination and so they chose not to broach the subject, even when the child had witnessed or been part of a race-related incident. Some mothers used the explanation that only a minority of people were racist, and the child should just ignore them.

*Umm, he [the child] was studying at school and there is a Pakistani child there and they said to them, 'Sikhs are no good, we hate Sikhs', and I told him, 'Look, son, not everyone is the same, you know.'*

*Rani, British Indian mother*

Only one mother from the British Indian group discussed using a proactive stance when parenting. She spoke to her child about being independent and fighting for his rights. This was in anticipation of future experiences of discrimination

Overall, in the British Pakistani group, a large number of mothers discussed the use of preparation for bias parenting, and there was a fairly equal mixture of mothers using the proactive versus reactive approach. British Pakistani mothers seemed to anticipate that their children would encounter more discrimination. Similar to mothers from the two other groups, some mothers used the discussion of ‘people being horrible to one another’ as a way of talking about racism without talking about the
‘full-blown subject’. For some families, it was a discussion that came up often, and mothers were very straightforward in how they discussed the subject, with the child knowing that discrimination was negative. A group of mothers discussed anticipation that their child would face prejudice from a young age. This anticipation was found more frequently in mothers and children who wore niqab or hijabs.

The more reactive types of preparation strategies often followed Islamophobic incidents. Mothers frequently downplayed incidents or used other means to help the child emotionally to come to terms with the incident. One mother, Feroz, talked about a time when she wore a niqab and a group of teenagers insulted her in front of her children, which made them get very angry.

I used to wear a niqab . . . I did it because I thought that that would make me closer to Allah. Then I got lots of uh . . . racist . . . actually to my face. I used to get people walking by me, effing at me and my children. I could see it was affecting the children. You know, my older son. There would be a certain group of teenagers. We used to walk past the high school. And they would say to, you know, like uh, comments. Just rude. You know, just eff . . . or um, just derogatory comments really. It would be . . . and . . . and then he was getting angry. He was only eight or nine at the time.

Feroz, British Pakistani mother

Feroz worried that, as a result of this racism, her children would be very negative in their views towards White people. She tried to explain to her children that troublemakers are only a minority.

He would say, he goes, ‘I’m not going to go to that school’. And he was . . . you know determined, too . . . I think that was actually quite . . . and I found that really sad. I just thought . . . that . . . you know that he shouldn’t discriminate against a whole bunch of people because there’s a few idiots. I used to feel we were vulnerable.

Feroz, British Pakistani mother

Another British Pakistani mother, Shazia, discussed downplaying an incident to her child when a woman was racist at a local swimming pool. She told the child that the woman was ‘ignorant and rude’ and ‘didn’t understand things’. This served as a means of protecting her child at a young age and creating an explanation that would not upset her daughter.

In the non-immigrant White group, most discussion around racial intolerance was in direct response to a race-related incident that had occurred in the mother or child’s life and was, therefore, a reactive strategy. The event may have come up in the media, through an experience at school or an everyday routine. For example, one mother, Tracy, encouraged her child to ignore news reports when they related to racism, and tried to answer her child’s questions in a neutral way.
Probably if it’s just come up on the news . . . if he hears it. Obviously there is quite a lot of it, so he will ask questions about and I’ll try and explain what’s going on, and I don’t know, I just kind of say to him that you need to ignore it babe, and . . . just kind of get on with it. Don’t bite back to it if it happens. It’s . . . because it just seems to be that that’s what they want.

*Tracy, non-immigrant White mother*

Mothers who ignored racist incidents or downplayed them tended to do so as part of a protective approach. Stephanie, a non-immigrant White mother, used this approach. She narrated an incident in which her child wanted to eat halal food at his school canteen. The child was copying his Muslim friend, but was told ‘No!’ by the dinner lady because he was ‘not Muslim’. This event upset her child, who came home and asked, ‘Mum, am I only allowed to eat Christian food?’

*Fair enough if they only order so much in that they can’t give it to everybody but there are ways of kind of explaining that to children. I thought you are not really helping by dealing with it like that, by saying, ‘Well you can have that but you can’t have it because you are clearly not a Muslim child you are a white English child and you are not allowed to have it!*  

*Stephanie, non-immigrant White mother*

Stephanie was forced to discuss with her child why this had happened. She explained that Muslims had separate diets and, in this way, helped her son cope with the emotional aspects of the event.

*So I had to kind of explain it to him, but even myself I was thinking – it’s a bit bad. I think sometimes schools don’t deal with things in the correct way, even though they do try. Suppose things like that you wouldn’t call a racist incident, but it shows the differences – it’s making him aware of the differences between everyone when really there was no need for it or it could have been dealt with in a more positive way.*  

*Stephanie, non-immigrant White mother*

She spoke about being appalled by the behaviour of the school dinner lady and made a complaint.

*I thought really – you know schools go on about bullying and racism and all the rest of it . . . like they do their projects and everything like that. But things like that are a simple thing to a six-year-old and he was like, completely confused by it and didn’t know what they were talking about and why he couldn’t have it.*  

*Stephanie, non-immigrant White mother*

Another example of an incident described by a non-immigrant White mother that took place, again, at school, involved the child’s ten-year-old brother being accused of being racist towards a Black child by another mother at his school. This had resulted in the brother being put on probation for two weeks.
When one of my other sons was in primary school, um, he . . . he didn’t like this boy in his class. And his mother said it’s because he’s . . . he’s um, he’s racist, he doesn’t want to play with my son because he’s Black. And, um, so the school kind of pointed out that all of [the brother]’s other friends were Black, and so they didn’t understand how this could be . . . construed as racism. Anyway, so then they . . . they said what they had to do was they observed [the brother] for two weeks. Watched him play. Watched him to do this, and had to write everything down . . . That was their policy.

Hailey, non-immigrant White mother

This mother (Hailey) was forced to answer some tough questions to her son, regarding why he had been placed on probation. The school agreed that the child had been wrongfully accused, yet they still placed him on probation to appease the school board and the other mother. These events impacted Hailey’s parenting of her younger son, and she discussed her choice to remain silent about racism with him because of how much the incident had affected his brother. She felt that this was the most effective means of protecting her child.

The part of it that I found really difficult, was cause then I had to sit down and talk to [the brother] about racism. And . . . and discuss what it meant, and he . . . he didn’t really . . . he didn’t get it. Do you know what I mean? And he was about the same age as [the child] is now. And he didn’t get it, and it just kind of confused him. So, for that reason, I’ve never really. I’ve never brought . . . brought the topic up, because I just . . . you know, just from previous experience.

Hailey, non-immigrant White mother

As discussed above, some mothers chose to use an egalitarian explanation to help their children understand that, even though they had been victimised, every person is equal and the people who had been racist were a small minority. This served as a means of coping with emotional consequences of discrimination.

The non-immigrant White group also used proactive strategies of preparation for bias. Mothers explained how they discussed with their child the changing nature of British society in order to help them understand diversity and the negative elements that could sometimes arise from it. Non-immigrant White Mothers anticipated that their child would either be discriminated against because they were sometimes a minority, but also being targeted as a perpetrator of racism. In the first case, one mother, Emma, discussed speaking to her child about immigration and how being born in Britain meant ‘non-White people could be British’. Another mother, Hannah, felt angry that White people were so easily accused of being racist. She stated that her far-removed ancestors were bigots who discriminated against minorities, but not her. She explained this to her daughter.
I might say something and then someone might say, ‘Oh, you’re racist’, and I’ll be like . . . or they’ll have a chip on their shoulder, and be like saying about the slaves back in the day. And I’m like, but that wasn’t me. Wasn’t even my Nan. Wasn’t even my great Nan. Probably went way back, you know, and like it’s . . . it’s just like we need to get over that now, and just deal with what we’re at.

Hannah, non-immigrant White mother

Promotion of Mistrust

When mothers passed on messages to their children about avoiding interaction with members from particular ethnic groups or being careful when interacting with them, they were using promotion of mistrust. Such messages were transmitted either directly, or in more subtle ways. Examples of this were when mothers directly stressed to their children the importance of maintaining ingroup relations or spoke to their children about being vigilant in their interactions with outgroup members. Overall, this type of socialisation was found in few mothers and was fairly equal across each of the groups. During interviews, mistrust sometimes came out in isolated comments while, at other times, it was obvious that derogatory comments about a particular group were being made.

There were a few recurring areas in which promotion emerged, with some being group-specific and others found in all groups. In the British Indian group, one unique type of promotion of mistrust parenting was that a few mothers seemed to show internal discrimination towards first-generation Indian mothers and their children. One mother discussed her awareness that children from India with ‘accents’ were picked on, and she felt that her son may be involved in that harassment. According to this mother, first-generation Indian families were ‘a bit backward’.

A few British Pakistani mothers expressed feelings of mistrust towards the non-immigrant White group. These were mainly comments that were repeated in front of the child, relating to stereotypes about English culture. For example, one mother felt that while some English mothers parented their children in a very responsible way, others had ‘lost the plot’.

You know, they don’t mind . . . like these have single parents and things like that. There’s no sort of society really is there . . . there’s no family or kinship or anything. The goriya.84 They’re horrible . . . you know they’re like single parents who live in council flats . . . They don’t. Definitely. I don’t think they’ve got any aspirations. They just breed kids, and then when they’re sixteen, they want them off their hands. No seriously that’s what it’s like.

Fatima, British Pakistani mother

84 Goryia is literally translated to white person, and is often used in a derogatory way.
Some British Pakistani mothers discussed their feeling that not all English culture was compatible with their beliefs, and how they would be careful in their parenting practices. As one mother, Hira, put it, ‘I don’t want her to completely absorb every single aspect of it. I want her to reject a lot of major parts of British culture.’

In the non-immigrant White group, a few mothers discussed having negative feelings towards Muslims, for not integrating into mainstream society and not being respectful towards others’ beliefs. These mothers gave examples of Muslim mothers not allowing children to go on school trips when the destination was a place of worship (other than a mosque), not allowing their children to visit the White mothers’ homes and discouraging Christmas events at school. Some mothers were very direct in their discussion about their dislike for Muslims, which their children could easily pick up on. However, children are more likely to pick up on their parents’ actions.

Well we had a real troublemaker lady who was round there. An Irish lady, uh, who was a convert. And she was the worst Muslim. Yeah, and you know she caused a lot of problems for everybody. In a sense of we couldn’t call our Christmas Fair, ‘Christmas Fair’. We had to call it ‘Winter Fair’. You know, all these . . . there’s all, lot of issues surrounding it . . . And you know, all of our children would celebrate Eid, Divali like everybody else, but a lot of their congregation would boycott the Christmas thing. So it’s . . . it’s kind of like that really. Um, which in a way does make you feel a bit racist. Like sometimes it really does make you feel that way.

Hannah, non-immigrant White mother

I’m not saying they can’t have it, but at the end of the day . . . you know if you want our children to suffer . . . because they have to have Eid off . . . I think that . . . Christmas should be the holidays.

Charlotte, non-immigrant White mother

One British Pakistani mother, Parveen, whose child was on the receiving end of prejudice, spoke of an incident at her child’s school in which non-immigrant White parents were using clearly discriminatory practices in the way in which they invited children to their child’s birthday party. This example is an interesting as it clearly shows promotion of mistrust in practice and the repercussions of that practice in the receiving group.

Because I know a parent in her class . . . White . . . invited all the White people to the child’s birthday . . . but no Asians, and no Blacks . . . and when I see the child’s dad, he just gives you a big blank look and I even said, ‘It’s because I’m Asian? I know it is . . . and you think, where’s the children going to get it from? If that’s what they see at school. You know ‘We’re going to invite all the White people from your class to your birthday, but no one else.’

Parveen, British Pakistani mother
The type of schools that mothers chose to send their children to also demonstrated promotion of mistrust. Two mothers from the non-immigrant White group discussed their unhappiness with the lack of White children in their child’s school and their worry that their child would not have White friends. One mother felt forced to change her child’s school as a result of this. In their discussion, the mothers conveyed feelings of protectiveness for their children, alongside feelings that they wanted their children to have ingroup friends, which pointed to another dimension of promotion of mistrust.

Some aspects of promotion of mistrust were found in more than one group. For instance, some mothers discussed negative and racist feelings towards Black and mixed-race individuals. These feelings were often discussed in front of the child and, in some instances, escalated further. The child’s future marriage and partner choice was also something that mothers were already thinking of, particularly in the case of female children, despite their children being very young. Some mothers from the British Indian group discussed not wanting their child to marry outside of their caste, while mothers from the British Pakistani group as well as the Indian group stated that they would not want their child to marry outside of nationality or religion. A minority of mothers in each group discussed not wanting their child to marry someone from another racial group. One Indian mother discussed speaking to her elder daughter about this and ensuring her younger daughter knew about her feelings, as well.

*I say ‘No, hold on a second, we’ve got to have a boundary here.’ And okay fair enough if you get married out of caste its okay, but you can’t get married out of colour.*

Arthi, British Indian mother

Another British Indian mother, Aasha, said she would ‘die’ if her daughter said to her, ‘I want to marry a Black guy’. In the non-immigrant White group, a few mothers also spoke about their worry that their child would marry outside of their ethnic group. In one example, a non-immigrant White mother, Tracy, narrated how she had told her child it was acceptable for her to like boys, provided they were not Black.

*Well I was talking to her and . . . one of my eldest said something about, ‘Oh you should have seen this boy’. And [the child] went, ‘He’s Black’. So I said well that’s fine, as long as you don’t marry him. And I didn’t mean that in a racist way, and then she said to me I was racist. So I said, ‘Oh why am I that?’ ‘Because you don’t like Black people,’ I said, ‘No, it’s not that I don’t like . . .’ and it’s really hard to under . . . explain to a six-year-old that it’s not because I don’t like Black people. I wouldn’t . . . I know it’s not my choice. But I wouldn’t want [a sibling] to go and marry a Black person . . . And you can’t explain that . . . It’s hard to explain that to her.*

Tracy, non-immigrant White mother
The child happened to repeat these comments in school.

and then she come home. One of the little boys. They were playing, and he went, ‘[The child], marry me!’ He’s Black. And she went, ‘I can’t. My Mum said I can’t marry Black people.’

Tracy, non-immigrant White mother

The child was then labelled a racist at school and the mother, in order to end the ordeal, persuaded the child that it had all been a joke, and decided to discuss it further with her when she felt she would understand better.

Silence About Race

There were four main situations in which mothers chose to remain silent about race, namely: (1) in relation to a racial trauma, (2) when the child was too young, (3) when the issue had not arisen, and (4) in order to promote egalitarianism in the child and encourage them to disregard difference. The fourth reason has been discussed above in the section on egalitarianism; therefore, the first three will be discussed here.

Some mothers who had been involved in a racist incident and had been victimised either recently or in the past, chose to stay silent, as they did not want their children to suffer. In some cases, children may have been involved in the racial incident, but the mother chose to remain silent about it. This was found in mothers from all ethnic groups.

And I remember a few years ago, I was driving along, and then there was a chap in a white van, and he was driving really fast, and I . . . you know . . . uh, I think he was at fault. And he drived [sic] past and he put two fingers up and he called me Paki. And I was really offended and I felt almost sick. Because you hadn’t heard that phrase . . . and then I heard [the child] . . . And I just felt . . . I felt really violated, and I felt really awful . . . and I just stayed quiet because well I thought, well I don’t want her to be exposed to that.

Shilpa, British Indian mother

We’ve always tried to protect our children from racism, cause I think it can be quite traumatic. I mean I think I am, a little bit traumatised by it and my experiences with it.

Parveen, British Pakistani mother

Mothers also discussed their choice to remain silent, asserting their children were too young to cope with such a subject. One mother, Arthi, described this as: ‘So why put something on his head he doesn’t need to have on his head’. Choosing to stay silent was a protective mechanism for many mothers.
No, because I think she’s too young to understand and also there’s no benefit to doing that, at this age. Yeah, I suppose when you bring up your kids, you want to sort of, um, partly cushion them, but also make sure that they’re confident enough to understand that it’s not them, and it’s not personal thing, it’s a problem with the other person. It’s an issue that’s out there but it doesn’t have to be a constant chip on their shoulders.

Madhu, British Indian mother

Finally, a number of mothers said that the reason they had not spoken about race or ethnicity to their children was because the issue had never arisen and they didn’t feel the need to bring it up. Some mothers also said that they would reconsider if their children ever brought up the issue.

We don’t have to really. It’s never come up. Never.

Olivia, non-immigrant White mother

Events Mothers Reported or Observed

Multiculturalism and Contemporary Britain

This theme explored attitudes towards increased diversity in the communities being studied.

Feelings About Multiculturalism and Diversity

There were a number of reactions to multiculturalism in each ethnic group. Some of these were group-specific while others were more universal. The responses included: (1) overall positive feelings, including advantages of diversity for children, (2) feelings of positively embracing multiculturalism by actively choosing specific multicultural neighbourhoods in which to bring up children, (3) worries about multiculturalism linked to worries about the child (particularly in the non-immigrant White group), (4) feelings of resignation towards multiculturalism (i.e. a ‘nothing we can do’ attitude towards increased diversity), (5) averse feelings towards immigration and its link to increasing multiculturalism, (6) feelings of change occurring at a very rapid pace across the lifespan of three generations of a family,85 (7) feelings that ‘informal segregation’ was occurring in the non-immigrant White group,86 and lastly, (8) feelings within British Indian and British Pakistani families of security and safety in regards to living in extremely ethnically diverse environments (imbalanced multiculturalism).87

85 Mostly found in the non-immigrant White group.
86 Discussed further as a separate sub-theme: ‘Informal Segregation’
87 Discussed further as a separate sub-theme: ‘Imbalanced Multiculturalism’
Positive feelings towards multiculturalism and diversity were found in mothers who stated that it allowed their children and themselves to learn about different cultures, people, and religions, thus fostering tolerance and harmony. One mother stated it enabled a ‘truer understanding of people’.

The impact of multiculturalism on the child came up frequently. Mothers discussed that the child growing up in such a varied environment encountering different languages, foods and cultures would make them ‘open-minded’ and knowledgeable. Diversity was also discussed as something that would foster creativity in the child.

Oh yeah. I mean . . . part of it is the experience of growing up in a . . . in a community which is um, so mixed in terms of race and background. I mean . . . also in terms of the diversity of what . . . what people do . . . I like the fact that there’s lots of people round here who do interesting things . . . so you get lots of people who are doing . . . creative things. I think it’s very good for you as a human being

Emily, non-immigrant White mother

A number of mothers highlighted worries relating to multiculturalism. Others spoke about feelings of resignation towards multiculturalism. These views tended to be more negative than positive and were reported more in the non-immigrant White group than the others. Mothers felt powerless to affect the increasing change and had to accept that their children would interact with children from different backgrounds.

Umm . . . it’s hard to say because . . . to be honest, if . . . I . . . wherever you go. I mean, unless you move out somewhere. You’re gonna . . . you know, without being racist, or whatever . . . you’re going to get them everywhere. No matter what they are, so, you’ve got to learn to accept it . . . and you’ve got to accept that she’s going to have friends . . . of all different races and that.

Charlotte, non-immigrant White mother

Negative feelings about increased multiculturalism also came to the fore in conversations on immigration. Increased diversity was felt to be associated with increased immigration, and this, in turn was associated with mothers’ worries about their child’s future in terms of jobs and other opportunities. These feelings were found in all groups, including the British Indian and British Pakistani groups, despite the grandparents of the ethnic minority families being immigrants themselves, thus highlighting a sense of now belonging to Britain.

88 These are discussed as separate sub-themes: ‘Celebrating Englishness’, ‘English as a Second Language’ and ‘Informal Segregation’.
Discussion of generational differences occurred frequently in the non-immigrant White group. Mothers talked about the changing face of Britain and the speed with which this had taken place across their own lives and their parents’ lives, and how their children were now growing up in an incredibly different environment. A number of mothers discussed feeling that there was a significant difference in the make-up of the classroom.

*You know when I went to school there was one child with a brown face in the class, and that was it.*

**Emma, non-immigrant White mother**

**Celebrating ‘Englishness’**

Celebrating ‘Englishness’ related to the feelings of a few non-immigrant White mothers about their culture being marginalised by schools. Mothers felt very strongly that state primary schools found ethnic minority culture to be more important than their own, and some felt resentful about this. St George’s day and Nativity plays were the two main examples of cultural practices they felt were being sidelined. One mother, Dianne, held the government responsible for what she felt was too much political correctness.

*Um, and particularly things like, um . . . St George’s Day for example. The fact that we’re not allowed to have it as a national holiday. You know we’re not allowed to celebrate, um, you know . . . and it’s considered racist if you put up an England flag in your window. Or things like that . . . I think this country has got far too politically correct. Um, you know, to the detriment of the indigenous population . . . I think there isn’t enough emphasis on, um . . . on English culture and English history, really.*

**Dianne, non-immigrant White mother**

A subgroup of these mothers were those mothers who found it difficult to define what their culture was, which seems to point to an interesting contradiction in their cultural beliefs and actions.

In some interviews, racist undertones were detected that may be linked to promotion of bias and Islamophobia. However, these were isolated cases.

---

89 See ‘Non-immigrant White Culture’, above.

90 Discussed further in the subtheme: ‘Islamophobia’
I mean, take for instance, they go and see, um, the mosque and bits and pieces, but they never ever go and visit a church. And at Christmas . . . but they don’t do a nativity. Now, that does get to me . . . I think it is a bad thing, because at the end of the day, anybody, um, if they’ve come into this country . . . we go by British laws. If we went to Saudi Arabia . . . we’d have to . . . I’d have to go by their rules. I wouldn’t be able to . . . the way they dress. Or whatever, um . . . you know . . . They should embrace what we do here or go back.

Charlotte, non-immigrant White mother

Overall, in most instances, non-immigrant mothers were happy for their children to learn about other religions and cultures, provided they celebrated Englishness also.

English as a Second Language

This sub-theme refers to the worry some mothers had that their children were being held back academically, particularly in English language classes, because of excess diversity. This was limited to a small number of mothers in the non-immigrant White group. Increasing multiculturalism and school policies were found to be responsible for this concern. One mother felt that schools held high overall rankings to be of greater importance than the education of each individual child, and that schools prioritised getting children to speak English at only a basic level, particularly if it was not their first language (as in the case of immigrant children). This meant that the children who spoke English fluently were not being challenged enough. The term ‘English as a second language’ was often used to highlight those children who did not speak English confidently. This issue was sometimes tied to the immigration debate and was intermingled with resentment for a range of other issues.

I know that some friends, further in . . . in Walthamstow . . . are feeling very antsy, because the balance in the school they’re at, is . . . the White indigenous British kids . . . or particularly kids with English as a first language are now, in . . . are very much in a small minority. And they’re not increasing the staffing levels. To the point where the feeling is, it’s my . . . my children are suffering education-wise . . . because there’s not enough support for the language thing . . . so actually the educational experience is changing because you haven’t got people upon an equal playing field.

Emily, non-immigrant White mother

And then I hear . . . and then some . . . sometimes some of my White friends, I would hear things like, um, you can’t get seen in A&E because there’s all these immigrants and um, and then they would say the thing about English as a second language at school. ‘How can my child get on if nobody speaks English?’ That kind of thing.

Helen, non-immigrant White mother
However, some families embraced the fact that English was not universally spoken, feeling it added diversity to the classroom and offered a way for their children to learn more about different languages.

‘Informal’ segregation

‘Informal’ segregation is a complex sub-theme that many White mothers discussed. It refers to the existence of neighbourhoods with high proportions of ethnic minorities and low proportions of the majority group. One reason for these neighbourhoods is the outward migration from the neighbourhood of many non-immigrant White families, with minority groups choosing to stay. The White families that do remain in these minority-dominated neighbourhoods experience a shift in the balance of demographics, causing some to worry. A number of mothers were very forthcoming about expressing concerns, whilst others expressed anxieties more indirectly. Mothers stated that they worried about their child not having anyone from their own ethnic group to ‘identify’ with at school, currently and in the future.

As I say, there is nobody in his class that he could really identify with on that level because a lot of the children there have been brought up in a different – not a different way, but probably some of them have been brought up differently but obviously it isn’t the same. As much as they all play together and they get on, um, I would like there to be more White children.

**Stephanie, non-immigrant White mother**

A number of White mothers discussed the importance of their child having a friend from the same ethnic group. They also felt that children and families from other minority groups excluded their children from parties and play dates. This exclusion may have been intentional or unintentional. In her narrative, Hannah begins with a clarification that she is not being racist; this shows that she feels insecure about expressing her worries about her child being possibly marginalised by other children.

Yeah. I mean, I’m not racist at all, but I do feel . . . I mean my eldest son . . . he’s . . . he’s one of two White people in his class. So to me, that’s unfair. Because it should be . . . if it’s going to be multi-cultural, let it be multi-cultural. Not one-sided . . . do you know what I mean? . . . But a lot of the time, you find they’re actually quite racist. Um, [child] bless him, he doesn’t get invites to their houses, or . . . you know so it is my close friends that we deal with.

**Hannah, non-immigrant White mother**

Mothers from the non-immigrant White ethnic group, therefore, were concerned with the imbalance in the classroom and neighbourhoods in which they lived, and particularly that their child might
stand out as being different from the others. Some mothers actually changed their child’s school, as they worried about their child being marginalised. Anna spoke about the experience she had with her child and their new school after moving to a new, extremely multicultural, area.

When she started going to school there . . . it’s really interesting, but we felt really . . . there were no other people like us. It’s really hard to explain. There were no other White middle class . . . people with their kids there. There’s a very, very big community of Pakistani, Muslim kids, and Somali Muslim . . . kids, and so a lot . . . lot of the people [the child] made friends with were Muslim girls, and they weren’t allowed to mix with her out of school. I don’t know. And it was quite a big issue, and just us not feeling that there was anyone else like us . . . and so we changed . . . to [another] school.

Anna, non-immigrant White mother

Not all mothers viewed this imbalance as completely negative, with some non-immigrant White mothers actively choosing to live in very multicultural neighbourhoods and embracing diversity.91

I’ve always said to them, it’s great that they’ve got so many different friends from different backgrounds, and . . . because that’s why I came in such an area, and I feel if we didn’t feel happy with that and want to embrace that, then we would move somewhere else.

Emma, non-immigrant White mother

Imbalanced Multiculturalism

Imbalanced multiculturalism relates to the perspectives of British Indian and British Pakistani mothers living in fairly homogenous communities made up of a few predominant ethnic minority groups. Imbalanced neighbourhoods, in many cases, mean that many British Pakistani and British Indian families live in close proximity, with their children going to schools full of ethnic minority pupils. Some Indian and Pakistani mothers were acutely aware of this fact and discussed it as being both positive and negative. On the positive side, they felt there was more of a power balance in favour of ethnic minorities, allowing for equal opportunities irrespective of ethnicity, and sometimes even greater opportunities, because of connections with the local community. Feelings of safety in the neighbourhood and fewer chances of racial incidents were also mentioned. On the negative side, they discussed their feelings that lack of diversity meant their specific neighbourhoods were not true reflections of British society. Divya, a British Indian mother, felt that the large number of Asians living in the area meant ‘nosy neighbours’ and gossip, because of the close community.

91 Closely linked to the sub-theme ‘Egalitarianism’
It’s good, because most Asians want their children to do well, and she’s kind of in that environment where . . . where she . . . she’s with people that are very similar to her.

Lajja, British Indian mother

I do worry about her sometimes being raised in this area. Only because I don’t think it’s a real representation of what’s out there. Because it’s a very . . . a very dense community of, you know, Asians, basically . . . And I would like her to go somewhere which is bit more mixed than that really, so . . . it’s really just the area that we live in.

Anita, British Indian mother

Growing up in Contemporary Britain

Mothers from all groups commented on securities and concerns they had about their child growing up in contemporary Britain, and these were not limited to worries about multiculturalism. Further, what came across as worries for some, were positives for others. A number of British Pakistani and British Indian mothers discussed feeling happier about their children growing up in Britain, compared with Pakistan or India, due to good education, free health care, opportunities for women and access to electricity and water.

We have everything here . . . You know we have all the facilities, of electric, gas, a home, you know? Education. Better here. Everyone’s coming to study here, so it’s got to be a good country. You know.

Aasha, British Indian mother

Mothers reflected on feeling that there was a sense of community and neighbourhood spirit when they were younger that is not present now. They also believed that increases in crime mean that things are more ‘dangerous’ and it is less safe for children to play outdoors. Mothers spoke about how increases in knife crime, risk from paedophiles and increased gang violence have led them to worry more about their children’s welfare. Pakistani mothers, in particular, commented on how they felt the ‘freedom’ of their children is affected by the worries they have around safety and that they are less likely to let their children play outdoors unsupervised.

You know, it’s all around you. Different . . . things in society . . . the crime rate’s so high. I remember when we were growing up, our parents would be quite happy for us to play round the park with bicycles. We were all together. We were quite safe. Now, I wouldn’t be happy until . . . unless I was accompanying my child.

Parveen, British Pakistani mother

A number of mothers in each the group felt concerned about their child using media technology, and the implications of the Internet, chat rooms and social networking. Mothers believed that children are less likely to play creatively. Further, some mothers discussed feeling that children are becoming
‘urbanised’ too quickly as a result of excess media images. As one mother, Emily, stated, ‘kids are not allowed to be just kids’ anymore.

Concerns about children’s future were also discussed, particularly with regards to their transition to secondary school. Many perceived secondary school to be a tough place. One mother, Aasha, said she was ‘scared for her child’ and his future in secondary school. Secondary school was felt by some as a place where teens carry knives, get involved in gangs and lose control. Worries about higher education, future job security and financial security for their children were also expressed, and related to mothers’ worries about the economy.

Some worries were specific to the South Asian mothers. British Pakistani mothers, as well as a few of the British Indian mothers, discussed worries they had relating to racism, terrorism, Islamophobia and their child’s future. Post September 11th, mothers felt there was a more ‘in your face’ type of racism, and some felt that having a Muslim name or identity could impact on their child’s access to jobs and other opportunities.92 Further, Pakistani mothers and a few Indian mothers spoke about their concerns with British society being too ‘open’ and ‘non-conservative’,93 and worried that their children would lose cultural values and become too ‘Westernised’. This was noted particularly more in relation to girls and in regards to future relationships and marriage.

_The only thing that worries me is that . . . when they hit their teens. I mean . . . I don’t see that she’ll have a problem, but I get . . . I become a bit concerned. I think . . . not so much with the boys. But for the girls especially society and how girls are, and there’s much . . . obviously she’ll go on the internet and stuff like that. It . . . it is quite frightening, but um . . . I think that’s one of my main concerns._

_Fauzia, British Pakistani mother_

_Experiences with Racism_

This theme explores experiences mothers had with discrimination and prejudice.

_Racism_

Discrimination was felt to be very much present in contemporary Britain. However, some mothers spoke about how it had evolved into an ‘area-specific’ problem, in that it is more prevalent in smaller towns and cities further north.

---

92 Discussed further in the subtheme ‘Islamophobia’
93 Discussed further in the theme ‘Intergroup Perceptions’
I’ll tell you when feel it . . . is when I go to a new area, um, going up north or going to anywhere that I’m not familiar with. Where there’s no multicultural, kind of, you know . . . community, then I do feel like I’m sort of . . . I’m very colour-aware then.

Anita, British Indian mother

It was frequently mentioned that multiculturalism resulted in less discrimination. Another aspect of racism was the idea that it was more prevalent in much older generations, and this related to the rapid change in demographics, law and institutions through immigration. However, discussions with mothers also showed that racism was also still found in younger generations. Mothers shared feelings of ‘being out of place’, which happened when they walked into restaurants and grocery stores and even onto public transport. Jannat, a British Pakistani mother, narrated an incident of being treated differently on the bus because of what she was wearing (a traditional dress). She was accused of being disrespectful for not giving up her seat for an old lady, even though she had offered to do this.

The bus was quite full. And I had my child with me, and somebody got up . . . and I sat down. And then I offered it to an old lady next to me. She said she didn’t want it. And the lady next to her, had a big complaint, ‘Oh people like you that have come to this country. You know, you think just cause you’ve got a child you can just take a seat, and you don’t offer.’ But actually I did offer the old lady. But she didn’t obviously realise that. And I was brought up in this country . . . you know, maybe it was because of the clothes that I was wearing.

Jannat, British Pakistani mother

Jannat spoke about feeling victimised, alienated and upset, particularly because her child was with her. However, another mother, Aasha, who is British Indian, stated that second-generation mothers are more likely to stand up to racists. Aasha spoke about having the confidence to ‘stand up’ when she is victimised. These examples highlight the intricate nature of racism and the many types of power dynamics at work. For some families, discrimination is still very much a part of life.

‘Inverted’ Racism

This sub-theme includes discussions by non-immigrant White mothers of being stereotyped and marginalised. Many mothers highlighted feeling, for the first time, that they were victims of discrimination. This is a result of increased multiculturalism in Britain and the development of high-density minority neighbourhoods. A number spoke about how they felt racism towards White individuals is not acknowledged in society. One mother described how at school her child was picked on for being White, and that when she reported this, she was told that ‘there is no such thing as racism against English people’. Many of the mothers stated that they had never had direct experiences of racism, but felt they were often stereotyped by members of other communities for
being White. This stereotyping was sometimes made manifest in their children not being invited to other children’s homes who were from a different ethnic group (as discussed above). Anna, who is an English teacher for adults at a diverse community centre, also discussed feeling stereotyped when her students spoke about her in their native languages.

I wouldn’t really say that’s . . . maybe not racism . . . but I do think that they were stereotyping me in a certain way.

Anna, non-immigrant White mother

Some mothers discussed feelings of unequal treatment in the public sphere. One example of this is in local government institutions. Mothers felt that they were pushed to the back of queues or otherwise sidelined, because minority groups were given more importance.94

Um, I think British society today is more geared to people who were not born here . . . both me and [the child] ended up in a hostel for, um, almost a year . . . in a room about this size. The hostel was infested with rats, and mice . . . Um, and there was lots of people of mixed, um, of sort of mixed racial and ethnic backgrounds in . . . in the hostel, but we were there by far longer than anybody else. Um, and we did seem to be . . . consistently pushed to the back of the queue as far as housing was concerned.

Dianne, non-immigrant White mother

We’ve had quite a few housing managers, kind of, saying that, you know, you’re the wrong colour.

Tracy, non-immigrant White mother

Some mothers reported incidents of feeling as if they were direct targets of racism. Furthermore, some mothers felt that second- or third-generation immigrants were more likely to discriminate against non-immigrant White individuals, as opposed to new immigrants

Well, there was just . . . weird incident with this guy on his bike last week at . . . he . . . me and my friend were walking down the street, and he . . . he deliberately tried to ride into us on his bike and then spat at my friend. It was a Black guy, and we reported it to the police.

Helen, non-immigrant White mother

Another aspect of inverted racism relates to mothers’ feelings of defensiveness. Mothers believed that other groups are quick to label non-immigrant White individuals as racists, even if they are just having a disagreement. They felt some ethnic minority groups still carry a ‘chip on their shoulders’ because of the past.

94 This was particularly true of mothers from lower socio-demographics.
You know because people will say to me . . . I might say something and then someone might say, 'Oh, you’re racist', and I’ll be like . . . or they’ll . . . or they’ll have a chip on their shoulder

Hannah, non-immigrant White mother

Finally, Mothers discussed worrying about the ‘unequal treatment’ of their children becoming more prevalent as neighbourhoods become more segregated.

I don’t worry, but often we talk about moving where there is more of a balance. I suppose in the back of my mind I do thing oh, when he gets older, is he going to stand out as the only one and not in a positive way...and be seen as; not odd but different. I suppose one of my worries is what it will be like in secondary school when he is the only white child in his year.

Stephanie, non-immigrant White mother

Islamophobia

This sub-theme explores Islamophobia, which refers to acts of discrimination and racism towards Muslims. From discussions with mothers it became apparent that Muslims are experiencing much prejudice. Although not all of the British Pakistani mothers described experiencing discrimination, a sizable number of the mothers gave victimisation accounts. The September 11th terror attacks, the 7/7 London bombings and the subsequent wars in Afghanistan and Iraq all contributed to increased discrimination. As one mother, Smita, stated, ‘It don’t help with this war going on’. A number of Pakistani mothers discussed that people harmfully generalise the behaviour of a few Muslims to many Muslims.

I suppose with all of these suicide bombers and these kind of things that happen – the 9/11 attacks was it and people kind of get a bad picture of what Islam is like and I think everyone gets tarnished with the same brush.

Aisha, British Pakistani mother

British Pakistani mothers also mentioned the media as a major antagonistic force, in propagating negative messages. One mother described feeling that Muslims are being portrayed as the ‘new Jews’ by television and print media.

I think there is a climate of anti-Islamic Muslim and a lot of stuff on TV haven’t helped. BBC are quite anti-Muslim in how they portray Muslims on TV. So I think there is a culture of it. We are the new target, or the new Jews, you could say. Because every so often you need a new target group. But less to do with colour and more to do with intolerance now than issues about race.

Shazia, British Pakistani mother
In the interviews with British Pakistani mothers, many other examples of Islamophobia were mentioned. Some mothers felt that perhaps Muslims were misunderstood and didn’t fit into British society as much as other ethnic groups, since they didn’t go ‘out for a drink after work’ and they socialised in a different way. Some mothers argued that Muslims don’t make it easier for themselves and that Islamophobia could also come from within the Muslim community.

*Islamophobia is maybe spreading. I don’t know . . . There is even within the community . . . Within religious groups you’ll have girls who wear niqab who will discriminate against girls who don’t wear niqab . . . there’s silliness, everywhere. Pettiness.*

**Feroz, British Pakistani mother**

Non-immigrant White mothers had two attitudes towards Islamophobia. While most stated that expressions of intolerance are negative and that they opposed discrimination against Muslims, some mothers actively stereotyped Muslims within their interview. One mother, Dianne, felt that some Muslims encouraged discrimination due to their appearance and different behaviour.

*I think also their language is quite . . . it sounds aggressive . . . I think it is to do with that . . . it is the fear factor. I mean, you know [the child], sort of walks down the high street, and she’s been . . . sort of cowering when she . . . when someone approaches in a . . . in the full . . . and I never know which way round it is . . . is it the burka with just the eyes showing? The letterbox [laughs]. I find it intimidating. And you look at these people and one of the things that always strikes me, every time is, how do you know if that is actually a woman underneath that?*

**Dianne, non-immigrant White mother**

Within the British Indian group, there were, again two attitudes towards Muslims. One was of empathy and understanding for Muslims. The other attitude came from Indian mothers who felt negatively towards Muslims, as they had been victimised, themselves, by other groups, and mistaken for Muslims because of their appearance.

*When I was working on the checkouts, um, at Tesco . . . a White customer actually came up to me and he’d bought something and um, I . . . I’d forgotten to ask him about the club card or something, and he turns around and says, ‘Oh, you fucking Paki!’ And I’m like ‘You fucking’, but I couldn’t exactly say it, so I said, ‘Excuse me.’ And I said, ‘I’m not a Paki Muslim, I’m a . . . I’m an Indian Hindu.*

**Divya, British Indian mother**

However, not all British Indian mothers who had actually experienced discrimination felt resentment towards Muslims. Rani described her husbands’ experiences with racism and how she felt all intolerance was wrong, irrespective of religious belief.
You see my husband used to be clean-shaven at one point in time and we felt the difference between before then and now. After 9/11 we experienced quite a lot of racism... I mean, he has been called everything – Osama Bin Laden, Taliban, Al Qaeda, you bloody name it, but again, it’s just like water off a duck’s back... I mean any religion can practise their religion freely. So you know... you know, its fine, you get idiots in society.

Rani, British Indian mother

Intergroup Perceptions

This theme examines the mothers’ intergroup perceptions of similarities and differences in parenting practices. The statements made by mothers are not always adequate representations of reality; however, they serve the useful purpose of helping to understand how mothers feel about family life in other communities.

British Indian Mothers as Reported by British Pakistani Mothers

A group of British Pakistani mothers felt British Indian mothers were becoming Westernised at a faster rate than British Pakistani mothers, and that in the integration process they seemed to be losing their culture. British Indian mothers were perceived to be less traditional and religious and more likely to mix with other cultures as well as adopt other festivals, such as Christmas.

I think the Indian families are sort of... losing their culture a lot quicker than Pakistani women and I’m not sure if it’s religious of whatever, but... Indian women seem to be like... um... really, really Westernised... they’re more open to their children having boyfriends and things like that... whereas I think Pakistani women, because of Islam and so on, we’re not that.

Fatima, British Pakistani mother

Yet, British Pakistani mothers also discussed parenting similarities between themselves and British Indian mothers, including a shared stress on education, belief in the same ‘core values’ and protectiveness of their children. The importance of the extended family structure was also found to be another key similarity.

Um, with my Indian friends. I mean I don’t see any difference to be honest. They always like... same thing. Yeah they are disciplined. And they... some of them are home schooling their children. And um... we share the same core values. And core beliefs on how to bring up children.

Hira, British Pakistani mother
British Pakistani Mothers as Reported by British Indian Mothers

Overall, most British Indian mothers said that their parenting was very similar, if not the same, to British Pakistani parenting, with both groups ‘pushing their children in the same way’. British Indian mothers also felt that both second-generation British Indians and British Pakistanis believed in ensuring that their children gained dual identities of ‘Britishness’ and ‘Asianness’. However, religion was viewed as the main difference between these groups, although some British Indian mothers argued that religion was very subjective and varied between families. One mother, Madhu, gave the example of a Pakistani Muslim friend who shared similar parenting views, but was held back from practicing all of them because of religion.

Yeah, slightly more conservative I suppose, but not because, out of choice, but because she recognises that the wider society needs, that you know they live in a predominantly Muslim area, so she wouldn't let them go out in sleeveless tops and she resents that, because, she sees my girls do, and she feels hampered.

Madhu, British Indian mother

Some British Indian mothers believed religion caused major differences in parenting, with Muslim Pakistani mothers being stricter and more conservative. Smita, a British Indian mother, gave an example of a Pakistani child in her elder daughter’s class who was not allowed to attend sex-education classes. The mother felt that this was very wrong, as it caused exclusion of the children.

Because, certainly when, um [sibling] was having sex education at school, at primary level . . . a lot of Muslim boys weren’t allowed to join in. Um, I thought that was awful actually, because, well, cause it was at such a basic level, and it was all about life and loving. That’s all it was. That was the title . . . and I thought, so all these Muslim boys aren’t going to know how to live and love, you know. You know it’s just so sad.

Smita, British Indian mother

Finally, British Indian mothers also asserted that poverty is more prevalent in British Pakistani families. Mothers noted that British Indian children seem to possess more expensive things than their British Pakistani counterparts.

British Indian and British Pakistani Mothers as Reported by Non-immigrant White Mothers

Many non-immigrant White mothers classed both British Indian and British Pakistanis as the single category of ‘Asian’. Also, a number of mothers used the term ‘Muslim’ to refer to British Pakistanis, and thus, directly linked faith with that ethnicity.
Few mothers made the distinction between first-generation and second-generation British Indians and British Pakistanis, and argued, despite a few differences, feeling ‘very similar’ to them overall, as the mothers in that group had been ‘born and brought up in the country’. This was particularly noted in reference to parenting strategies.

One mother, Charlotte, felt that British Indian and British Pakistani mothers learned about discipline and parenting by absorbing Western culture, and that this changed from generation to generation. She felt that it was likely that third-generation parents would assimilate parenting styles even further.

> I think if they’re born here . . . then they . . . they pick up a lot of the Western ways. And they do a lot of things the same as us. Um, because their parents obviously come over and a lot of people couldn’t speak English, so they . . . they’ve had to learn from other people. So the time is come for like, my age group, um, of them being Mums. They’ve learnt the Western ways, even though they may dress in their saris, and . . . things like that.

**Charlotte, non-immigrant White mother**

There were five other areas that non-immigrant White mothers touched upon when describing perceived differences in family life between British Indian and British Pakistani mothers and themselves. These were religion, extended family, perceived independence of mothers and stress on education and discipline.

Some mothers felt that British Pakistani mothers were focused on their child learning about Islam, by sending their children to the mosque to learn about their faith. This was described as being different from Indian mothers, who focused less on religion.

> I suppose I would notice more an emphasis on the religious side for the Muslim (Pakistani) women. Um, you know, needing to get their child to the mosque and that kind of thing, whereas for the Indian women, I know that isn’t such a . . . priority, yeah.

**Helen, non-immigrant White mother**

Presence of extended family was noted as a difference between South Asian and non-immigrant White families. A large number of mothers discussed this. Some felt that this was a reason why their children were often not invited round to play at Indian or Pakistani houses, because those children already had a familial social network. One mother, Emma, spoke about how she felt extended family made South Asian children less independent, as they interacted less with friends and their activities were all centred on the family. Some non-immigrant White mothers also discussed feeling that, as women, they had more independence than Indian and Pakistani women, because of South Asians’
interdependent nature and their ties to their immediate and extended family, which they felt could become stressful.

I would say probably the English mum is expecting to be more independent, and have more of her own life, whereas an Indian or Pakistani would be more about it’s my children, it’s my husband, it’s my family, it’s my house, it’s my mother-in-law and obviously the extended family thing . . . Actually I think there’s a lot of pressure on Asian mums, I think.

Emma, non-immigrant White mother

Education was perceived to be very important for British Indian and British Pakistani families. This was linked to some Asian families being successful and having children who are high achievers. However, mothers felt that expectations on the children to do well could be too high. Also, some discussed feeling that, with their focus on homework and extra learning, some British Indian and British Pakistani mothers might create too much structured time for their children compared with non-immigrant White families.

Yeah, they are very, you know, education, education, education and the kids do spend a lot of time doing outside of school. I think also the . . . the expectations of the children, in terms of behaviour, um, I think sometimes, um, they . . . they . . . they’re expected to be quite mature, quite young

Hailey, non-immigrant White mother

Finally, a number of mothers discussed feeling that discipline was different between non-immigrant White and British Indian and British Pakistani families. Some mothers felt that South Asian parents showed stricter discipline and gave children ‘less freedom’ resulting in children who were ‘less naughty’. Other mothers talked about South Asian children being more spoiled, especially in an extended family setting. Some felt that boys were treated differently in British Indian and British Pakistani families. Finally, the existence of arranged marriages in Indian and Pakistani families was also mentioned by a few mothers as being a difference.

English Mothers as Reported by British Indian Mothers

Second-generation British Indian mothers felt they had picked up many parenting techniques from English mothers, and that both groups experienced similar parenting problems and the ‘same battles’ with their children.

English will be used here to refer to the non-immigrant White group.
Yeah. I think we probably pick up a lot more from the English mums, and what they normally do with their kids. Uh, again I don’t think there’s much difference. Um, they have the same problems that we have . . . they’re all working parents.

Kritti, British Indian mother

Some mothers discussed feeling that both groups show equally ambitious hopes for their children, despite British Indian parents often being stereotyped for this. However, English mothers were thought to be much more secretive about their ambitious hopes.

A lot of the, um, White parents, pretend not to be ambitious for the kids, but they actually are secretly, and um, White friends are sort of . . . they will ask you know, ‘So what book is she reading?’ and stuff like that. And, you know there are sort of quiet about it . . . but I’d say they’re just as wildly ambitious as the rest of us, you know.

Madhu, British Indian mother

British Indian mothers also reported a number of specific differences of parenting styles. A few mothers felt that British Indian parents tended to be more protective of their children and fussed over them more. Similarly, some said that they were more careful about where they let their children go.

They’re very like, if the child’s crying they’ll just like let them carry on crying, or not bother, whereas like if it was an Asian mum she’ll like start looking worried at the child, or . . . ‘Oh what’s wrong with you?’ It’s like material things, like clothing . . . if it’s really cold, it’s some mothers like don’t worry, or you’ll be alright . . . and things like that and we’ll kind of like put loads of layers on and wear woolly hats and everything, even if it’s not that cold outside. I think some White people are caring. Some aren’t, but I think Asians are more caring than others.

Divya, British Indian mother

Other mothers spoke about differences in the mother-child interaction, with English children sometimes showing a lack of respect towards their parents.

Yeah sometimes in most British, uh, um, White families, there’s nothing. You know, ‘Okay Mum, I’m going out.’ This and that. No interaction with the kids. No nothing. The kid don’t know how to speak to the mother, this and that.

Rani, British Indian mother

Another difference noted by British Indian mothers was to do with modesty, in particular relation to daughters. British Indian mothers believed that when it came to relationships, dress sense and even marriage, there was a difference between the groups.
English Mothers as Reported by British Pakistani Mothers

A number of second-generation British Pakistani mothers felt that they shared many similarities in parenting with English mothers, as both groups were brought up in the UK and shared many life experiences. They used the same disciplining methods, such as the ‘naughty step’, and showed affection in the same way.

One of the main differences reported by British Pakistani mothers was the feeling that English mothers gave their children more freedom, and allowed their children to play outside and at others friend’s homes more frequently.

*I say, more White mums give their children a bit more freedom, even compared to myself. They would let their child down the road. I think the outside thing is a big thing. Also, if I want to take her swimming, my parents say, ‘Well why are you taking her swimming? It’s too cold. You’re going to get them ill.’ . . . but when I go swimming I see White mums take all their kids.*

**Jannat, British Pakistani mother**

British Pakistani mothers also discussed feeling that English mothers were open with their children, discussing a range of subjects with them, while British Pakistani mothers tended to hold things back from their child.

*Yeah, with the English kids I find that they’re, um . . . obviously they speak more openly about, you know . . . we would call it rude, but you know things about boys and girls, and this and that . . . I find that they’re more open about it. I think they know too much sometimes for what . . . what age they are.*

**Aisha, British Pakistani mother**

The importance of religion in family life was another subject of difference reported by British Pakistani mothers, feeling that English families placed less emphasis on religion. Finally, social class was thought to play a role in determining parenting differences.
Chapter 4
SUMMARY, DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

This study set out to conduct an in-depth investigation of the similarities and differences in parenting practices, parent-child relationships, children’s psychological adjustment and parental social experiences in British-born Indian, British-born Pakistani and non-immigrant White families with young children living in ethnically diverse regions of the UK. It is situated in acculturation, social and developmental psychologies. It also tapped into cross-cultural psychology, particularly the independence/interdependence (individualism/collectivism) model of Markus and Kitayama (1991), which identifies ‘western’ cultures (such as non-immigrant White culture) as more independent, and ‘non-western cultures’ (such as Indian and Pakistani) as more interdependent. One of the central premises of the study was that child development occurs within specific cultural and environmental contexts and in relation to others, such as parents and peers (Bronfenbrenner, 1999). In its design and implementation, the study tried to move away from a deficit-oriented approach, common to much research in this area.

Two main aspects of family life were examined by the study. The first was parenting and child adjustment, which included quantitative measures of: (1) parents’ marital and psychological state, (2) parenting and mother-child relationships, and (3) child adjustment. The second was cultural and contextual factors in family life, which included quantitative and qualitative measures on family relationships, multiculturalism, ethnic identity, ethnic-racial socialisation, acculturation and religion. Below, each set of findings are described in turn.

Parenting and Child Adjustment

Parenting and child adjustment were compared in Indian, Pakistani and White families. The aim was to understand more about family functioning in these family types. While a number of similarities were found between mothers from the three ethnic groups, differences were also found. An overall pattern seemed to emerge, with differences mainly occurring between Pakistani and White mothers. The three groups could be thought of as existing on a spectrum with White families at one end, Pakistani families at the other, and Indian families between the two. In some aspects of family life, Indian mothers were more comparable to White mothers, while in other aspects, they

---

96 For the sake of simplicity, the term ‘Indian’ will be used to refer to British Indian, ‘Pakistani’ to refer to British Pakistani and ‘White’ to refer to non-immigrant White, in this section.
behaved similarly to Pakistani mothers. It is important to point out that this spectrum should be thought of as a continuum, due to different parenting practices varying between the three communities to different extents.

In terms of marriage, Pakistani mothers and Indian mothers (to a lesser extent) were more likely to be in an arranged marriage, compared with White mothers. Pakistani mothers were also found to confide less in their partners compared with White mothers. Other aspects of marriage, such as marital satisfaction and mutual enjoyment, revealed similarities between ethnic groups. High levels of both marital satisfaction and mutual enjoyment were found in all family types. Furthermore, high levels of conflict in the marital relationship (which represents a risk factor for difficulties in family functioning) were absent in all groups.

Mothers’ psychological well-being showed a group difference in relation to parenting stress. Pakistani mothers reported experiencing higher dysfunctional interaction with their child compared with Indian mothers, and both Pakistani and White mothers reported feeling that they had a difficult child compared with Indian mothers. However, it is important to point out that these group differences in levels of parenting stress were within the normal range. Furthermore, mothers showed good psychological adjustment in other areas of parenting, with levels of anxiety and depression falling within the normal range.

In relation to the quality of parenting and mother-child relationships, no group difference was found. High levels of warmth and mother-child interaction and low levels of criticism were found in Pakistani, Indian and White families. Levels of sensitive responding were found to be between average and above average in each family type. With regards to mother’s levels of child-centredness, Pakistani mothers seemed to centre their lives on their children more than White and Indian mothers. Pakistani mothers also had stricter rules regarding the supervision of their children compared with White mothers, relating to how far they would allow their children to play outdoors and the need for chaperonage of their children. In both child-centredness and supervision, levels for Indian mothers lay between levels for Pakistani and White mothers.

In terms of discipline, Indian and Pakistani mothers were more likely to use higher levels of overt discipline with their children compared with White mothers. However, the magnitude of this difference was small (within one scale point between groups). Furthermore, Pakistani, Indian and
White mothers reported similar levels of conflict with their children. Control of children (including control of bedtime) was also similar between groups.

When mothers were asked to assess how differently they parented their child compared with their own parents, Indian mothers were most likely to report that they parented differently, reflecting feelings that they had changed from the immigrant generation before them. There was no difference for generational parenting in Pakistani and White mothers, who felt that they parented similarly to their own parents.

Mutuality, which measures the degree to which mother and child are involved in positive dyadic interaction (i.e. characterised by warmth, responsiveness and cooperation), was not found to be different between Indian, Pakistani and White families. Furthermore, each family type showed high levels of mutuality. In past research, negative child outcomes (such as higher levels of externalising problems) have been associated with lower levels of mutuality (Deater-Deckard et al., 2004; Deater-Deckard et al., 2000; Deater-Deckard and Petrill, 2004). Therefore, the presence of high levels of mutuality in Indian, Pakistani and White families points to positive adjustment in the children from these groups.

The mutuality finding highlights the fact that, overall, no group differences emerged in the observational rating of mother-child interaction (of warmth, responsiveness and cooperation), nor in the standardised interview assessment of maternal warmth. These similar results from two methodological approaches add weight to the finding of high levels of warmth in all three family types. Further, the use of observational methodology, which showed high interrater reliability, allowed for a robust means by which the actual behaviour of mothers (rather than socially desirable behaviour) was assessed (Kerig, 2001), thus further strengthening the finding. It should be noted that the two methodological approaches assess quality of mother-child relationships in slightly different ways. The warmth construct (an assessment of the mother’s level of warmth towards her child) is unidirectional, while the construct of mutuality (an assessment of dyadic interaction between mother and child) is bidirectional.

In relation to child well-being, contrary to past research, which has suggested that children from ethnic minority groups may be more likely to display problematic behaviour compared with ethnic majority groups, third-generation Indian and Pakistani children in the study showed positive psychological adjustment. Similar levels of adjustment were found in the White children in the study.
and the mean SDQ score for total difficulties for each family type lay within the normal range. Thus, it seems that the children were doing well irrespective of the ethnic group to which they belonged. Furthermore, no differences were found between groups for other measures of child adjustment, including school adjustment.

To summarise, similarities were found for Indian, Pakistani and White families in a number of areas of parenting, including warmth, control and conflict. However, a number of differences were also identified, which were greatest between the White and Pakistani groups, with the Indian group in between. These include Supervision, Overt Discipline and Child-Centredness (higher in Pakistani and Indian families). Overall, the children from all three ethnic groups showed positive adjustment.

Cultural and Contextual Factors in Family Life

Cultural and contextual factors in family life were compared in Indian, Pakistani and White families. The aim was to further understand the influence of the mother and child’s broader social environment as well as cultural beliefs on family life in the three ethnic groups. The cultural and contextual factors were analysed using both quantitative and qualitative analyses. The qualitative findings support, as well as offer complementary information about, the quantitative cultural and contextual factors. Five main areas were examined: (1) family relationships, (2) religion, (3) acculturation, (4) ethnic identity and ethnic-racial socialisation, and (5) multiculturalism and exposure to diversity. A similar pattern for cultural and contextual factors emerged as for the parenting and child adjustment factors. The Pakistani families seem to be the most traditional compared to the White families, with the Indian families in between. In some areas, the Indian families are as traditional as the Pakistani families, while in others they are more similar to White families. Indian mothers also seem to experience the fewest challenges associated with multiculturalism compared with White and Pakistani families.

In terms of family relationships, Intrafamilial Stress was found to be similar between each family type. Levels of Intrafamilial Stress were low overall for the three ethnic groups, and within the normal range, indicating good family functioning. No differences in levels of Collectivism were found between Indian and Pakistani families, and both groups showed high levels of interaction with their wider extended families compared with White families. Indian children also placed their maternal grandmothers over a wider range of the family map compared with both White and
Pakistani children. This could reflect differences in emotional closeness felt by children towards maternal grandmothers in Indian families.

With respect to religion, the quantitative analysis revealed that Pakistani mothers showed higher levels of *Religion* compared with Indian and White mothers. This was assessed in relation to religious beliefs and practices, mothers’ religious socialisation of their children and children’s knowledge of their faith. Pakistani mothers were also more likely to engage in proximal processes to strengthen religious belief in children. For example, 90.3% of Pakistani mothers spent time engaged in religious play, compared with 53.3% of Indian mothers and 48.5% of White mothers. Further, 58.1% of British Pakistani children attended religious classes compared with only 7.7% of Indian and 4% of White children.

The qualitative analyses support the quantitative findings on religion. Pakistani mothers emphasised the importance of teaching Islam to their children and their religious beliefs were often entwined with cultural ones. Some mothers felt that their Pakistani identity had lost importance compared with their religious identity, and that their children had little identification with Pakistan and greater identification with Islam. They spoke about the importance of maintaining a bicultural identity as British Muslims. For other Pakistani mothers, traditional cultural beliefs remained important. Some clearly differentiated ‘Britishness’, ‘Pakistaniness’ and Islam, choosing to ‘pick and mix’ from different cultures to create a hybrid culture they identified with. Compared with Pakistani mothers, White mothers found it difficult to define what their culture was and distinguished more clearly between culture and religion. While some spoke about culture relating to ‘Englishness’, others discussed broader British culture as well as the impact of ethnic diversity on their culture. White mothers also had different levels of religious belief and often allowed their child to have a choice in how important religion was to them, unlike Pakistani mothers. Indian mothers seemed to be very much in the middle of these two groups, in terms of religious and cultural beliefs, being more traditional than the White mothers but less traditional than the Pakistani mothers. Similar to the Pakistani mothers, they spoke about bicultural identity and of the importance of identifying with being British and being Indian. Mothers in this group equated religion and culture more strongly than White mothers did. However, Indian mothers were also more likely to give children an element of choice about how religious they wanted to be and, overall, had a more relaxed approach towards religion and culture. The findings on religion highlight an area in which the Pakistani mothers seemed to be particularly different from White and Indian mothers.
In terms of acculturation, only Pakistani and Indian mothers were quantitatively measured for acculturation, using a scale that assessed their involvement in both their own ethnic culture as well as the wider dominant culture. This scale did not identify acculturation strategies as a whole, but measured different domains such as language, interaction, media and food and had strong intergenerational validity. No differences were found between groups with both Pakistanis and Indians showing similar levels of immersion in both cultural domains. Therefore, the findings point to the Pakistani and Indian families interacting fairly equally in their ethnic group traditions as well as their dominant group traditions and possessing a bicultural or more integrated identity.

Both Indian and Pakistani mothers had similar perceptions of parenting and family life in White families (discussed further below), and felt British to an equivalent degree. No differences were found in the fluency of Indian and Pakistani children in their traditional languages. However, Indian mothers continued to feel the caste system was important whereas Pakistani mothers felt less so.

In relation to ethnic identity, all three groups completed the Revised Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure. No overall difference was found between mothers in the construct of ethnic identity. Interestingly, mothers from all groups seemed to explore what their ethnic identity meant to them to similar extents. With regards to cultural socialisation, Pakistanis were most likely to engage in cultural activities with their child compared with White and Indian mothers. This reflects the more traditional nature of Pakistani mothers. However, Indian mothers still showed high levels of Cultural Socialisation compared with White mothers.

The relationship between parenting, ethnic identity and child outcomes was also explored, and showed that total parenting stress and strength of ethnic identity were most closely associated with child outcomes. Mothers with higher levels of parenting stress, as well as stronger ethnic identification, were more likely to report having children who experienced greater difficulties. It is not clear why this relationship between high ethnic identity, increased parenting stress and child outcomes was found. Past studies have shown that parenting stress is associated with child behaviour and thus the relationship between the two in the present study was not surprising. However, the increased level of child difficulties in families where mothers reported high levels of ethnic identity was unexpected. A possible explanation is that differences may exist between ethnic groups in the perception of what ‘good’ child behaviour is, and that mothers with higher ethnic commitment have higher expectations of ‘good’ child behaviour. Thus, behaviour which is viewed as acceptable by mothers with low ethnic identity may be rated as problematic by mothers with high ethnic identity.
The qualitative analyses support the quantitative findings on the traditional nature of Pakistani families. The way mothers from each group socialised their children about ethnicity and race (ethnic-racial socialisation) reflected their different views about culture and religion. Religio-cultural socialisation was highest in Pakistani mothers. All mothers showed covert means of socialisation, highlighting the deeply ingrained nature of culture and religion in this group. Covert socialisation in Pakistani mothers was found in food preparation, use of language and music, as well as in ethnic practices and discussions. Pakistani mothers also used egalitarianism socialisation, but to a lesser extent than White and Indian mothers. White mothers were more likely to use overt religio-cultural socialisation with their children, such as through school projects and celebration of festivals. Some discussed taking children to museums and emphasising the importance of British history to their children, but, overall, this group used less religio-cultural socialisation than Pakistani mothers. In contrast, White mothers used egalitarianism-based parenting the most, stressing the importance of equality to their children and exposing them to diversity. Indian mothers lay between Pakistani and White mothers in terms of both cultural socialisation and egalitarianism. They were most likely to report using egalitarianism, but also discussed using both covert and overt religio-cultural socialisation methods. Covert socialisation tended to be more superficial in this group compared with the Pakistani group, and mostly in the form of food preparation. However, Indian mothers also spoke of the importance of language as a form of communication with grandparents. Ethnic-racial socialisation in the form of preparation for bias was found most in Pakistani and White families. This occurred often in relation to racial incidents, and sometimes egalitarianism parenting served as a preparation for bias strategy in each family type. Promotion of mistrust was found least often in the mothers and was reported fairly equally among the three groups.

In terms of multiculturalism and exposure to diversity, the quantitative analysis shows that there is no difference in the way the mothers felt about their children growing up in Britain, reflecting that all groups felt there are both positives and negatives about Britain. Indian mothers felt more positive about multiculturalism compared with White mothers, with Pakistani mothers lying between these two groups. Indian mothers were also least likely to speak to their child about racism compared with White mothers, with Pakistani mothers lying between these two groups. The findings seem to point to Indian families experiencing the fewest challenges associated with multiculturalism compared with White and Pakistani families. Past literature has shown that there is perception among the White ethnic group that Indian families are more likely to integrate into British society. It is possible that this positive perception may result in a more positive treatment of Indian families in the UK by the
The qualitative analyses were in line with the quantitative findings on mothers’ feelings about multiculturalism and contemporary Britain. They also offer complementary information on mothers’ experiences of racism and mothers’ perspectives on family life in the other ethnic groups. Mothers from all families recognised positive aspects of diversity, including tolerance, harmony and insight into other cultures, but they also had distinct worries. Some Pakistani mothers felt Indian families were Westernising at a faster pace than Pakistani families, and that this was not positive. They stressed the importance of modesty in dress and behaviour according to their cultural and religious beliefs and worried about their children maintaining these while growing up in Britain. Pakistanis also discussed their worries about how being Muslim could affect their children’s lives. Indeed, this group experienced the most racism in the form of Islamophobia, and mothers described being more protective of their children as a result. Aside from feelings of difference in terms of religion, supervision and modesty, Pakistani mothers felt they parented their children similarly to White and Indian parents who had also been born in the UK. Similar to Pakistani mothers, Indian mothers discussed feeling protective of their children, as well as the importance of modesty, but to a lesser extent than Pakistani mothers. Indian mothers also reported experiencing less discrimination and feeling as though they had adapted more to British society, being second-generation parents. In the White families, many of the mothers appeared to be in the midst of coming to terms with increased diversity and adapting to change. Some felt positive about change and embraced multiculturalism, while others felt more threatened. These mothers felt that their English culture was being sidelined in favour of other groups’ cultural beliefs (particularly at school), that they were living in informally segregated neighbourhoods and that their children were being academically held back at school due to immigrant groups not speaking English fluently. Mothers from this group also reported experiencing discrimination and worrying about their children feeling marginalised in ethnic minority dense neighbourhoods. Additionally, they felt that discrimination towards White families was not adequately acknowledged in society. These findings have important implications for White families living in Britain. While past research has pointed to Muslims experiencing discrimination (further supported by the present study), the concept of discrimination towards the majority host culture is less familiar. Taken together, the findings about multiculturalism and discrimination in each of the ethnic groups point to the complex nature of British-born Indian, Pakistani and White
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families living in culturally-diverse contemporary Britain, not only in their immediate home environments, but also in relation to their wider social environment.

To summarise, similarities were found for Indian, Pakistani and White families in a number of areas of cultural and contextual factors, including *Intrafamilial Stress* and *Ethnic*. However, a number of differences were found, which were most often greatest between the White and Pakistani group, with the Indian group in between. These included *Collectivism* (higher in Indian and Pakistani families), *Cultural Socialisation* and *Religion* (each higher in Pakistani families). The qualitative findings support the quantitative findings as well as offering complementary information.

**Findings in Relation to Study Hypotheses and Existing Literature**

A judgment on whether the findings uphold the study hypotheses, are discussed below.

**a) Parenting and Child Adjustment**

The findings of positive child adjustment, taken together with the findings on parenting and mother-child relationships, uphold the hypothesis that positive parenting is associated with positive outcomes for children. The high levels of maternal warmth and mother-child interaction and low levels of battles with children and maternal criticism in each family type, as measured by the interview, support this hypothesis, as do the high levels of mutuality. Moreover, the regression between parenting and child adjustment reveals that, in each ethnic group, total parenting stress was a greater predictor of child socio-emotional adjustment than other aspects of parenting, with ethnic identity a lesser predictor. Although levels of parenting stress were higher in the Pakistani group, overall, they were still within normal levels, suggesting that they were not detrimental to family functioning and child adjustment at the ages of five to seven years in Pakistani families.

Recent research (Goodman, Patel and Leon, 2010; 2008) has suggested that Indian ethnic minority children display fewer problem behaviours compared with other ethnic groups, but this pattern was not identified in the present study. Overall, it seems that second-generation Indian and Pakistani mothers and their children showed positive well-being, which is consistent with good psychological acculturation and low levels of acculturative stress in the Pakistani and Indian mothers and children (Sam and Berry, 2010). The positive adjustment could also be associated with the children’s perceptions of their parents as warm and accepting rather than rejecting. This idea forms the basis of Rohner’s (1986) Parental Acceptance-Rejection Theory (PARTheory), which has been supported, by
much cross cultural research and offers a universalist approach to understanding parenting (Rohner, 1994; Khaleque and Rohner, 2002).

It was also hypothesised, based on acculturation literature that similarities in parenting would exist between ethnic groups. This was supported by similar levels of warmth, mutuality, control, mother-child interaction, conflict and criticism between Indian, Pakistani and White families. Particularly interesting was the finding that mothers from each ethnic group reported that their partner’s level of help in childcare was similar. Past literature has suggested that Indian and Pakistani men are less likely to be involved in parental assistance (Beishon et al., 1998). It is possible that the present finding points to a departure from a more patriarchal set-up in Indian and Pakistani families as they acculturate further, with fathers and husbands taking more of a hands-on approach to family life (Berthoud, 2000; Dosanjh and Ghuman, 1996).

It is not clear whether the above-mentioned similarities in parenting are a result of acculturation. Correlations were carried out between the parenting measures and two acculturation measures to investigate whether a relationship between acculturation and parenting exists in Pakistani and Indian families. No relationships were found, except for Chaperonage, for which it was found that increased immersion in the dominant society resulted in tighter chaperonage rules. The lack of association between the parenting variables and acculturation may be due to the type of acculturation measure used. Although the Stephenson Multigroup Acculturation Scale showed convergent validity with generational status, it was a general measure of acculturation and, thus, not specifically created for Indian and Pakistani families (Celenk and van di Vijver, 2011). Moreover, in discussions with Indian, Pakistani and White mothers, mothers from each group felt that, aside from cultural differences, many aspects of parenting were fairly similar between groups.

In the present study, the hypothesis relating to differences between ethnic groups in the nature of parent-child relationships, particularly in relation to supervision and discipline, was upheld. Differences were found between groups in Supervision, Child-Centredness and Overt Discipline. These were most often found between the Pakistani and White families, with the Indian families lying between the two.

When comparing differences in parenting between the three family types, it is important to bear in mind that the differences in levels of parenting are small in magnitude, and all levels are within normal ranges. The higher levels of Supervision and Child-Centredness found in Pakistani mothers compared with Indian and White mothers indicate higher levels of protectiveness in this family type.
Why should Pakistani mothers be more protective? Past research has reported that groups of individuals experiencing higher discrimination, such as Muslims at present in the UK, are more likely to use separation strategies (Robinson, 2009; Sam and Berry, 2010). It may be argued that higher maternal supervision and child-centredness in Pakistani mothers represents a form of separation strategy in parenting among mothers from this group. This would also support the findings in the present study, which show that mothers’ levels of Dominant Society Immersion are a significant predictor of maternal Chaperonage, with mothers who immerse themselves more in the dominant society (and likely face more discrimination) being more protective of their children.

Past research has also discussed the importance of upholding family honour, particularly in more collectivist-based Pakistani families (Werbner, 2002; Lau, 2000; Bose, 2000; Becher and Husain, 2002). It is conceivable that protectiveness is a parenting mechanism by which mothers uphold the izzat and behaviour of their young children in order to maintain family honour. This could relate to different ethnotheories around parenting in the family types. The term ethnotheories refers to the set of ideas, beliefs and socialisation practices needed to attain the ideal child in the context of culturally relevant development goals (LeVine, 1974; Quin and Holland, 1987; Super and Harkness, 1997, 2002). These parental ethnotheories are shared by members of cultural communities and are essentially parenting goals with the developmental domains of independence or interdependence at their core. Greenfield (1994) empirically argues that non-Western cultures and immigrants (such as those from India and Pakistan) follow the cultural ideal of interdependence. Interdependent oriented ethnotheories emphasise responsibility, honesty, correct demeanour, politeness, respect for elders and family loyalty as cultural developmental domains. In contrast, non-Western cultures (such as English culture) possess more independent oriented ethnotheories, which emphasise self-maximisation, assertiveness, self-esteem, curiosity and creativity. These developmental domains are capable of existing across different educational and socio-economic backgrounds, (although high SES and formal education are more associated with independence). Furthermore, in independent and interdependent cultures, the age of the child plays a part in parents’ decisions about when children are allowed to partake in different autonomous behaviours. In independent cultures, parents are more likely to be authoritative, while in interdependent cultures, parents are more likely to be authoritarian and therefore parents are likely to exert more control and supervision of their children at a young age (Arnett, 1995). Given the more interdependent nature of Pakistani culture, and the young age of the children in the study, this could thus help to explain the higher supervision of children and possible associations with correct demeanour in Pakistani families.
Higher levels of *Overt Discipline* were found in Pakistani and Indian mothers compared with White mothers. High levels of discipline have been reported in past cross-cultural literature on parenting styles, and it has been suggested that in more interdependent cultures, a more authoritarian style of parenting results in better outcomes for children, as children have been socialised to expect such discipline and do not interpret it negatively (Arnett, 1995; Rutter and Tienda, 2005). It is conceivable that this could explain the higher levels of overt discipline in Indian and Pakistani families, and that children from these groups understand that overt discipline does not indicate a lack of affection. The difference in emphasis on parental discipline may also be related to different parental and cultural values around obedience. In a study of Asian Americans, Chao (1994) found that greater authoritarian parenting is associated with a cultural importance placed on child ‘training’ which emphasises hard work and discipline rather than high levels of sensitivity. Other studies have shown that more authoritarian parenting is associated with better child outcomes in conduct and educational achievement in some ethnic groups (Darling, 1999; Chao, 2001; Chao and Tseng, 2002). Could similar parental ethnotheories also exist in an Indian and Pakistani families? Past studies have shown the importance parents from both groups (particularly Indians) place on educational attainment and hard work in children (Barn et al., 2006; Lau, 2000). Therefore, this could be a distinct possibility.

These differences in parenting were hypothesised to be associated with different outcomes in children. For example, children from Indian and Pakistani families that implemented high supervision and discipline were predicted to show fewer conduct problems than White children. Despite the presence of differences in parenting between groups (i.e. higher levels of *Supervision*, *Child-Centredness* and *Overt Discipline* in Indian and Pakistani families), no differences were found in levels of children’s psychological adjustment (which were high) between groups. How should we interpret this? Given that differences in parenting were identified, yet child outcomes were positive, a claim could be made that development in Indian, Pakistani and White children was taking place within particular cultural contexts and pathways, causing them to experience different parenting styles yet still attain positive adjustment. The idea of cultural pathways has been developed by Greenfield and her colleagues (1994). They argue that socialisation practices should be understood in the cultural context in which they originated and were obtained. This idea allows for a departure from the deficit model of psychology in understanding development in minority children, (which emphasises the practices of the dominant group as the ‘norm’ and all behaviour deviating from the norm as lacking). The existence of developmental pathways implies that there is a specific organisation of developmental tasks through the lifespan of an individual and that earlier tasks on the pathway lay down the foundation and prepare individuals for later tasks (Trandis and Suh, 2002;
The two developmental pathways (i.e. independence and interdependence) are thought to be part of larger sociocultural systems (i.e. individualistic and collectivistic systems). As discussed earlier Indian and Pakistani families represent more collectivistic cultures, while White families represent a more individualistic culture. Given the available data, the suggestion of developmental pathways in children could be possible. However, the present hypothesis could not be conclusively tested in children with the available data.

Overall, the findings thus support some but not all of the hypotheses relating to parenting and child adjustment.

b) Cultural and Contextual Factors

The way children acquire culture is a core part of their development. The ethnotheories and responses parents’ use, the behaviours they allow, and the parenting practices that children respond to are important and should be understood within their cultural settings.

In the present study, the hypothesis, based on ecological systems theory, that child adjustment would be influenced by different contextual and immediate environmental factors and the interaction of these across ecosystem levels, and that these factors would be different for Indian, Pakistani and White families, was upheld. This was predicted particularly in relation to extended family involvement. Indeed, higher levels of interaction with extended families and grandparents (i.e. Collectivism) were found in Indian and Pakistani families compared with White families. Much literature exists on the role of extended family for South Asians in Britain, discussing its importance as a social and support structure (Barn, 2006; Bose, 2000; Jackson and Nesbitt, 1993). Grandparents, in particular, have been shown to live in Indian households (Connolly and White, 2006). The current findings seem to support this literature and suggest that Indians and Pakistanis continue to have strong links with their wider families. These findings also support the claim that second generation Indian and Pakistani families seem to represent more interdependent/collectivist cultures, while White families are more independent/individualistic cultures. Indeed, Greenfield (1994) speaks about respect for elders, extended family and gender specific behaviour roles an important form of socialisation in an interdependent society, but also an important means of cultural continuity in the host society in immigrant families.
These differences across ecosystem levels were hypothesised to be associated with different outcomes for the ethnic groups. For example, it was predicted that high extended family involvement in Indian and Pakistani groups would be associated with higher levels of child adjustment in these families. The findings show that despite differences in family life (higher levels of Collectivism, in Indian and Pakistani families compared with White families), no differences were found in levels of child psychological adjustment (which were high) between groups. Given that differences in parenting were identified, yet child outcomes were positive, a claim could again be made that individual developmental outcomes in Indian, Pakistani and White children are very much the result of their eco-cultural setting and that development follows the path laid out in the eco-cultural context causing them to experience different parenting and familial interaction, yet still attain positive adjustment. However, with the available data, the present hypothesis could not be conclusively tested in the children aged between five to seven years.

When studying minority families, one must keep in mind the cultural roots, current relations and political and economic circumstances of the community being researched. In the present study, every effort was made to understand the parenting routines of a particular immigrant generation (second generation). Interestingly, from the findings, some aspects of parenting were found to be similar in the family types, while others were different. This begs the question: Does growing up in a particular environmental and cultural setting (such as multicultural Britain) cause Indians and Pakistanis to parent similarly in some areas to White parents? Greenfield et al (2003) argue that when culture takes on different components, such as when individuals grow up in two or more cultures then the chances of parenting practices changing across generations are high (Greenfield et al, 2003). Second generation families thus seem to represent a group in transition. Indeed, the findings on generational parenting in Indian families, which showed Indian mothers were least likely parent similarly to their own first generation parents would offer support to this claim. Additionally, thinking about developmental pathways and independence/interdependence orientation in ethnic minorities living in western societies, studies have shown that more than one variety of individualism or independence orientation and more than one variety of collectivism or interdependence may exist across/within cultures (Greenfield et al, 2003). This reflects potential variability in parental ethnotheories within cultural settings. Thus, in second generation families different variations of these domains could develop.

Others, such as Arnett (1995) have identified socialisation patterns which offer possible explanations for differences in parenting. These include: broad socialisation which occurs in cultures which value
independence, individualism and self-expression, and narrow socialisation, which occurs in cultures which value obedience and conformity and are more interdependent. Deviance from cultural expectations is discouraged in narrow socialisation. These broad and narrow patterns are found in different realms of the public and private sphere (i.e. family, peers, school/work, community, the media, the legal system and the cultural belief system). Parenting and family life are central in Arnett’s theory. Parents to some extent, follow the norms or ethnotheories around parenting in the culture in which they live. Those living in cultures with narrow socialisation are likely to be less flexible in changing their parenting styles, and are more likely to demand obedience, as opposed to parents using broad socialisation. Arnett (1995) also highlights the role of the extended family in socialisation in different cultures particularly less Western ones. In contrast, he argues that in more Western cultures, extended families often have less of a role to play and children are likely to have more socialisation influences outside the family such as peers and child care workers, thus promoting broad socialisation. Although the theory, in general classes cultures as broad or narrow, Arnett also discusses, that it is important to recognise heterogeneity within cultures, in that different aspects of socialisation within a culture can be less or more broad or narrow. He further states that the theory makes no attempt to state that one type of socialisation is better than the other, and that both types have advantages and disadvantages. Moreover, attachment has an important role in this theory, and is a central motivator for children to comply with parents’ socialisation. Arnett (1995) suggests that warmth love and attachment are important in both broad and narrow socialisation and thus more etic in nature.

In the present study, it could be argued that non-immigrant White culture is one in which broader socialisation occurred, while traditional Pakistani and Indian cultures possess narrower socialisation. What about second generation immigrant families? Second generation immigrants are exposed to both types of socialisation values. Is it thus possible that these values could clash in families? Indeed, while the idea of a cultural clash (in terms of a clash between broad and narrow values) has been discussed with respect to first generation families (Bolognani et al., 2011; Imtiaz, 2002), in second generation families this seems to have less precedence. The findings seem to point to a pattern of British Pakistanis and Indians being broad in many aspects of parenting while narrow in others, with Pakistanis using the narrowest socialisation.

The diverse communities in which the families lived were hypothesised to influence parenting strategies and how parents spoke to their children about ethnicity and race (ethnic-racial socialisation). Both the quantitative and qualitative data support this hypothesis. The ethnic-racial
socialisation (ERS) of children was found to be an important and dynamic part of parenting in families of each group. The study identified different forms of ethnic-racial socialisation (i.e. cultural socialisation, egalitarianism, preparation for bias, and promotion of mistrust). Each socialisation method used by Indian, Pakistani and White mothers had unique goals and some forms of socialisation were used simultaneously (e.g. cultural socialisation and preparation for bias). The age of the child was also an important deciding factor for the type of socialisation utilised, with some mothers preferring to remain silent about race depending on the age of the child involved. While all mothers used religio-cultural socialisation practices with their children, they were most frequently noted in Pakistani mothers compared with Indian and White mothers. Furthermore, the extent of cultural socialisation and other types of socialisation used depended on the mothers’ social experiences and larger macrosystem values. Peers and schools also played a role in ethnic-racial socialisation.

A growing body of research in the US has described ethnic-racial socialisation practices as protective buffering factors between racial and ethnic discrimination and development outcomes. For example, cultural socialisation and moderate preparation for bias have been found to act as buffers between racism and self esteem, stress and conduct problems in youth (Neblett et al., 2012; Harris-Britt el al., 2007). They effectively form a means of resilience from negative environmental factors. Recent studies have found associations between ERS (particularly cultural socialisation and preparation for bias) and academic motivations/outcomes (Bennett, 2006; Brown et al. 2009; Smalls, 2009) and ERS and socioemotional adjustment (Constantine and Blackman, 2002; Hughes et al., 2006; Neblett et al., 2008; 2006; Rivas-Drake, 2011). Other studies have found cultural socialisation and egalitarian messages as predictors of positive self-concept (Bowman and Howard, 1985; Davis and Stevenson, 2006). However, not all socialisation is positive. Negative developmental outcomes have also been reported in relation to specific forms of ERS (Marshall, 1995; Neblett et al., 2006; 2008). For example, preparation for bias messages on their own have been found to contribute to negative self-esteem in youth by causing them to feel lack of control over their environment and subsequently to disengage from school and other social activities (Hughes et al., 2009).

Thus far, few studies have explored the buffering protective effects of ERS on developmental outcomes (see Neblett et al, 2010). Furthermore, these have often been explored in youth and not in young children. They have suggested ethnic identity and self esteem to be mediating mechanisms in the protective process. They also suggest that ERS may help with coping responses to discrimination, positive self perception and resistance to negative treatment. A recent integrative conceptual model
which offers an explanation of factors which may interact to shape positive development in youth has been developed by Neblett and colleagues (2012). This includes racial and ethnic identity, ERS and cultural orientation as important components. Ethnic Racial Socialisation functions in the model as a means by which youth prepare to perceive the world in a certain way. Self-concepts, cognitive appraisal processes (how youth take part, understand and make sense of the world) and coping are all important protective mechanisms in this model. Importantly, it stresses that racial/ethnic identity development, the instilling of family values and cultural socialisation begin early in life, and evolve though time. Thus, it is important to explore these processes in children as well as through key developmental periods.

The present study is one of the few available studies that investigate ERS in young children. It also places ethnic-racial socialisation in a British context. Regardless of ethnicity or place of birth, it was found that Indian, Pakistani and White families were encountering issues on race, ethnicity and culture on a frequent if not daily basis, and thus using ethnic-racial socialisation parenting practices extensively. These findings have important implications. They shed light on the socio-cultural adaptation of families in the study, highlighting that fewer families opted for separation parenting strategies (such as promotion of mistrust) and more families opted for integration strategies (such as egalitarianism). The type of socialisation used in families suggests that parents were often instilling protective and positive messages in their children around race and ethnicity (i.e. through cultural socialisation combined with moderate preparation for bias and egalitarianism) that correspond to positive socialisation as described in past literature.

In the present study, the hypothesis that Indian and Pakistani groups would experience more discrimination than the White group and that a high level of prejudice would be associated with significantly lower levels of child psychological well-being, was only partly upheld. The qualitative data support the fact that Pakistanis seem to experience the most discrimination compared with other groups. Pakistani mothers discussed feeling victimised because of their religious beliefs, and they blamed the media and political events for creating a highly Islamophobic environment in Britain. Both White and Indian mothers also mentioned Muslims as a group that was experiencing the most discrimination in contemporary society.

Stressful environments and ethnic inequalities have been found to be associated with unfavourable developmental profiles in children (Shonkoff, 2000; Kelly et al., 2006; Duncan, 2005). Numerous studies have highlighted the negative association between discrimination and developmental
outcomes such as socioemotional adjustment (Brody et al., 2006; Rivas-Drake at al., 2008; Sellers et al., 2006; Simons, 2002; Nyborg, 2003; Szalacha, 2003; Coker, 2009; Runions, 2011; Caughy, 2004). Many of these studies have taken place in a US context and among ethnic minority youth. However, a recent study in the UK with 2136 mothers and their 5 year old children found data that supported that mothers’ experiences of racism were linked to markers of early child health and development in a UK context also. Mothers who had experienced interpersonal racism were found to be more likely to have children with a higher risk of obesity. Further, mothers’ perception of racism in residential areas was associated with socioemotional difficulties in children (Kelly et al., 2012). This study used data from the UK Millennium Cohort Study and mothers and children were from the main ethnic groups in the UK including White, Pakistani and Indian families.

In the present study, the qualitative data showed that racism is also experienced by Indian as well as White families, but to a lesser extent. Non-immigrant White mothers highlighted incidents of discrimination towards themselves and spoke of feeling stereotyped in increasingly ethnically-diverse neighbourhoods. They gave examples of not being treated equally in public, of worrying that their children were alienated at school and of feeling that other ethnic groups were quick to label them as racist in certain situations. The study has no corresponding quantitative measure or scale that directly assesses levels of discrimination experienced by families. It is therefore not possible to conclusively test whether the hypothesis holds, and if it supports the available studies on discrimination and child outcomes. However, there is a quantitative measure for discussion of racism with children, which reveals that White mothers are more likely to discuss racism with their children compared with Indian mothers, with Pakistani mothers lying between these groups. This seems to challenge the hypothesis. It would seem more likely that Pakistani and Indian mothers, who form part of a minority group in the UK, would speak to their children about racism more than White majority-group mothers. It is possible that mothers from these groups opt to discuss racism less openly with their children as a protective mechanism. Furthermore, perhaps the hypothesis would have been upheld if a more direct measure of racism existed.

Religion was hypothesised to have a greater influence on parenting and family life in Pakistani families compared with Indian and White families. Further, it was predicted that this difference in religion would be associated with positive influences in the child’s life, including involvement in social networks based on religious belief. This hypothesis was supported by the higher levels of religiousness in Pakistani families compared with Indian and White families. Pakistani mothers were more likely to send children to after school religious classes and engage in religious play with their
children, compared with Indian and White mothers. The qualitative findings further support the importance of religion for the Pakistani families. Religious beliefs varied between and within groups, with some mothers more religious than others. Further, all Pakistani mothers discussed having strong beliefs, even if they did not fulfil religious practices. Indian mothers were much less likely to stress the importance of religion than Pakistani mothers, and seemed more relaxed about passing on religious messages to their children. The current findings concur with past research, which has highlighted the centrality of religion to the Pakistani group and its lesser importance to the Indian group (Robinson, 2009; Shaw, 2000; Abbas, 2005; Stopes-Roe and Cochrane, 1990; Modood et al., 1994). The literature has also shown that Muslims in Britain often express outwards displays of religion through dress and behaviour (Barn, 2006).

The contrasting parenting approach in Pakistani families compared to Indian and White families may be a result of differing ethnotheories around religion and cultural socialisation. Parental ethnotheories have been argued to possess a ‘directive force’ (D’Andrade, 1992) and organisational ability, i.e. they coordinate a range of different actions, events and situations. This may explain the array of overt and covert religious messages and activities such as after school classes in the Pakistani families. Other studies have also highlighted the importance of after school religious classes for children in Pakistani families (Beishon et al., 1998; Parker-Jenkins, 1999). Overall, the findings thus support some but not all of the hypotheses relating to cultural and contextual factors.

As part of an exploratory analysis, mothers were probed about their feelings relating to living in a culturally-diverse environment, of children growing up in Britain and perceptions of parenting in other ethnic groups. As discussed, this revealed a range of opinions and views from mothers in Indian, Pakistani and White families. Mothers from all groups felt there were both advantages and disadvantages to living in Britain. Indian mothers seemed to feel most positive about multiculturalism compared with White and Pakistani mothers. Furthermore, mothers believed that there were many similarities in parenting between groups, such as control of bedtime. These findings shed light on what it is like to be a parent in multicultural Britain, as well as on acculturation in Indian and Pakistani families.

Past research on acculturation in South Asians in the UK has been contradictory and often assessed in relation to adolescents. On the one hand, studies have noted that young Pakistanis are more likely to favour separation as opposed to integration, which is more popular for Indian adolescents (Robinson, 2009). On the other hand, they have noted that South Asian adolescents are likely to have
more bicultural and hyphenated identities (Ghuman, 1999; 2003). The findings from the present study would then concur more with the work of Ghuman (2003). They also point to Pakistani and Indian mothers being acculturated in different areas to different extents. For example, Indian mothers placed greater importance on caste system beliefs compared with Pakistani mothers, which shows that in some areas, British Indians remain fairly traditional. Yet feelings of Britishness were also high for Indians and Pakistanis, despite past literature suggesting that British Indian adolescents find national identity more important than British Pakistani adolescents (Robinson, 2009). As Ward (2008) notes, it is important to look outside the ‘Berry boxes’, as by labelling a group as separated or integrated as a whole, the very subtle ways in which mothers use different acculturation strategies in different parts of their lives may be overlooked.

Benet-Martínez’s (in press) model of Bicultural Identity Integration (BII) may be helpful in trying to understand the patterns of acculturation in British Indians and Pakistanis. The current findings point to a more hyphenated identity in both groups, yet seem to portray Pakistanis as being more traditional. The qualitative findings also show that some Pakistani mothers reported religion playing a far more important role than traditional culture in their lives. In these second generation mothers, while ties and affiliations to ethnicity can remain important in certain ways, they exist less centrally than for their immigrant parents. Other studies have similarly found that second-generation British Muslims may be less invested in the nature of their ethnicity (e.g. whether someone is Pakistani or Bengali) compared to their religion (Song, 2012; Jacobson, 1997; Kibria, 2008). Benet-Martínez (in press) suggests that variation can exist within the integrative acculturation strategy and in the creation of a synergistic identity, with groups with high BII being able to view themselves as hyphenated, or part of an emerging culture, while low BII individuals separate the two cultures more. Perhaps the creation of a ‘British Muslim’ identity by some second-generation mothers signals a move towards a third emerging culture. It seems that this is a distinct possibility, yet with only a subset of mothers having reported a rejection of their Pakistani culture, it also points to ingroup heterogeneity.

The present study was highly interdisciplinary in nature, drawing from different perspectives and theories to conceptualise the findings, thus strengthening the result. In order to capture the complex nature of ethnic groups living in diverse communities, the integrative approach by Motti-Stefanidi et al. (2012) was found to be a useful way of thinking about the use of theory in the study. The integrated model of adaptation drew from developmental psychology, acculturation theory and social psychology to understand how the process of adaptation occurred over different levels of analysis. In
the same way, the present study drew from a developmental approach, using Bronfenbrenner’s PPCT model (1999), from acculturation theory using the framework of acculturation (Sam and Berry, 2010), and from social psychology through the use of Hughes et al.’s (2008) ethnic-racial socialisation theory. The different theories came together to offer different levels of analysis, including those of the individual, the characteristics of family and home life and the impact of wider society and cultural beliefs on child development and parenting.

Another approach to thinking about family functioning between the groups in the study is by viewing culture as a means by which the developmental environment is structured. Super and Harkness (1997; 2002) propose this idea in their Developmental Niche framework, which could be considered as a further elaboration on Bronfenbrenner’s model (1999). The Developmental Niche framework assumes the child is an active agent, capable of learning, engaging in, receiving and assimilating information from his/her environment as well as influencing his/her cultural surround. Three major subsystems operate in this framework in which the child is situated: the social and physical settings of society, the traditions, customs and practices of society, and the culturally regulated customs of childrearing (involving the ethnotheories parents have about child care). Each of the subsystems is also linked to outside forces, e.g. social and economic or social change (which can lead to new settings for children), scientific discoveries, religious persuasion (which can influence caretakers ethnotheories) and intercultural contact (from which new customs can emerge). Changes can cause instability in the niche and activate internal adjustments. Second order effects such as sex and temperament also are important in this framework. These are personal characteristics whose meaning and effects are organised by features of the niche. This theory is directive as it considers child development to be shaped by the cultural environment, and argues for a need to consider the organisation of the environment itself.

In many ways, the present study tried to do this also. Numerous contextual factors were examined to understand parenting and the environment in which the children were growing up in. For example, ethnic-racial socialisation in families was investigated in relation to the ethnic diversity of the neighbourhoods in which the children lived. The study also took into account that mothers from different ethnicities may have different parental ethnotheories associated with their particular culture. Further, the interdisciplinary approach that the study used, allowed for broader outside forces (as highlighted in the developmental niche) to be considered in relation to the child. For example, the political climate of the UK following the 7/7 bombings, as well as the role of immigrants in the UK and multicultural policy were taken into account. Therefore, this study approached child outcomes
and parenting in a highly sensitive manner. At all stages from design, to analysis and particularly in relation to the theoretical models used in the thesis this sensitivity was kept in mind. Moreover, it took a non-deficit approach to the use of measures and the interpretation of results. What this means was that it was not considered negative if the Indian or Pakistani groups had different outcomes from the White group, (e.g. more supervision in the Pakistani group). Instead, this was interpreted as reflecting different the parental ethnotheories of this group. Behaviour was thus understood in the cultural context in which it developed. Ultimately the approach was universalist and similar to what Berry (1969) describes as a ‘derived etic approach’.

**Strengths and Limitations of the Study**

One of the strengths of the present study was that it attempted to reduce bias and inequivalence in a number of ways. The sample of participants had the smallest possible cultural distance (i.e. the minimal difference between the cultures being studied)\(^98\) in order to enhance validity of the study and minimise differences due to extraneous variables. All mothers and children were British-born and lived within ethnically diverse regions of London. Children attended state primary schools that had similar school curricula. All mothers stated English was their first language. Families were well-matched according to education (based on education levels in the general population according to the London census), and details of many contextual factors, such as age of family members, number of other children, sex of children and parents’ marital status were collected to build up a detailed picture of the families. Following analysis, only a few differences were found in the contextual factors. These included: Age of Father (Indian fathers were youngest), Number of Other Adults in the Household (highest in Indian homes) and the Mother’s Working Status (there was a higher number of Pakistani mothers not working and a higher number of White mothers working part-time). Aside from these three differences, all other contextual factors showed close matching between groups.

The recruitment of participants from ethnic minority groups is often difficult, particularly those from lower socio-economic status who are classed a ‘hard to reach group’ (Nazroo, 2006). Furthermore, ensuring the families were all British-born was difficult. While every attempt was made to ensure both parents were British-born, a small number of fathers from the Indian and Pakistani families were not born in Britain but had immigrated to the UK during their formative years. In light of these difficulties of recruitment, the size of the sample was satisfactory, although smaller than originally

---

\(^{98}\) When groups have a larger difference, it is more likely that significant cross-cultural differences will be found, and uncontrolled variables are also more likely to influence the results, offering alternative non-cultural explanations to differences (van de Vijver and Matsumoto, 2011).
planned, mainly due to time constraints. A small sample size increases the risk of Type II error (i.e. the chance of missing an effect and thus stating that there is no significant effect when in reality there is). Furthermore, a trade-off exists between Type II and Type I error. If a test is conservative (the probability of a Type I error is small) then it probably lacks statistical power (the probability of a Type II error will be high). Therefore, there is a need for the multiple comparison procedures used to control the Type I error rate but without a major loss in power (Field, 2009). In the study, great care was taken to try and reduce Type I and Type II error as much as possible. Data was effectively analysed such that the minimal number of effects were examined (though the use of inter-item correlations and computation of aggregate scores of variables where appropriate, and following up MANOVAs with ANOVA (and post-hoc tests) only when the effect was significant), underpowered analyses were avoided and caution was taken in the interpretation of results. However, despite these precautions it was possible that these errors still influenced the results to an extent.

In comparison to some studies, the present study seems to have fewer participants in each group. However, it has a strong representative sample and unlike other studies, distinguishes between generation type within immigrant groups. For example, Sonuga-Barke and Mistry (2000) recruited 44 Muslim and 44 Hindu families for their study on mental health in extended families and Atzaba-Poria et al. (2004) recruited 59 English and 66 Indian children in their study on child problem behaviour from an ecological perspective. Yet, neither made a distinction between the generation type of participants and both had more lax participant inclusion criteria. Future studies (such as the present one), which are designed specifically for a particular cross-cultural question could benefit from recruiting larger samples for comparison. Such studies would have the ability to detect smaller differences between groups. An example of a larger study on Indian children and mental health conducted by Goodman et al. (2010) studied 13,836 White children and 361 Indian children. However, this used data from the British Child and Adolescent Mental Survey which was not specifically designed for the research question, and also made no distinction between generations. Yet, it allowed for powerful quantitative analyses to be performed on the data. Thus a trade-off exists between the two study types. Future cross-cultural studies need to think carefully about this dilemma.

It is also important to remember that the present study took place in London, which has the highest level of ethnic populations and is thus different from other parts of Britain. Therefore, the results cannot be generalised to families in the UK as a whole. Additionally, the study was cross-sectional, which limits the ability to make causal inferences. Nevertheless, the study still provides detail about
the family lives of three important ethnic groups in Britain, examining for the first time second-generation families. Also, most importantly, it helps us understand the types of issues faced by families in increasingly diverse British neighbourhoods. Furthermore, this is the first study to explore ethnic-racial socialisation in such depth in the UK. Therefore, with immigration and the growth of ethnic minorities in the UK, it serves an important purpose. The findings could be generalised to other high ethnic minority density areas of Britain, such as Bradford, and it would be interesting to examine how they compare.

The use of a pilot study and initial discussions with participants from each ethnic group about what they felt different questions meant, was another strength of the study, as it helped reduce construct and method bias. Further, the ethnic matching of the interviewer to the groups being studied helped to ensure rich and detailed information was collected. This is evidenced in some of the detailed responses mothers gave on sensitive issues such as racism. Data were drawn from self-reported activity, through questionnaires, as well as through interviews with mothers rated by the researcher. The interview used both standardised measures as well as a qualitative component. The fact that mothers may present themselves in a socially desirable manner during the interview was anticipated. The characteristics of the interview helped account for this. It involved detailed and lengthy questioning and the assessment of non-verbal behaviours, including facial expressions and body language. Further, an observational measure was included to measure mother-child interaction which was less open to socially desirable responding. Such studies, which use many different methodologies to collect data, have been recognised as particularly credible (O’Connor, 2002). The use of interview, questionnaire and observational measures also helped reduce problems associated with method bias (i.e. that variance could be associated with the method of measurement rather than that the constructs being measured) (Podsakoff et al., 2003). Moreover, the questionnaires used in the present study had all been used cross-culturally in other studies and had good reliability and cross-cultural validity.

Mothers reported on the well-being of their children through the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ), which was the main measure for assessing child adjustment. Although the SDQ is a robust measure, and extensively used cross-culturally, the study would have been strengthened if an independent observer such as the child’s teacher had also completed the SDQ. This would have further increased validity and offered a more complete view of children’s behaviour difficulties (Zaslow et al., 2006). Indeed, collecting data from a number of informants also helps reduce reporting bias.
The use of mixed methods gave a more detailed understanding of cultural and contextual variables. The qualitative findings also offered complementary data on the lives of families. Further, the exercise of reflecting after each interview was very useful. This involved the researcher writing a short note about each family as well as a description of personal feelings about how the interview went, immediately following data collection. Reflecting strengthened the quality of the thematic analysis as it served as a reminder of participants, allowed for an in-depth understanding of each family being studied and was useful in creating data themes and sub-themes. The present study was the first to systematically ask mothers about their feelings about increased diversity in Britain, in relation to family life, particularly in the host non-immigrant White group, thus giving them a voice.

Being aware of how ‘personal reflectivity’ influences the researchers approach to and interpretation of interviews is important, and has been called for in research (Song and Parker, 1995). Some theorists have argued that in actuality a symbiotic relationship exists between reason and emotion and that subjectivity and objectivity should be viewed as acting together and not in a binary fashion (Stanley and Wise, 1993). In the present study, as an interviewer, I was always mindful of taking an unbiased stance. I believe my personal life experiences helped me with this. The fact that I had undergone an immigration experience myself, had lived in different countries and my training as a psychologist helped me in maintaining a degree of subjectivity and openly accepting different viewpoints. Moreover, in situations where mothers were discussing discrimination or other negative life experiences, I believe the empathy I was able to show allowed me to gain the interviewees’ trust. I was careful not to let my personal feelings (being British Pakistani myself) about the position of Pakistanis in relation to other groups in society influence my findings. The reflective experience after every interview, helped in this process. However, it is possible that my pre-existing beliefs may have somewhat influenced the analysis of the qualitative data; particularly as thematic analysis views the researcher as an active agent in making decisions about themes (Braun and Clarke, 2006).

In relation to the interviewee, Song and Parker (1995) argue that more attention needs to be placed on the assumptions made by the interviewees relating to the cultural identity of the researcher and how this shapes interview accounts. In the present study, my identity as a bicultural British and Pakistani researcher placed me in a unique position. The interviewers could claim to feel similarity or difference with me, based on ethnicity, physical appearance, language and gender. Furthermore, given the concept of intersectionality (Pheonix and Pattynama, 2006; Pheonix and Hussain, 2007) and the multiple positioning of these elements in relation to one another, it was possible that the
interviewee identified with me across more than one area. This matching was kept in mind during the interview process. Further, the fact that the study involved the exploration of ethnic/cultural identity and what it meant to be British may have highlighted these areas of similarity/difference even more so.

I found that the Pakistani families often felt similarity with me on religious grounds; the White families were able to identify with my Britishness, while the Indians connected with my ‘South Asianness’. As a researcher, I feel I played to these strengths. I was careful in the way I dressed, particularly in more conservative Pakistani households and was sympathetic to the views of all families. I seemed to become very British when the situation demanded it. The fact that I was bilingual also helped me establish a rapport and trust in South Asian families when a grandparent was present (who often spoke a traditional language). Some of the areas where a number of second generation mothers questioned me (and possibly felt difference) related to whether I was married, how independent I was and the extent of my education. It is possible, that such mothers revealed less because they felt they could not relate to me. With regards to the White mothers, the extent to which they chose to reveal their true feelings about immigration and South Asians may have been affected by my appearance and identity. However, given the rich data I was able to collect on all issues; it seemed that many mothers felt they could trust me enough to disclose information. There are thus numerous strengths and a few limitations around in depth interviewing in the present study.

Although the study examines the perspectives of mothers, it is important to note that some aspects of family relationships were not captured, including the child’s relationship with siblings and grandparents, as well as a more detailed account of the child’s relationship with their father. While information on the father was collected from the mother, the father’s involvement in the study may have provided valuable information.

The study did not quantitatively examine the role of gender in parenting and child development. There were two reasons for this. Firstly, it was felt that individual group sizes were relatively small such that representative inter-group comparison along the lines of gender would not have been possible. Secondly, the age of the children was felt to be too young to further investigate differences in activities such as household chores (which past studies have shown tend to fall on girls in Indian and Pakistani households) (Bose, 2000). However, from a qualitative perspective, the study explored cultural differences between groups and some second generation Pakistani and Indian mothers spoke of the importance of maintaining *Izzat* in their daughters (Werbner, 2002; Becher and Hussain, 2007)
and of their worry of their daughters’ future partner choices. Interestingly, some studies have indicated that there are fewer marked differences in gender roles in second generation households (Beishon et al., 1998). Perhaps a more detailed exploration of gender both quantitatively and qualitatively would have provided valuable information.

The study hypotheses were developed with an integrative use of three main theories in mind, as well as Markus and Kitayama’s (1991) independence/interdependence paradigm and past literature on Indian, Pakistani and White family life and parenting (as discussed in the literature review). Yet, there were a number of limitations regarding the theoretical approach used. There was a lack of one overarching theoretical model, which may have helped during the interpretation of results. Past use of ethnic-racial socialisation has mainly focused on adolescents and their mothers. However, in this study, ethnic-racial socialisation was only measured from the perspective of the mother, as the children were of such a young age. Further, the use of more quantitative measures of ethnic-racial socialisation (which the study lacked) may have helped in understanding overall patterns of ethnic-racial socialisation used by mothers. Additionally, there was no direct quantitative measure of levels of racism experienced by mothers, which may have helped in the interpretation of findings. Acculturation, also, was not measured in Indian and Pakistani children due to their young age, and past literature has also rarely studied acculturation in such a young age group.

The independent/interdependent construct (Markus and Kitayama, 1991) was used to help interpret findings. An important and common criticism of the independence/interdependence (individualism/collectivism) paradigm is that it is highly reductionist and that the use of binary dichotomies is simplistic (Killen and Wainryb, 2000). Another critique is the idea that independent and interdependent values can exist within the same culture (Killen and Wainryb, 2000). Some theorists have argued that it is impossible for the two to co-exist, as both systems are parallel and a child follows a developmental path in one direction or the other. Greenfield et al. (2000), respond to this by stating that a particular behaviour might be valued in both cultures but its level of priority within the culture may be different. For example, in mainstream American culture, sharing with siblings is a matter of personal choice. However, in Mexican immigrants in the US, sharing is a higher priority and is simply expected in the culture (Raeff et al, 2000). Giving priority to one value over another can imply setting boundary conditions for the favoured value to be expressed. Greenfield et al. (2000) further argue that the existence of two different systems in bilingual individuals does not provide evidence against the systems. Although they agree that the two systems exist as parallels, and not a mix or separate characteristics, they argue that each system can be
independently brought out through a culturally relevant prime (Hong et al., 2000; Kuhnen and Oyserman, 2002; Kuhnen et al., 2001). This idea concurs with Benet-Martinez’s theorisation on culturally relevant primes in biculturals (in press). In the present study, the idea that second generation families can tap into different value systems in different areas of their lives seems to agree with the findings. Although similarities were found in parenting between groups, definite differences were present which most often seemed to emerge from a specific cultural context.

**Future Directions, Contributions of the Study and Implications for Policy**

There are a number of important possibilities for future research. It would be interesting to follow up on the children and mothers in the present study, particularly in relation to the development of ethnic-racial socialisation over the life course to understand whether the issues experienced by third-generation children are similar to those of their parents. Another study that would be particularly interesting would be one that compares ethnic-racial socialisation in different areas of the UK, including ethnic minority-majority regions as well as ethnic majority regions, to examine whether the way in which parents speak to their children about race depends on environment, such as neighbourhood and school. Indeed, there were indications of the importance of schools to ethnic-racial socialisation in the present study. Schools were found to play a strong role in encouraging egalitarianism, and many mothers spoke of this. Not only was school a place where children were exposed to diversity through other pupils, but it was also an environment where children actively learned about other cultural practices and differences. It seems that UK state schools opt for egalitarianism-based socialisation, which acts as a buffer for countering racism and discrimination and can instil a sense of equality in children. Yet, this begs the question: How important is it for children to see diversity in a classroom in order for them to truly appreciate and understand egalitarianism? In situations where more homogenous minority-majority neighbourhoods are developing in parts of the UK, the question of whether children will fully conceptualise the important messages of egalitarianism is an important one. Conversely, certain incidents in school, such as those relating to prejudice, could also trigger other types of ethnic-racial socialisation, such as preparation for bias.

A promising result from the research was the finding that some mothers focused heavily on diversity. A sub-group mentioned feeling that their child was a ‘multicultural child’ who had been exposed to diversity from birth. They actively made friends and had teachers who were from different ethnicities, and their multicultural child took all of this in their stride. As one mother put it, ‘because
they have always been brought up in a . . . multicultural area it is nothing new for them, so they accept things’. Mothers encouraged diversity and equality at home, ensuring the multicultural child developed fully. They described their children as being highly tolerant and accepting. It would be valuable to explore these ‘multicultural children’ in future research.

Overall, the study makes a number of important contributions. If we recall the three goals of cross-cultural psychology identified by Berry and Dansen (1974), the present study has made some headway in addressing these goals, particularly in a UK context. It highlights similarities and differences among British Indian, British Pakistani and non-immigrant White groups, giving us a greater knowledge of these cultures. It therefore increases understanding about the extent to which the parenting processes that have been found to be most significant for positive child development can be generalised to other ethnic groups, and allows for a holistic understanding of phenomena with more ‘pan-human validity’. It also provides information about what it means to be second-generation parents and what it means to parent in an ethnically diverse area. It has the potential to inform policy and increase theoretical understanding of the mechanisms that affect parenting in Indian, Pakistani and White families.

Capturing the diversity and lived experiences of second generation Indian and Pakistani families and White families is important for our understandings of cultural diversity and the formation of public policies. Good service delivery to all groups in a multicultural society requires knowledge of the types of issues addressed in the study, such as perceptions of ethnic groups and experiences of discrimination. Psychologists, teachers and social workers need to be aware of these for ethnic groups and realise the importance of group heterogeneity and generational differences.

Placing the findings from the study in a theoretical context, it can be argued that it is important to understand the two paradigms of development i.e. independence and interdependence, particularly when they come into contact in multicultural societies. This sentiment is also echoed by Greenfield and her colleagues (1994). When immigrants from collectivist societies first come to more individualistic host societies, conclusions can be drawn about their development by professionals. Where there is lack of information about the cultural pathways in which these immigrants and their children develop, professional recommendations may be made about care which assume an independent development (e.g. separate sleeping arrangement) but which conflict with interdependent development and ethnotheories of immigrants. This can thus lead to incorrect recommendations about the child’s development. Second generation parents, as discussed seem to be
independent in some aspects of parenting while interdependent in others. For example, Pakistani mothers showed more overprotectiveness with their children compared to Indian and White mothers, but showed similar levels of warmth. The study shows, that as in the case for first generation immigrants, it would be wrong of clinicians and professionals to assume an either complete independence orientation or complete interdependence orientation in second generation immigrants. It is therefore important that second generation families are understood in the context of their developmental pathways and of both their collectivist and individualistic characteristics.

It could be argued that this idea also relates to education provision in different cultures. Past research has shown that in independent cultures, teachers focus more on independent academic achievement while in collectivist cultures, they may emphasise more on respect and social behaviour. How do second generation families relate to this argument? It was found that Indian parents reported less parenting stress in their children. This may be due to their children showing more compliance and obedience and being less assertive. However, in a classroom setting, a quieter child may not necessarily be considered to be excelling. Thus, it would be important for a teacher to keep cultural differences in mind when coming to this conclusion. Perhaps a quieter child is showing good behaviour in their cultural context.

The study also revealed a number of other areas wherein differences lay between groups. It provided information about the type of after school classes children from the different groups engaged in. Pakistani children were most likely to attend religious classes, while Indian and White children were more likely to attend sports and dance classes. This finding may provide information about the degree of physical activity children from different groups engage in. Although the study did not take anthropometric measures relating to the levels of fitness and weight in the children, it would be interesting to examine whether a difference in these existed according to ethnicity. This could be related to the priorities different cultures placed on specific after school activities. Such information would be particularly useful to schools in ensuring that all children receive adequate exercise.

From a definitional perspective, it was seen that ethnicity, race, religion and other forms of identity in the study were often not mutually exclusive. Furthermore, the White group discussed feeling more ‘ethnicised’ in highly multicultural environments. This finding has implications for the way researchers interpret the word ‘White’ and how much emphasis they place on this term as being a ‘racial’ rather than ‘ethnic/cultural’ term. Moreover, the type of ethnic and racial categories which surveys (as well as the census) allow participants to choose from, is important. When a group feels
little identification with being a certain way, forcing them to choose a particular category may be distorting. It may give the impression that an individual has a more unified identity than actually is the case. For example, some mothers in the Pakistani group discussed feeling more British and Muslim than Pakistani and that national identity held less precedence for them as they were second generation.

The study revealed much about how diversity influences parents and children in societies such as the UK, where ‘super-diversity’ (Vertovec, 2007) is evident. The importance of ethnic-racial socialisation as a protective buffer for young children and explanatory mechanism for parents was shown. More understanding in schools and other institutions is needed about the positive and negative effects of particular types of socialisation. Additionally, the study showed that some White mothers felt that the celebration of ‘Englishness’ was being sidelined in favour of the celebration of other cultures at schools. It is important that such feelings of discontent are recognised at an early stage and that schools and other institutions provide a fair and equal celebration of all types of cultures. Discontent in such areas can sow the seeds for future inter-ethnic tension between groups. Racism was experienced by all groups, including the White group. The negative effects of racism on children have been much documented and were discussed in the study. Interventions that attempt to improve child development and address inequalities between groups need to incorporate effective approaches to tackling racism at all levels of society. This sentiment is also echoed by a recent British study (Kelly et al., 2012).

These findings have important implications for understanding more about the type of intercultural strategies used by British born families, and the mechanisms of multiculturalism (described by Berry, 2011). The second generation families in this study showed bicultural identities and seemed to immerse themselves fairly equally in the dominant and ethnic societies. The White families spoke about interacting with ethnic groups on a daily basis. Yet, some felt that in such ethnically diverse areas, where there was a dominance of one major group, mixing could be difficult. At the institutional level, some mothers gave accounts of how ethnicity and race came into play in a school environment and how their children often had friends from many backgrounds.

The study shows that it is important for policy makers and the media to take intra-group variability into account. Second generation families have been found to be very different to the immigrant generation before them. When recent reports such as the Cantle report (2001) speak about polarisation in educational and community institutions, voluntary bodies, places of work and social
and cultural networks, and of communities leading parallel lives, how true is this for second generation families? The present research seems to show that these families do not lead completely isolated lives. Furthermore, when policy speaks about moving ‘beyond multiculturalism’ (Joppke, 2004) and places emphasis on citizenship, what place does Islam have in this? While theorists have argued Islam and the West are polar opposites and much public debate has taken place on this topic, the study showed that some Pakistani mothers reconciled the two and were proud to call themselves British Muslims. Future strategy needs to integrate religion into policy around diversity and understand it as an important identity to many groups living in the UK today, including second generation Pakistanis. Studying more about these groups will help increase understanding and dispel some of the stereotypes prevailing, which the media often sensationalises. If multiculturalism is to exist in its true definitional form as a framework where people can live with equal opportunities, more of such research is needed.

The current findings relating to second-generation mothers and their children do not support the negative assumptions often associated with ethnic minority families, and point to the importance of viewing the non-immigrant White group in an ethnicised manner. They are, therefore, particularly relevant in contemporary British society with its increasing diversity and ongoing debate about what multiculturalism means and how to manage it.
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# APPENDIX A

## Population of the UK by Ethnic Group

Table A.2

Population: by ethnic group, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>United Kingdom</th>
<th>Total population</th>
<th>Non-White population (percentages)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>Percentages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>White</strong></td>
<td>54,153,898</td>
<td>92.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mixed</strong></td>
<td>677,117</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Asian or Asian British</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>1,053,411</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>747,285</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>283,063</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Asian</td>
<td>247,664</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Asian or Asian British</td>
<td>2,331,423</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Black or Black British</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Caribbean</td>
<td>565,876</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black African</td>
<td>485,277</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Black</td>
<td>97,585</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Black or Black British</td>
<td>1,148,738</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chinese</strong></td>
<td>247,403</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other ethnic groups</strong></td>
<td>230,615</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All minority ethnic population</strong></td>
<td>4,635,296</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All ethnic groups</strong></td>
<td>58,789,194</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Census 2001, Office for National Statistics; Census 2001, General Register Office for Scotland; Census 2001, Northern Ireland Statistics and Research Agency*
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Recruitment Booklet

CONFIDENTIAL

Does MOTHER/FEMALE GUARDIAN live with the child? 
O Yes    O No

If ‘Yes’, what is MOTHER’S/ FEMALE GUARDIAN’S main job? 
(Please describe on line below)

Which of the following qualifications does MOTHER/FEMALE GUARDIAN have? (Please tick all levels achieved)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualifications</th>
<th>Levels Achieved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O 1 or more GCSEs/O levels/CSEs (any grades)</td>
<td>O NVQ Level 1, Foundation GNVQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O 5 or more GCSEs/ A-C)/ O levels (A-C)/ CSEs (Grade 1)/ School Certificate 1</td>
<td>O NVQ Level 2, Intermediate GNVQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O NVQ Level 3, Advanced GNVQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O NVQ Levels 4-5, HNC, HND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O Other Qualifications (e.g. City and Guilds, RSA, OCR, BTEC/Edexcel)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O Professional qualification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O No Qualifications</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Does FATHER/MALE GUARDIAN live with the child? 
O Yes    O No

If ‘Yes’, what is FATHER/MALE GUARDIAN’S main job?

Was your child born in Britain? 
O Yes    O No

Was MOTHER/FEMALE GUARDIAN born in Britain? O Yes O No
Which of the following qualifications does FATHER / MALE GUARDIAN have? (Please tick all levels achieved)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualifications</th>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>O NVQ Level 1, Foundation GNVQ</th>
<th>O NVQ Level 2, Intermediate GNVQ</th>
<th>O NVQ Level 3, Advanced GNVQ</th>
<th>O NVQ Levels 4-5, HNC, HND</th>
<th>O Other Qualifications (e.g. City and Guilds, RSA, OCR, BTEC/Edexcel)</th>
<th>O No Qualifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 or more GCSEs/O levels/CSEs (any grades)</td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or more GCSEs (A-C) / O levels (A-C) / CSEs (Grade 1) / School Certificate 1 A level, 1-3 AS levels</td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 or more A levels / 4 or more AS levels / Higher School certificate</td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Degree (e.g. BA, BSc)</td>
<td></td>
<td>O NVQ Levels 4-5, HNC, HND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Degree (e.g. MA, PhD, PGCE, post-graduate certificates/diplomas)</td>
<td></td>
<td>O Other Qualifications (e.g. City and Guilds, RSA, OCR, BTEC/Edexcel)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional qualification</td>
<td></td>
<td>O No Qualifications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Was FATHER / MALE GUARDIAN born in Britain?  
O Yes   O No

DO YOU AGREE TO BEING CONTACTED TO HEAR MORE ABOUT THIS PROJECT

(please note you are free to withdraw from your agreement at any time without giving a reason)

O Yes   O No

SIGNED  
(Parent/Guardian) ____________________________________________

DATE  ____________________________________________

Thank you very much for your help with this project
APPENDIX C
Location of Ethnic Groups in London

Key

White British
- 75% - 94.8%
- 60% - 75%
- 50% - 60%
- 8.7% - 50%
From:
APPENDIX D
Qualification Framework

Personal Qualifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualification Details</th>
<th>Relevant Qualifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 or more GCSEs/O levels/CSEs (any grades)</td>
<td>NVQ Level 1, Foundation GNVQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or more GCSEs (A-C)/O levels (A-C)/CSEs (Grade 1)/School Certificate 1 A level, 1-3 AS levels</td>
<td>NVQ Level 2, Intermediate GNVQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 or more A levels/4 or more AS levels/Higher School certificate</td>
<td>NVQ Level 3, Advanced GNVQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Degree (e.g. BA, BSc)</td>
<td>NVQ Levels 4-5, HNC, HND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Degree (e.g. MA, PhD, PGCE, post-graduate certificates/diplomas)</td>
<td>Other Qualifications (e.g. City and Guilds, RSA, OCR, BTEC/Ed-excel)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Qualifications</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CODED AS 1 (PRIMARY)

CODED AS 2 (SECONDARY)

CODED AS 3 (HIGHER)

CODED AS 1
APPENDIX E
Information Sheet for Parents

UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE
Centre for Family Research

Family Life in Multicultural Britain

INFORMATION SHEET FOR PARENTS

Thank you for your interest in this study of family life and child development across different ethnic
groups in the United Kingdom. The study aims to better understand the well being and progress of
children in today’s multicultural British society.

As part of the study you will be interviewed and asked to fill out questionnaires about family life, the
things you do together, and your child’s development and wellbeing. The interview will last
approximately one and a half hours and the questionnaire will take about 15 minutes to complete. You
are under no obligation to take part. We would like to make a video recording of you and your child
doing a puzzle together for 10 minutes.

If you are happy to give consent for your child and you to take part in this project your results will be
completely confidential. This means that:

1. Your personal data and your child’s data will be held in a locked filing cabinet at the University
   of Cambridge with no identifying information attached. An identification number will be used in place
   of your child’s name.

2. Any personal details of your family will only be known to the researcher in charge of the study
   and will be kept in a locked filing cabinet at the University of Cambridge.

3. Information entered onto the computer for data analysis will be in the form of numbers and will
   not include names, addresses or any other identifying information.

4. When the results of the research are written up, you will not be identified as having taken part in
   the study. Neither will information which might make you identifiable be reported.

5. We will protect the confidentiality of the information you provide within the limitations of the
   law

The project has been reviewed by the Ethics Committee of the University of Cambridge and has
received ethical approval.

If you have any queries please do not hesitate to contact Humera Iqbal at 07823690821 or email
hi226@cam.ac.uk
APPENDIX F
Consent Form for Parents

ID NUMBER: -------------------

PARENT CONSENT FORM

Delete as Necessary

• Have you read the information sheet? YES/NO

• Have you had an opportunity to ask questions and discuss this study? YES/NO

• Have you received satisfactory answers to your questions? YES/NO

• Do you understand that you are free to withdraw from this study? YES/NO

• at any time

• without giving a reason for withdrawing

• Do you agree to take part in this study? YES/NO

• Do you agree to allow the interview to be tape recorded? YES/NO

• Do you agree to allow the puzzle with you and your child to be video recorded? YES/NO

Signed..............................................................................................................................

Name in Block Letters..............................................................................................................

Date...........................................................................................................................................
PARENT CONSENT FORM FOR CHILD PARTICIPATION

• Have you read the information sheet? YES/NO

2. Do you understand that you are free to withdraw from this study? YES/NO
   • at any time
   • without giving a reason for withdrawing

3. Do you agree to allow your child to take part in this study? YES/NO

4. Do you agree to allow the puzzle with you and your child to be video recorded? YES/NO

Signed............................................................................................... (MOTHER/FATHER)

Name in Block Letters........................................................................................................

Date.................................................................................................................................
APPENDIX G
Copy of the Mothers Interview

HOUSEHOLD STRUCTURE

I'd like to begin by getting a few details about your family and who lives here with you.
(Obtain number of adults, number of children and relationships to mother.)

Data entry
Other adults relation to mother: 1 = husband, 2 = cohabiting partner, 3 = mother’s mother, 4 = mother’s father, 5 = mother’s mother-in-law, 6 = mother’s father-in-law, 7 = other relative (extended family or kin members- specify), 8 = friend, 9 = lodger, 10 = nanny, Sex: Male = 1, Female = 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>D.O.B.</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Relation to child</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(PROBES)

Do you mind telling me how old you are? (get d.o.b)

Number of siblings in household: __________
HOUSEHOLD STRUCTURE Continued:

Can I just check, is (partner) (child’s) father?

So (child) is living with ..........

Does your partner have any children from a previous marriage who live elsewhere?

Current marital status

Married to child’s (original) father 0
Cohabiting with child’s father 1
Separated/divorced from child’s father 2
Father died 3
New partner (married) 4
New partner (cohabiting) 5

Family structure

Child with both parents 1
Child with mother only 2
Child with father only 3
Child with mother and stepfather 4
Child with father and stepmother 5
Other 6
Child with mother and new partner, not married but is in the father role 7

Partner’s children elsewhere

No 0
Yes 1
OCCUPATION/TRAINING

Are you working now - I mean a job outside the home?

IF YES: Is that full-time or part-time?

IF NO: Have you worked in the past?

What is your occupation?

Can I ask about your qualifications?
* Tick all levels achieved

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O 1 or more GCSEs/O levels/CSEs (any grades)</th>
<th>O NVQ Level 1, Foundation GNVQ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O 5 or more GCSEs (A-C)/O levels (A-C)/CSEs (Grade 1)/School Certificate 1</td>
<td>O NVQ Level 2, Intermediate GNVQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A level, 1-3 AS levels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O 2 or more A levels/4 or more AS levels/Higher School certificate</td>
<td>O NVQ Level 3, Advanced GNVQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O First Degree (e.g. BA, BSc)</td>
<td>O NVQ Levels 4-5, HNC, HND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Higher Degree (e.g. MA, PhD, PGCE, post-graduate certificates/diplomas)</td>
<td>O Other Qualifications (e.g. City and Guilds, RSA, OCR, BTEC/Edexcel)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Professional qualification</td>
<td>O No Qualifications</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mother’s working status
Not currently working ........ 0
Working part-time .......... 1
Working full-time .......... 2

Mother’s occupation
Professional..................... 1
Managerial/Technical......... 2
Skilled non-manual .......... 3
Skilled manual............... 4
Partly skilled............... 5
Unskilled.................... 6
Not applicable ............ 9
OCCUPATION/TRAINING (continued)

How about your partner? Does he work?

**IF YES:** Is that full-time or part-time?
**IF NO:** Has he worked in the past?

What is your partner’s occupation?

Can I ask about your partner’s qualifications?
* Tick all levels achieved

---

**Partner’s working status**

- Not currently working ...... 0
- Working part-time ............ 1
- Working full-time............ 2

**Partner’s occupation**

- Professional.................... 1
- Managerial/Technical......... 2
- Skilled non-manual ............ 3
- Skilled manual.................. 4
- Partly skilled.................... 5
- Unskilled........................ 6
- Not applicable .................. 9

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualification Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O 1 or more GCSEs/O levels/CSEs (any grades)</td>
<td>O NVQ Level 1, Foundation GNVQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O 5 or more GCSEs (A-C)/ levels (A-C)/ CSEs (Grade 1)/ School Certificate 1</td>
<td>O NVQ Level 2, Intermediate GNVQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A level, 1-3 AS levels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O 2 or more A levels/ 4 or more AS levels/ Higher School certificate</td>
<td>O NVQ Level 3, Advanced GNVQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O First Degree (e.g. BA, BSc)</td>
<td>O NVQ Levels 4-5, HNC, HND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Higher Degree (e.g. MA, PhD, PGCE, post-graduate certificates/ diplomas)</td>
<td>O Other Qualifications (e.g. City and Guilds, RSA, OCR, BTEC/Edexcel)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Professional qualification</td>
<td>O No Qualifications</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ETHNIC IDENTITY

How would you describe yourself?
(PROBE: based on nationality, background, culture etc)

How would you describe your ethnic identity?

For Non Immigrant White families:

Originally, what part of the UK was your family from?

Have you always lived in London?

For Pakistani/Indian families:

Were your parents born in the UK?

Originally what part of Pakistan/India is your family from?

What decade did your parents (or grandparents) migrate to the UK?

Was your partner born in the UK?

And were your partner’s parents born in the UK?

Have you always lived in London?

Biraderi and Caste

Are you from a specific biraderi or caste? (specify)

Is your Husband from the same biraderi or caste? (specify)

How important is your biraderi/caste to you?
PARENTAL DESCRIPTION OF THE CHILD

Now I’d like to ask you some questions about how (child) is getting on.

(N.B. Mothers are given two minutes to talk freely in response to each of the questions below.)

What is her personality like?

Could you tell me what (child) looks like?

What is S/he like to live with?

Description of child

Negative ........................... 0
Neutral .............................. 1
Positive ............................. 2

Probe:
*If you had to describe her to someone who has never seen her before-how would you describe her appearance?

Perception of child

Good, easy .......................... 1
Some problems, not a strain .... 2
Some problems, a strain ........... 3
Difficult child, not a strain ...... 4
Difficult child, a strain .......... 5
DEVELOPMENT, BEHAVIOUR, AND EMOTIONAL PROBLEMS

Has (child) ever had any major health problems?
(PROBE: If major or chronic problems)

IF YES: Has s/he ever had to go into hospital for 7 days or longer?

(PROBE: Specific reasons for hospitalisation)

How old was s/he then?

How long did s/he spend in hospital in total?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADMINISTER STRENGTHS &amp; DIFFICULTIES QUESTIONNAIRE NOW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(See Questionnaire 1 in Mother’s Questionnaire Booklet)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Serious health problems

No.............................. 1
Yes............................. 2

Child in hospital more than 7 days

No.............................. 1
Yes............................. 2

Reasons for hospitalisation

Infections.................1
Operations....................2
Accidents/injury............3
Other..........................4
Not Applicable...............9
GOING TO SCHOOL

Now I’d like to ask you about when (child) goes to school......

Is s/he going to school?

Where does she go?

What kind of school is s/he going to?

How does s/he get there?

Does s/he like school?

How is s/he getting on?

What’s it like when s/he says goodbye to you? Anxious or tearful?

Or does s/he not seem worried about going in?

Is there any problem over separating from you? Or is everything fine?

If YES: How do you deal with this?

School Attended
Not at school .....................0
State school ......................1
Private Primary .................2
Special school ....................3
Religious school ...............4

Settled
Very Settled .................1
Moderate .................2
Not Very Settled ............3

Separation Pattern
Not at school .................0
Unconcerned .................1
Apprehensive .................2
AFTER SCHOOL

What time does s/he get out of school?

Do you meet him/her?

How is s/he when you first meet up again?

What does s/he do?

Do you do anything to welcome him/her home?

How does s/he respond to this?

Do you send your child to any form of after school or weekend classes/ activities?

Can you give me examples of the type of classes your child goes to (if yes)?

How long for (if yes)?

Recontact Behaviour

Well connected................1
Some Connection ............2

After school classes

No..............................1
Yes............................2

After school classes/activities (type)

None..........................0
Religious classes............1
Language classes ..........2
Dance classes.................3
Home work clubs...........4
Tuition (extra learning)......5
Music lessons .................6
Art classes.....................7
Sports..........................8
After school clubs..........9
Other .........................10

Duration

Number of times a week: -----
Number of hours: --------
**SUPERVISION**

*Now I’d like to ask you about when (child) plays……*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outside Boundaries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not allowed out of home/garden ….0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plays on definite patch .....1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plays mostly on definite patch............................................2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently plays off patch..........................3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No specified territory .........4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rules for friend making</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No rules for friend making….0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage child to make friends with children from the same faith........................1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage child to make friends with children from the same culture..................2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage child to make friends with children of the same gender........................3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)..................................................4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chaperonage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not allowed to play with other children ........................................ 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowed to play with others in own home only ......... 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowed to play with others in home or well-known other child’s home............... 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowed to play outside on well-known patch with other known children............ 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowed to play on patch with other children not known to parents .............. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowed to play with known children, territory undefined ................................ 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowed to play with unknown children, territory undefined............................. 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Is s/he allowed to play on his/her own outside or with friends?

How far do you let him/her go?

Would you ever let other children take him/her further away to play e.g. shops, park etc?

Do you have any rules about who s/he plays with?

What rules do you have about who s/he makes friends with?
(Probe: to do with ethnicity and faith/ gender of child)

Do you always know where s/he is and who s/he is playing with by name?

Is it important that you know his/her friends’ parents? Or not really?

Does s/he have friends over to play at home?

Does s/he play at other friends’ homes?

How often is this?
EVENING TIME

Does the family have an evening meal together?

How often does your child help out around the house?

What do you do in the evening?

What time does (child) usually go to bed?

Does s/he have a set bedtime?

Does s/he actually go then?

How do you settle him/her down?

Does s/he have a story?

Is bedtime easy or difficult?

Does he/she use any kind of delay tactics?

How much of a battle is bedtime for you?

What about bedtimes during weekends and holidays?

Child helps out

Never.............................0
Once in a while.............1
Regularly.....................2

Set bedtime

No..................................1
Yes.................................2

Control of bedtime

Controlled by child.........1
Some parental control.....2
Parents: flexible............3
Parents: flexible (w/e) ......4
Parents inflexible.........5

Ease of bedtime

No difficulty...............1
Minor reluctance............2
Significant resistance......3
Resistance & disruption ...4
Major battles...............5
RELATIONSHIP WITH MOTHER

How do you get along with (child)?

Is s/he easy to be affectionate with?

In what ways does s/he show affection towards you?

Do you enjoy each other’s company?

Are there things you do together in your spare time?
I’ll just run through a quick list…
(PROBE: activities in coding…)

How much time have you spent in the last week doing these kinds of things? (in hours)

What do you do?

Where do you go?

How often?

Overt warmth in the relationship
little or none .............. 0
some ....................... 1
moderate .................. 2
marked .................... 3
not applicable .............. 9

Mother → Child ___

Child → Mother ___

Types of play shown by mother and child (Including when father is present)
Yes............................ 1
No ............................. 2
N/A .......................... 9

Playing with toys (e.g. dolls, action figures)_____

Games (e.g. puzzles, board games, lego, computer, PS3, wii or internet games)_____

Reading together _______

Drawing/craft/making things together............ _______

Rough and tumble/physical play___________

Domestic play (e.g. cooking/ doing chores together for fun) __________

Imaginative/pretend play (e.g. pretending to be pop stars or action heroes) __________

Religious play (e.g. DVDs hanuman, religious stories) __________

Other (Please describe) _____

How long in last week spent playing (hrs) _____

Mutual Enjoyment of play
Little or none ............. 1
Moderate ................ 2
A great deal ............ 3
RELATIONSHIP WITH MOTHER continued:

Most children have battles at some point with their parents.

Is there any arguing or bad feeling between you?

Is there anything in (child’s) nature which causes you irritation?

How often does this happen?

What do you disagree about?

How often?

How does it start?

How do you react?

How long does it last?

Do you shout or discuss the issue calmly?

How does it end?

Do you make up or give the ‘silent treatment’?

---

**Frequency of battle**

- Never .................. 0
- Occasionally .......... 1
- Frequently .......... 2
- All the time .......... 3

**Level of battle**

- No confrontations ........ 0
- Minor episode (5 mins) ... 1
- Moderate .............. 2
- Major battle .......... 3
- N/A .................... 9

**Resolution**

- Full ................. 0
- Partial ............. 1
- None ............... 2
- N/A .................. 9
**DISCIPLINE**

How do you deal with battles or troublesome behaviour?

Do you and your partner work together as far as discipline is concerned, or do you disagree about how to handle things?

Will you agree a lot of the time?

Do you disagree much?

Who does most of the disciplining?

How often do you smack your child?

**Generational Parenting**

How similar or different is your method of parenting to the way you were parented?  
(PROBES: Warmth, Discipline, Hierarchy, Respect)

*Do you intentionally parent differently from your parents?*

*Do your parents care for your child in a similar way to that in which you were parented?*

**Parenting consistency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No partner</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active uncoordination</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive uncoordination</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routine</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some joint policy</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinated action</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No routine/not that naughty</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Disciplinarian**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Smacking**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never smacked</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smacked (1-2 x)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smacks rarely (more than 1 x per year)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smacks regularly (at least monthly, includes weekly and daily)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Generational Parenting**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mother does not distinguish</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents the same as parent</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother adopts some methods</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents differently than parent</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PARTNERS CONTRIBUTION TO PARENTING

How much does your partner help you in looking after (child)?

Does he help with the day-to-day things such as taking (child) to school, or preparing dinner?

Would he offer to help or would you have to ask him?

Do you feel that you can rely on him to help you with (child)?

Are there ways in which he takes the child caring load off you, for example, in looking after (child) when you’re busy or you want to go out?

Partner’s help in care

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No partner</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive/unhelpful</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helps in extremis</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helps when asked</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General backup</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active support</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takes the major load</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Load taking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No partner</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some/average</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active load taking</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major parenting load</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**CURRENT MARRIAGE/COHABITATION**

*I’d like to ask you a few questions about the time in which you have been living together or have been married.....*

How did you and your partner meet?
(PROBE: arranged or non-arranged (love) marriage)

Did you live together before you were married?

How long was that for?

How old were you when you got married to/started living with (current partner)?

How old was your partner when you first lived with him or got married?

So you’ve been married/living together for (x) years.

How long had you been going out before you got married/started to live together?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Choice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arranged………………… 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-arranged (love)….. 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lived together</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No…………………….. 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes……………………. 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of years living together</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>_____ years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age of mother at marriage/cohabitation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>_____ years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age of spouse/cohabite at start</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>_____ years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration of current marriage/Cohabitation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>_____ months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time going out prior to marriage/cohabitation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>_____ months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CURRENT MARRIAGE/COHABITATION

(Rate here for all couples)

In general, how do you get on?

Are there any things you positively enjoy doing together?

Such as going out to the cinema, or to visit family and friends?

What about at home?

How often do you do that?

Do you talk to each other about things that are on your mind?

What about things that are bothering you, any problems or difficulties?

Like worries over the children?

Or worries or problems with relatives?

Or worries with your health?

Mutual enjoyment

None............................ 4
Some............................. 3
Quite a lot...................... 2
A great deal................... 1

Confiding

All important matters discussed adequately ........ 1
Majority of important matters discussed adequately .............. 2
Some (a minority of) important matters adequately discussed .... 3
Important matters mentioned but not adequately discussed ......... 4
No communication about matters of importance......... 5
**Current marriage/cohabitation (continued)**

(Rate here for all couples)

*Most couples have arguments or fall out from time to time.*

How often does that happen to the two of you?

(PROBE: I mean a serious falling out where you end up shouting at each other or not speaking to each other)

What usually happens?

When was the last time?

(Arguments)

None, or occasional......... 0
Some, less than 4/year....... 1
4-12/year ................... 2
More than 12/year .......... 3

(cont. on next page)
Current marriage/cohabitation (continued)

What happened then?

Has it ever got more serious than that?

What happened there?

Has it ever got physical?

**IF YES:** (PROBE: throwing things, pushing, hitting, etc.)

Have either of you ever been (seriously) injured?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MARITAL/COHABITING RELATIONSHIPS LEVEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marriage/cohabitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>positive source of support and enjoyment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good marital/cohabitation history</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall satisfactory history, but some problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major marital/cohabiting problems, but some significant functioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major problems, and limited functioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History dominated by discord/breakdown, or failure to establish relationships</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No dysfunction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predominant discord/breakdown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predominant avoidance/apathy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary rating of marital relationship  

____
FEELINGS ABOUT MULTICULTURALISM

I would now like to ask you a few things about how you feel about Britain today and how you raise your child in relation to your culture

Contemporary Britain:

What are your feelings about Britain (or British society) today?

How do you feel about your child being raised in Britain today?
(PROBE: a) worries? b) positive aspects?)

How do you feel about your child growing up in a multicultural environment?
(PROBE: a) worries? b) Positive aspects? NATURE OF NEIGHBOURHOOD)

Culture and Identity:

Could you briefly describe to me what you think your culture is?

Could you describe what you feel your identity is?

(FOR ASIAN PARENTS)

On a scale of 1-5 how British would you say you are

Do you feel more British or Asian? (or other categories)
(*PROBE: English)
ETHNIC-RACIAL SOCIALISATION

Cultural Socialisation:

How do you feel about your child's knowledge of his/her culture?

Do you ensure your child learns about his/her culture?

Language: (FOR ASIAN PARENTS)

How do you feel about your child's knowledge of his/her native language?

Do you ensure your child learns about his/her language?

Racism: (FOR ASIAN PARENTS)

Could you give me an example within the past five years of a time where you experienced or felt you experienced racial discrimination?

(PROBE: where, when, verbal/physical, severity,)

Have your ever felt like a lesser citizen in Britain?

Do you think Racism is still a problem in Britain?

How often do you talk to your child about racism?

ADMINISTER modified SMAS QUESTIONNAIRE NOW

(See Questionnaire 2 in Mother’s Questionnaire Booklet)

Knowledge of culture
none…………..0
very little……..1
adequate………2

Knowledge of language
none…………..0
very little……..1
adequate………2
fluent…………..3

NB: OBTAIN A DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF EXPERIENCE, WHERE IT OCCURED, PRECIPITANTS AND THE COURSE OF THE EXPERIENCE

Includes:

-Being treated with less courtesy/respect than others
-receiving poorer service compared with others
-people acting as if:
  * they think you are not smart
  *they think you are dishonest
  *they are afraid of you
  *they think they are better than you
-being called names or insulted
-being threatened or harassed
-being followed while shopping
Racism: (FOR WHITE PARENTS)

Could you give me an example within the past five years of a time where you experienced or felt you experienced racial discrimination?
(PROBE: where, when, verbal/ physical, severity,)

How often do you talk to your child about racism?

Do you think Britain is free from Racism?

Which groups in society are more prone to experiencing racism?

NB: OBTAIN A DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF EXPERIENCE, WHERE IT OCCURED, PRECIPITANTS AND THE COURSE OF THE EXPERIENCE

Includes:
-Being treated with less courtesy/respect than others
-receiving poorer service compared with others
-people acting as if:
  * they think you are not smart
  * they think you are dishonest
  * they are afraid of you
  * they think they are better than you
-being called names or insulted
-being threatened or harassed
-being followed while shopping
PARENTING AND PERCEPTIONS of FAMILY LIFE (British Pakistanis)

*Section I

Now I would like to ask you some questions about how you think other communities in Britain raise their children

(N.B. Mothers are given two minutes to talk freely in response to each of the questions below.)

What do you think makes a good parent?

How do you think you are doing as Parents?

Describe how you think Pakistani parents are?

Do you see a difference in British Pakistani mothers and first generation Pakistani mothers?

Do you have Indian and/or English friends who are also mothers?

How do you think a Pakistani mother is different from an Indian mother? (Probe: +ve and –ve aspects)

Do Pakistani children behave differently to Indian children?

How do you think a Pakistani mother is different from a White English* mother? (Probe: +ve and –ve aspects)

Do you think Pakistani children behave differently to White English children?

*White English/British = non immigrant White

Parenting skills

PROBE: a) positive aspects b) negative aspects

a)

b)

Pakistani Parents

PROBE: a) positive aspects b) negative aspects

a)

b)

Perception of Others:

Indian:
Negative ....................0
Somewhat negative ......1
Neutral.........................2
Somewhat positive.......3
Positive......................4

English

Negative ....................0
Somewhat negative ......1
Neutral.........................2
Somewhat positive.......3
Positive......................4
Now I would like to ask you some questions about how you think other communities in Britain raise their children.

(N.B. Mothers are given two minutes to talk freely in response to each of the questions below.)

What do you think makes a good parent?

How do you think you are doing as Parents?

Describe how you think Indian parents are? (+ve/-ve)

Do you see a difference in British Indian mothers and first generation Indian mothers?

Do you have Pakistani and/or English friends who are also mothers?

How do you think an Indian mother is different from a Pakistani mother? (Probe: religion; conservativism, +ve and –ve aspects)

Do Indian children behave differently to Pakistani children?

How do you think an Indian mother is different from a White English mother? (Probe: +ve and –ve aspects)

Perception of Others:

**Pakistani:**
- Negative ..................... 0
- Somewhat negative .... 1
- Neutral .......................... 2
- Somewhat positive ...... 3
- Positive .............................. 4

**English:**
- Negative ..................... 0
- Somewhat negative .... 1
- Neutral .......................... 2
- Somewhat positive ...... 3
- Positive .............................. 4

Parenting skills

PROBE: a) positive aspects b) negative aspects

a)

b)
PARENTING AND PERCEPTIONS of 
FAMILY LIFE
(White Non Immigrant)
Section III

Now I would like to ask you some questions about how you think other communities in Britain raise their children

(N.B. Mothers are given two minutes to talk freely in response to each of the questions below.)

What do you think makes a good parent?

How do you think you are doing as Parents?

Describe how you think English parents are?

Do you have Pakistani and/or Indian friends who are also parents?

How is an Indian parent different from a Pakistani parent?

How do you think an English mother is different from a South Asian (Indian/Pakistani) mother?

How do you think an English child is different from a South Asian (Indian/Pakistani) child?

Parenting skills

PROBE: a) positive aspects b) negative aspects

a)  

b)  

English Parents

PROBE: a) positive aspects b) negative aspects

a)  

b)  

Understanding of Difference:

None.............................. 0
Little.............................. 1
Moderate.......................... 2
High............................... 3

Perception of South Asian families:

Negative........................0
Somewhat negative ..........1
Neutral............................2
Somewhat positive...........3
Positive.........................4
EXTENDED FAMILY AND KINSHIP

What does the term ‘family’ mean to you?

Who would you include in your family?

Do you come from a large family?

Are your parents living in Britain?

What about your husband’s parents?

How is your relationship with your mother-in-law? 
(PROBES: understanding, traditions, respect, help, misunderstandings)

What about with your father-in-law?

Is your child close to his/her grandparents? 
(PROBE: Respect and Kinship Names)

How often does your child see his/her grandparents?

What sort of things do your child and his/her grandparent do together?

Do they help out with your child/ offer support? 
(Probe: after school support/ discipline)

Do you have other family members living nearby?

Are they involved in helping raise/ discipline the child?

How often does your child see his/her cousins?

How involved are you with other members of your community?

Relationship with mother-in-law (description)
Negative .................. 0
Somewhat negative ......1
Neutral ................... 2
Somewhat positive ......3
Positive .................. 4
Not applicable ........... 9

Interaction with grandparents
Paternal: 

Maternal: 

*collectivism

ADMINISTER 
modified FAM-III 
QUESTIONNAIRE 
NOW 
(See Questionnaire 3 in Mother’s Questionnaire Booklet)
RELIGION

What is your current religious preference? (Probe: strength of belief)

On a scale of 0-4 (with 0 being not at all, and 4 being extremely high), how religious are you in terms of:
   a) beliefs:
   b) practices

How do you teach your child about religion? (PROBE: religious classes, religious institutions, television programmes, books, grandparents, visits to temple, DVDs)

How do other members of the family (can be extended) contribute to your child’s understanding of religion?

How do you feel about your child’s knowledge of religious practices/rituals?

Do you send your children to religious classes

How do you feel about your child learning about other religions at school?

Degree of Religiousness:
None ............................................. 0
Little ............................................. 1
Moderate ................................... 2
High ............................................. 3
Extremely high....4

Beliefs ________
Practices_______

Childs knowledge of religion:
None.............................................0
Little ............................................. 1
Moderate ...................................... 2
High ............................................. 3

Religious classes
No ................................................. 0
Yes ............................................... 1
**MOTHER’S HEALTH**

*I would now like to ask you a few things about your health.*

What has your own health been like recently? (i.e. in the last year)

Have you had to see your family doctor for worrying, depression, nervous troubles or any other psychological problems?

(IF YES: Obtain details of nature, severity and duration of problem)

Have you had any kind of regular prescription for worrying, depression, nervous troubles or any other psychological problems?

What about sleeping tablets?

Do you drink? How much do you drink?

**Mother’s psychiatric contacts**

- None ............................................. 0
- GP ................................................ 1
- Out-patient ................................... 2
- In-patient ...................................... 3

**Mother’s sedatives or stimulants**

- No................................................. 0
- Yes ............................................... 1

**No. of alcohol units per week_____**
### Overall View of the Child’s Future

*I would now like to ask you a few questions about child’s future. Is that something you have thought of at all?*

What are your feelings about (child’s) future?

What kind of life would you like him/her to have?

Do you have any particular hopes and ambitions for (child)?

What do you think are (child’s) best characteristics, the things most likely to help him/her be happy or successful?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADMINISTER QUESTIONNAIRES 4&gt; NOW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thought of future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thought of............1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not thought of........2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| View of child’s future          |
| Gloomy.............1             |
| Worried.............2           |
| Average concern.....3           |
| Generally optimistic.4         |
| Over optimistic.......5         |
# OVERALL RATINGS

## EXPRESSED WARMTH
- None ...................... 0
- Little .................... 1
- Some ..................... 2
- Moderate ............... 3
- Moderately High ...... 4
- High ..................... 5
- Not rateable .......... 9

## SENSITIVE RESPONDING
- None ...................... 0
- Somewhat sensitive .... 1
- Average sensitivity ..... 2
- Above average ........... 3
- Very sensitive responding..... 4
- Not rateable .......... 9

## CHILD CENTREDNESS
- Little or none ............ 0
- Some ..................... 1
- Moderate ................. 2
- Enmeshed ................ 3
- Not rateable .......... 9

## MOTHER-CHILD INTERACTION
- Very low .................. 0
- Poor ....................... 1
- Moderate .................. 2
- High ....................... 3
- Very high .................. 4
- Not rateable .......... 9

## EXPRESSED CRITICISM
- Considerable ............ 0
- Moderate .................. 1
- Some criticism .......... 2
- No criticism ............... 3
- Not rateable .......... 9

## MATERNAL CONTROL
- Little/No control ........ 0
- Poor control ............. 1
- Average .................... 2
- Good ....................... 3
- Over controlling .......... 4
- Not rateable .......... 9

## OVERT DISCIPLINE
- None ....................... 0
- Some ...................... 1
- Average .................... 2
- Somewhat aggressive ... 3
- Aggressive ................ 4
- Not rateable .......... 9

## COLLECTIVISM
- Strongly Nuclear ........ 1
- Little Involvement ........ 2
- Moderate Involvement .... 3
- High involvement ........ 4
- Extremely collective .... 5
### DISCUSSION OF RACISM

- No Discussion .............. 0
- Some Discussion ............ 1
- Moderate Discussion ...... 2
- Active Discussion .......... 3

### CULTURAL SOCIALISATION

- None ...................... 0
- Little ..................... 1
- Some ..................... 2
- Moderate ................. 3
- Moderately high ........... 4
- High ...................... 5
- Not rateable .............. 9

### RELIGIOSITY

- None ...................... 0
- Some Discussion ........... 1
- Moderate Discussion ...... 2
- Active Discussion and Participation .......... 3
An example of an account I wrote following an interview with a British Pakistani mother:

Tayyabah\textsuperscript{99} was very talkative and open during the interview and gave me detailed descriptions of family life. She lived in an extremely multicultural neighbourhood. She had two sons, and lived together with her husband, her brother-in-law and his family also. Tayyabah used to be a scientist, but switched to child care after she had her kids. She also claimed she found ‘religion’ later in life and this caused many changes in her family life, and helped her build her relationship with her husband. She lived her life using the Quran as her book of knowledge. Her parenting was practiced using the Quran as a guide. She spoke about this in terms of discipline. Her children were also being raised with religion in their lives. They attended mosque classes 5 times a week. Culture, tradition and teaching Urdu to her child were important to her. [The child] was very warm. He kept saying funny things, climbing out of windows and jumping on the sofa. He quickly picked up the family map task and I could tell he was bright. He also seemed to be a very loving boy and was very close to his elder brother.

\textsuperscript{99} A pseudonym has been used.
APPENDIX I
Excerpt from the Accompanying Coding Manual

OVERALL RATINGS

These ratings are made immediately following the interview and are based on information obtained from the entire interview.

EXPRESSED WARMTH

0 = None
1 = Little
2 = Some
3 = Moderate
4 = Moderately High
5 = High

Aspects of warmth to be considered:

(a) **Tone of voice, expression, gestures when speaking about the child:**
   This is the single most important criterion. Be alert for enthusiasm shown when talking about child and any changes in tone or manner when mother switches from talking about neutral matters to talking about her child. This could be either exhibited as more enthusiasm or less enthusiasm. Flatness or coldness of tone is evidence of lack of warmth so this should be taken into account even if positive affect is present. (Visual cues are important here so ratings should be made at the time of interview as things may be misses from the tape).

(b) **Spontaneity:**
   Spontaneous expressions of warmth should increase the rating. Failure to express warmth where direct opportunities for this are provided should tend to lower the rating, e.g. When asked if the child is easy to be affectionate with and when talking about playing together. So if the mother seems unenthusiastic about any mutual activities e.g. Play, other aspects of warmth should be re-scrutinised. Lack of spontaneous remarks of warmth does not preclude ratings of moderate and high warmth as long as other evidence exists.

(c) **Sympathy and concern about child’s difficulties (if any):**
   Note should be taken of how the mother expressed concern for the child and a higher warmth rating should be given if the concern is for the child themselves and a lower rating given if concern is for the effect any problem may have on the mother. For example, child’s feeding, sleeping, or physical & health problems.

(d) **Interest in child as a person:**
   Enthusiasm and interest in child’s achievements in relation to the child as a person would elevate the warmth rating. Satisfaction with regard to the accomplishment e.g. Child progressing developmentally quicker than others, reflecting of the mother as a good parent, does not count. Expressed enjoyment of child’s company is good evidence of warmth.
Irrelevant factors:

- Any judgement about what mother actually feels, the rater should be concerned only with manifest expressions of warmth.

- Warmth of mother’s personality, people differ greatly in the amount of warmth they show towards the interviewer and it is important that the rater should not be influenced by this as such. A person showing a good deal of warmth towards the interviewer will not necessarily do so about others in the home: the rating must be based only on the warmth expressed about the person concerned during the interview.

- Comparisons with warmth shown towards others, it is the amount of warmth shown towards the person that should be taken into account not the difference between that shown toward him or her and that shown towards other (including the interviewer). For example, one mother was clearly warmer to one of her children than to the other but still rated as ‘high’ on warmth to both of them.

- Depression, the depression of the respondent as such should not influence the rating. Even clinically depressed persons should be considered capable of expressing the whole range of warmth; from time to time we have found respondents who were clearly clinically depressed but capable of expressing a great deal of warmth. The interviewer should be careful not to make any assumptions of what is possible for a person, nor to be afraid of assigning a high rating if depression exists. The existence of depression in the respondent should neither lower nor elevate the rating which, as already noted, should be based entirely on the amount of warmth actually demonstrated toward the person during the interview.

- Criticism or hostility although the interview as a whole should be considered when rating warmth, the presence or absence of criticism or hostility should not be allowed to contaminate the rating. Frequent criticism is certainly compatible with moderate warmth, and respondents with ambivalent attitudes may well express rejection of the person at one point of the interview while expressing marked warmth at other points.

- Stereotyped endearments, endearments such as dear or darling are often use in a stereotyped way and are not necessarily to be considered as evidence for rating warmth. The rater will have to decide for each individual respondent whether the endearments reflect feelings of warmth or not. This ruling is especially relevant when the rating is made in a joint interview.

- Positive remarks are not necessarily said warmly; and are not in themselves evidence of warmth. They should only be considered if they are said warmly. It is quite possible for a respondent to give a detached account of a person’s behaviour and personality and to include in this description a number of positive remarks which are fair rather than warm.
By the nature of warmth, ratings cannot be defined mechanically point by point. However, it is helpful as a general guide to divide ratings into three broad categories:

(a) Instances in which there is definite and clear cut warmth, enthusiasm, interest in and enjoyment of the person. This should be rated ‘moderately high warmth’ or ‘high warmth’ according to the amount of warmth and enthusiasm expressed.

(b) Instances in which there is definite understanding, sympathy and concern but only limited warmth should be rated ‘some’ or ‘moderate warmth’. Where there is little or no warmth of tone or a ‘clinical’ approach ‘some’ would normally be rated.

(c) Instances should be rated ‘no warmth’ where there is little or no understanding, sympathy or concern and no warmth, enthusiasm, interest in, and enjoyment of the person. However, if a little is shown ‘very little warmth’ can be rated.
APPENDIX J
Picture given to mother and child for the Etch-a-Sketch Task
APPENDIX K
PARCHISY Global Ratings for the Mutuality Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parent Code</th>
<th>Responsiveness to child’s questions, comments and behaviours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Never responds; ignores child’s comments, questions and behaviours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>One or two instances of responding to child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>A few/several instances of responding to child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Moderate amounts of responsiveness- responds to about half of the child’s comments, questions, and behaviours, although some responses may be delayed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Responds more than half the time, with only a few delays in responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Responds to most of the child’s comments, questions, and behaviours, with no delay; expands on some comments made by the child; only one or two instances of non-responsiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Always responds immediately to the child; expands on comments made by the child (i.e. parent is really engaged).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ A very important code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ There must be a ‘bid’ by child intended to elicit a response from the parent, and a response to that bid from the parent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ Is it sometimes easier to watch how many times the parent is unresponsive.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child Code</th>
<th>Responsiveness to parent’s questions, comments and behaviours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Never responds; ignores parent’s comments, questions and behaviours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>One or two instances of responding to parent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>A few/several instances of responding to parent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Moderate amounts of responsiveness- responds to about half of the parent’s comments, questions, and behaviours, although some responses may be delayed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Responds more than half the time, with only a few delays in responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Responds to most of the parent’s comments, questions, and behaviours, with no delay; expands on some comments made by the parent; only one or two instances of non-responsiveness. N.b. No more than 2 instances of non-responsiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Always responds immediately to parent; expands on comments made by the child- but expansion on comments made by child is not requisite for a code of 7.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dyadic Codes</th>
<th>1) Reciprocity: e.g. shared positive affect, eye contact, a “turn-taking” (i.e. conversation-like) quality of interaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>no evidence of reciprocity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>one or two instances of reciprocity (either shared affect or eye contact)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>a few/several instances of reciprocity (either shared affect or eye contact)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>moderate levels of reciprocity; evidence of both shared affect and eye contact; some evidence of conversation-like interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>clear evidence of reciprocity; one or two episodes of intense shared positive affect coupled with eye contact that is sustained for several “turns” between parent and child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Substantial reciprocity involving numerous episodes of intense shared affect coupled with eye contact that is sustained for several “turns”; only one or two instances of non-reciprocity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Highly integrated and reciprocal; constant shared affect and eye contact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

298
contact that never loses “turn-taking” quality.

- shared positive affect, eye contact, a “turn-taking”- these are examples of reciprocity, reciprocal behaviour may take other forms
- To code a 6 or a 7, there must be clear instances of both shared positive affect and eye contact.

2) Cooperation: defined as explicit agreement and discussion, about how to proceed with and complete task (e.g. “Shall we do this next?” and child says “Yes”)

1. no evidence of cooperation during task
2. one or two instances of cooperation
3. a few/several instances of cooperation
4. moderate amounts of cooperation- appears during about half of the interaction
5. cooperative interaction throughout, with a few/several instances of lack of explicit cooperation
6. substantial cooperation throughout, with one or two instances of lack of explicit cooperation
7. highly cooperative interaction for entire task

- Cooperation must be verbalised.

Kirby Deater-Deckard, Maria V. Pylas, and Steven A. Petrill (Institute of Psychiatry and Institute of Education, University of London, May 1997)*Edited October 2011, by Iqbal.H*
Circle 1 (British Indian child), Circle 2 (maternal grandfather, uncle and cousins), Circle 3 (mother, father, maternal grandmother, uncle and friends), Circle 4 (siblings, friends and cousins) and Circle 5 (friends and cousins)