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Abstract

Supporting the development of healthy children is a goal for parents. Proper development becomes a challenge when children do not receive adequate health care, educational enrichment, and housing. These challenges are amplified by the continuous rise in violence in the U.S.- México border region. This study looks specifically at child development and child rearing practices in two poor colonias (neighborhoods) in Ciudad Juárez (Chihuahua, México). It relies on and extends from a project conducted by Gente a favor de gente and funded by the Paso del Norte Health Foundation. There were 2 phases in this study: a quantitative phase (N=151) conducted by Gente a favor de gente and a qualitative phase of in-depth interviews (N=16) with a photo-interview component (N=9). For the quantitative phase, parents with children between 0 to 3 years old were surveyed about their access to economic, cultural, and social capital and the child was given two tests to measure his/her current stage of development. Using the survey and results from the development tests, the analysis explores how relationships between parents’ economic, cultural, and social capital and child development vary. More social capital was found to be an influence on higher development scores, with economic capital also being important. Then in the qualitative phase, we employed 16 in-depth interviews with a subset of surveyed parents to further investigate parents’ access to economic, social, and cultural capitals and their child rearing practices, along with a photo-interviewing method in which a subset of 9 interviewed parents took pictures and reflected on them to complement and extend on the information gathered through in-depth interviews. We found that social capital and, secondarily, economic capital were key influences on child development and child rearing practices. Differences in capital can contribute to understanding parents’ experiences in child rearing in poor colonias in Ciudad Juárez (Chihuahua, México).
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Chapter 1

Introduction, literature review, and study context

1.1 Introduction

Supporting the development of healthy children is a goal for parents and health care providers. Proper development becomes a challenge when children do not receive adequate health care, educational enrichment opportunities, nutrition, discipline, and development. These challenges are amplified in the U.S. - México border region. This study looks specifically at child health and development in two poor colonias in Ciudad Juárez (Chihuahua, México). As a result of expansion of regional employment opportunities, Juárez has grown rapidly without adequate investment in infrastructure and housing. Research suggests that children raised in environments with few resources (both in terms of public services and familial) may be subject to detrimental developmental health outcomes as a result of their socioeconomic disadvantage, including lower IQ, school achievement and socio-emotional functioning (McLoyd, 1998). Improving poor children’s development and understanding parents childrearing practices is an important step towards improving these children’s life chances as adults because, as Walker (2007) maintains, “poor children are likely to remain in poverty as adults, thus continuing the pathway shown to their offspring” (p.146). This thesis explores parental access to economic, cultural, and social capital and their effect on child development and child rearing practices in the context of escalating violent situation in Ciudad Juárez, México using quantitative, qualitative, and photo methods.

In chapter 1, I will provide the theoretical framework focusing on Bourdieu’s forms of capital (cultural, social and economic) followed by a review of the literature related to how economic, social and cultural resources influence parents in the parenting field. Chapter 1 will also review the work of Annette Lareau in integrating the three capitals, as well as introduce the context of Ciudad Juárez, where the study takes place. In chapter 2, I will provide the methods of the two phases of the study starting with quantitative phase which included a survey and two development tests, and continue on to the
qualitative in-depth and photo interview methods. In chapter 3, I will provide an analysis of the results of these two phases. Chapter 4 will address a discussion of the significance of the findings, and chapter 5 will provide a conclusion for this study and provide policy recommendations based on the findings.

1.2 Theoretical Framework and Literature Review

Bourdieu’s (1986) work on the forms of capital (cultural, social and economic) has been used in empirical studies related to children and health, with many of them focusing on how capital impacts children’s health and development (Dumais, 2002; Grineski, 2009; Lareau, 1987, 2002, 2003; Lee & Kao, 2009; Wolraich, 2003). In Bourdieu’s (1986) words, “Capital is accumulated labor (in its materialized form or its "incorporated," embodied form) which, when appropriated on a private, i.e., exclusive, basis by agents or groups of agents, enables them to appropriate social energy in the form of reified or living labor” (p. 241). Bourdieu (1986) argues that in order to understand the social world, we must study capital: i.e., social, economic and cultural power in all its forms. Economic capital is the money or other material resources that one owns, cultural capital refers to legitimate knowledge, and social capital involves social support and trust in social relationships based on group membership and networks of influence and support (Ritzer, 2008). Bourdieu’s theoretical framework can offer a perspective that incorporates cultural processes of social differentiation that can help in our understanding of the systems in the social world that contribute to the unequal distribution of life chances (Abel, 2007). As Lareau (1987, 2002, 2003) explained, having capital in the parenting field, such as cultural skills, social connections, and economic resources, can be translated into better outcomes for children. Symbolic capital, which extends from one’s honor, prestige, or recognition (Ritzer, 2008), will be excluded from the analysis because it has less relevance to the scope of this thesis.

This study builds on Lareau (2002, 2003) by applying the well-developed theoretical tools of economic, cultural and social capital (Bourdieu, 1986) to understanding families' experiences with child
rearing and child development. By using Bourdieu’s framework, the main focus of the analysis will be on how capital relates to child rearing and development, and how the violence has affected parents’ access to the capitals. Bourdieu’s theory suggests that differences in childhood experiences give individuals varying cultural skills, social connections, and economic resources that can be translated into different forms of capital, which impact their lives as adults as the number of elite slots in social class is limited (Lareau, 2003). In what follows, I will provide a detailed definition of each type of capital and discuss how it relates to child development and child rearing.

1.3 Economic Capital

Economic capital “is immediately and directly convertible into money and may be institutionalized in the form of property rights” (Bourdieu, 1986, p. 242). In other words economic capital is the money and material resources that one possesses. Economic factors can have an effect on a child’s development even before he or she is born. Some of the effects that mothers with low economic capital face include poorer nutrition before, as well as during, pregnancy, low access to prenatal care, and higher rates of post-neonatal mortality (Yudkin & Yudkin, 2010; Aber et al., 2007; McLoyd, 1998). Consequently, children from families with limited economic capital are at greater risk than wealthier children for poor cognitive, behavioral and health outcomes (Yudkin & Yudkin, 2010; Aber et al., 2007; Lareau, 1987, 2002, 2003; Duncan and Brooks Gunn, 2000; McCulloch & Joshi, 2000; Houston et al., 1994; Duncan, 1994; Houston, 1991).

Research has repeatedly demonstrated a link between a lack of economic resources and lower cognitive functioning. After controlling for maternal education, family structure, and ethnicity (among other factors), Duncan et al. (1994) found that family income and poverty status were significant predictors of IQ scores among 5 year olds and that higher income children had higher IQ scores than their poorer counterparts. Similar to Duncan et al. (1994), McCulloch and Joshi (2000) used income as a predictor of children’s cognitive functioning, concluding that children of higher incomes tended to
perform better than poorer income children on the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test, a measure that is strongly related to scores that children would obtain in an IQ test. These differences are reflected in school performance. In comparison to non-poor children, poor children are 2 times more likely to repeat grades in school and are 1.4 times more likely to have a learning disability than non-poor children (Duncan and Brooks Gunn, 2000).

In regards to child rearing practices and economic resources, Berger’s (2009) findings suggest that 3 year old children from lower income families are more likely than wealthier children to lack emotional support and have low levels of cognitive stimulation; they more often have mothers who are stressed, depressed, harsh, and/or unresponsive. Lareau (2003), incorporating Bourdieu’s theoretical framework, studied parents with differing access to economic capital and how it affected their child rearing practices. She suggests that parents’ economic burdens negatively affect their child’s developmental pursuits due to stress and material deprivation. Economic capital is of importance for both its immediate effects as well as its long-term effects; literature suggests that poor children are likely to remain in poverty as adults (Walker, 2007; Korenman, 1995). With the exception of Walker (2007) and Korenman (1995), most of the literature reviewed focuses on the effects of income and child development in the U.S. One could predict that these effects may be multiplied in less developed countries, such as México, where there are fewer social protections (e.g., free public housing) for the poor.

Poverty can have negative long term effects on children’s development. This is because children living in poverty more often face perinatal complications, social skills deficits, single-parent status, large family size, family conflict, harsh and inconsistent parenting, lack of social support, and difficult neighborhood risk factors (McLoyd, 1998; Arnold & Doctoroff, 2003; Wolraich, 2003; Anders et al., 2009). While economic capital is obviously important, cultural and social resources matter too. As Bourdieu (1986) declares, “It is in fact impossible to account for the structure and functioning of the
social world unless one reintroduces capital in all its forms and not solely in the one form recognized by economic theory” (p. 142). Bourdieu also warns that to focus solely on income neglects the roles of heredity, accumulation, and inertia in conditioning opportunity, urging scholars to expand focus to include other structuring forces, such as social and cultural capital (Grineski, 2009).

1.4 Social Capital
Social capital entails trust in affiliations based on group membership, networks of influence and support which are linked to positions in a durable network of more or less institutionalized relationships of mutual acquaintance, recognition and reciprocity (Bourdieu, 1986). According to Bourdieu, social capital implicates “contacts and group memberships which, through the accumulation of exchanges, obligations and shared identities, provide actual or potential support and access to valued resources” (as cited by Grineski, 2009, p. 109). Social capital is also interrelated to the other forms of capitals. The amount of social capital that an individual possesses depends on the size of the network and the connections that the individual can efficiently mobilize to gain the benefits that can accrue from membership (Bourdieu, 1986). Bourdieu’s concept of social capital relates to child development and child rearing because “child outcomes relate to the social ties between community norms and practices, as well as positive role modeling” (as cited by Irwin, Siddiqi & Hertzman, 2007, p. 27).

One of the ways social capital is linked with child development and rearing practices is by helping parents cope with the stresses of poverty, which has already been linked to worse development outcomes and children rearing practices (see McCulloch and Joshi, 2000). Parents with greater social networks experience less stress and tend to lead healthier lives because social networks can help lessen the negative effects of poverty (Oyen, 2002). As Oyen (2002) argues, social networks of the poor are often found to be related to strategies for survival and that poverty can be transcended in the trading of goods and services, for instance neighbors taking care of each other’s children. Another benefit of social networks is the sharing of knowledge, for instance, that related to parenting experiences. Exploring the
positive effects of parental networks on child health suggests that social capital can be a tool to reducing the effects of poverty (Oyen, 2002).

Spouses and kin are important sources of social capital for poor and working class families (Portes, 1998). Portes (1998) emphasizes that family members constitute social capital, thus implying that children of a two parent households are generally better off than those of single parents which could be because there is more support (i.e., economical, emotional, social) in the home to aid in child rearing and development. As an example of the importance of family, mothers with knowledge of early infant development gained from their children’s grandparents had better abilities to interact with their child and to develop their child’s cognitive skills (Sistler and Gotffired, 1993). This finding illustrates how social capital (e.g., support from grandparents) can allow a parent access to that person’s cultural capital (e.g., child rearing knowledge). Lareau (2003) also found that parents believe that their kinship ties will benefit their children, in terms of support and interaction, implying that those ties provide benefits beyond simply access to material goods.

However, as Kotchick and Forehand (2002) state, contextual factors, such as political unrest and violence can reduce parents’ willingness to make and maintain social ties. In addition, Jimeno’s (2001) findings on the effects of violence on social life indicate that political unrest reduces residents’ social networks and trust in institutions including health care and law enforcement. McIlwaine and Moser’s (2001) study also suggests this in their findings on the effects of violence on social capital in Colombia: their qualitative analysis revealed that parents had limited social networks including institutional networks, such as lack of trust in health services due to the violence.

1.5 Cultural Capital

Cultural capital “refers to non material resources such as educational credentials, types of knowledge and expertise, verbal skills, and aesthetic preferences that can be converted into economic capital” (Appelrouth & Edles, 2008, p. 688). In other words, it consists of legitimate knowledge.
Cultural capital contributes to accessing higher status in society, financial security, employment opportunities, and better educational experiences (Grineski, 2009).

Even though economic capital has been studied extensively in relation to health inequalities, cultural capital has not been the focus of much health research (Abel, 2007). This could also be said about child development research. However, the available research suggests that cultural capital has a noteworthy effect on the academic performance of children, which suggest that it could be related to child development and child rearing. Lee & Kao (2009) measured the effects of cultural capital (i.e., participation in art activities, directed activities, and cultural activities), race, and immigrant status on the academic outcomes (i.e. performance in reading and math assessments) of kindergarten children. By using a nationally representative sample in a longitudinal study, researchers examined how participation in cultural capital building activities (such as participation in art) varies by race and immigrant status. The study found that minority children had lower levels of participation than white children, and that they were particularly disadvantaged in terms of parental income and parental educational background (Lee & Kao, 2009). Study results also suggested that the lack of participation in cultural capital building activities among immigrant children negatively affected their academic skills in reading and math.

Dumais (2002) explored cultural capital by focusing on students and their cultural activities, such as checking out books at the library and attending museums or musical events, by gender and socioeconomic status. The study found that differences in socioeconomic status (SES) are greater than gender differences in predicting cultural participation, and that those with greater SES and cultural participation did indeed achieve higher grades and receive more attention from teachers than those with lower access to cultural resources and lower SES (Dumais, 2002).

Parental education (i.e. cultural capital) has been shown to be a predictor of child development and child rearing practices. Parents’ education can be an important predictor of development because they may be more effective teachers at home. This is because they are more likely to understand the
material the children are being taught at school and thus able to help with homework and to provide appropriate cognitive stimulation when children are not in school (Alexander et al., 1994). Levine et al. (1991) explored the relationships between mothers’ educational levels and their child care behaviors. After controlling for SES (socio-economic status), Levine et al. (2001) found that maternal schooling remained a significant predictor of mothers’ commitment and energy in child care and that child health variables (e.g., prenatal care, use of medical clinic for child health emergencies, child having diarrhea frequently) were largely associated with maternal, and not paternal, years of schooling. This possibly reflects the cultural division of labor in which men are less involved in child care. The authors also found that mothers with higher levels of education were more likely to see child care as a labor-intensive task and were less likely to leave their children in someone else’s care (Levine et al., 2001). Similar to Levine et al. (2001), Davis-Kean (2005) studied parents’ educational attainment as an indicator of child development and child rearing practices. Davis Kean’s (2005) findings suggest that parental education is indirectly related to children’s achievement through the parents’ educational expectations, time spent reading with the child, and the warmth of parent-child interactions.

While the research reviewed has shown that parental economic, cultural, and social resources are important for children’s development, only one other author has fully integrated Bourdieu’s framework in a series of studies on U.S. families (Lareau, 1987, 2002, 2003). Her work will be discussed next.

1.6 Integrating Capital: The Work of Annette Lareau

Annette Lareau (1987, 2003) has used Bourdieu’s theoretical framework and the three forms of capital that are utilized in this paper in her research, which explores how these capitals influence parents’ child rearing practices. Lareau (1987) studied family-school relationships in white working class and middle class communities in the US to measure social class differences and structural inequalities. She drew on Bourdieu’s theory of class distinction and found that social position affected children’s educational success because it led them to construct different pathways for realizing that
success (Lareau 1987). Furthermore, Lareau suggests that differences in childhood experiences give individuals varying cultural skills, social connections, and economic resources that can be translated into different forms of capital with unequal value as individuals move out into the world (Lareau, 2003).

In a follow-up study with a more diverse group of parents, Lareau (2003) explains that working class and middle class parents have unequal abilities to customize their interactions with their children because of the structural barriers they encounter in their daily lives. She found these class differences to be more important than racial differences (i.e., African-American vs. non-Hispanic white). Poor parents’ economic burdens overshadowed the developmental needs of their children as parents struggled to put food on the table. Lareau’s data suggest that differences in economic capital among parents are closely tied to differences in the cultural logic of child rearing, which influence the child’s development, demonstrating how economic capital converts into cultural capital. As Lareau (2003) points out, parents living in poverty may not put as much importance on the difference between a child entertaining him- or herself without special assistance or toys versus playing with age-appropriate toys. Lareau (2003) adds that the life burdens in working class parents’ lives contribute to their relative inattention to their child’s developmental pursuits. Therefore although parents were willing to make substantial sacrifices to meet their child’s basic needs (e.g., food and shelter), nurturing their creative development was not a rearing practice that the majority of poor parents in Lareau’s (2003) sample saw as part of their responsibility.

Although previous research has applied Bourdieu’s theoretical ideas and has explored parental capital (mainly separately) as related to children’s development, there is lack of information regarding how differing access to economic, social, and cultural capital influence poor parents—more specifically those living in the colonias along the Mexican side of the U.S. México border—and their childrearing practices. This study builds off Lareau (2003) by focusing on the experiences of Hispanics in a setting that is vastly different than that of parents living in the urban U.S. This study highlights what has not received attention in the literature in regards to how economic, cultural, and social capital affect
parenting, and it contributes to the understanding of families’ experiences in child rearing and development in Juárez colonias.

1.7 CONTEXT AND SETTING
Families living in poverty in underserved colonias in the U.S.- México border region face a number of challenges (e.g., reduced access to potable water and electricity, unpaved streets, and little police/fire protection) that profoundly affect children living there (Heyman, 2007). Ciudad Juárez, the setting for this study, is located along the Mexican border with the U.S. and has an estimated population of 1.3 million (INEGI, 2005). The city has recently (since 2008) been suffering from both the local impacts of a worldwide recession and a wave of drug-related violence. The city has attracted rural migrants because of regional employment opportunities (e.g., in the maquiladoras) since the NAFTA, although migration has slowed due to the economic recession and violence. Many of these rural migrants come to Ciudad Juárez from Durango (Chihuahua’s southern neighbor), Coahuila (its eastern neighbor), Zacatecas, and Veracruz (Grineski & Collins, 2010). Factors such as shortage of jobs in these areas in the interior of México, and the increased demand for unskilled labor in the border region push residents to seek employment in maquiladoras in border cities such as Juárez (Anderson 2010).

Although migrants come to Juárez to better their economic state, many of them struggle to meet the needs of their family given the low wages maquiladoras tend to pay. As Ramirez (2001) reports, the majority of maquiladora workers takes home less than 55.55 pesos (approximately U.S. $6.00) a day, which is only 28.6% of what a family of four people needs to meet their basic needs. Given these low wages, many parents working in maquiladoras struggle to meet their family’s day-to-day needs.

As the maquiladoras are the main employers in Ciudad Juárez, they have also been affected by the current economic recession. It has been reported that Ciudad Juárez has lost more than 80,000 jobs from 2007 to 2010 because of the recession, with a number of maquiladoras having closed permanently (FNS, 2010). However, as some plants close others open; a pattern that has remained fairly constant.
(Kolenc, 2010), although recovery of jobs has been slower in Juárez than in other Mexican cities. In 2010 the number of maquiladora workers ranged from 192,735 to about 200,000. These numbers are relatively low compared to the 250,000 workers that were employed in the maquiladora sector by the end of 2007 (FNS, 2010). It has been reported that while State of Chihuahua has already recovered 45% of jobs lost due to the economic crisis, Juárez has been slower to recover, having only recovered 28% of jobs (maquila portal, 2010).

In terms of the drug-related violence, it has been reported that there are 165 deaths per 100,000 residents in Ciudad Juárez, making the city a challenging context in which to be a parent given the current rise in violent crime (Kellner, 2010). In 2008, there were a total of 1,600 killings reported, and in the year 2009 the murder toll increased to 2,600 (USA Today, 2010). In 2010, the death count amounted to 3,111 (Elagora, 2010). With 322 drug-related killings in August 2010 alone (Licon, 2010), which is as many as 22 per day, Ciudad Juárez is one of the most murderous cities in the world (Chung, 2010). Some of the everyday problems for parents living in Ciudad Juárez, apart from the murders, are business extortions, shootings, gruesomely violent imagery (e.g. public displays of dead human bodies and body parts), car theft, and dangerous traffic conditions as criminals evade police or crime scene to name a few. The violence is also affecting Juárez economically not only by dramatically reducing the amount of tourism from the U. S. that contributes to Juárez’s small business economy, but also because extortions have forced many businesses to close down therefore reducing the employment opportunities for families living in Juarez (Bracamontes, 2008). The violence in Juárez is likely contributing to the slower recovery of jobs lost as compared to the State of Chihuahua as a whole. An estimated 10,000 small businesses have closed or moved across the border to Texas (Kolenc, 2010).

The ongoing 2-year drug war has left more than 10,000 children in México orphaned and more than 40,000 relatives of victims affected by the violence (Paterson 2010). México’s president Felipe Calderon has sent more than 2,000 military troops in an effort to fight the ongoing drug war and restore
peace. More recently the World Bank has loaned 1.25 billion loan to support the México’s government’s efforts to not only increase the number of people benefitting from the free Seguro Popular health insurance and to make the program more efficient (The Financial, 2010). The goal of these efforts was to enroll 100,000 of the uninsured to this health insurance program by Dec. 31, 2010 (Moya, Eva, Assistant Professor of Social Work personal communication, 18 September, 2010).

Given this, parents feel pressure to keep their children in the home, and daily activities such as visiting the grocery store, or even the ride to school, have become a challenge because of the constant occurrence of shoot-outs on the streets (Ramos, Vicky, Gente a favor de gente, A.C., personal communication, 18 June 2010). Due to the current rise in crime and violence in México, and specifically in Ciudad Juárez, parents are presently experiencing higher levels of distress and concern over the safety of themselves and their children. In addition, children’s development may be suffering due to this stress as well as reduced opportunities to play outside and interact with others. As Paterson (2010) reports,

UACJ researchers Hector Padilla and Hugo Almada examined the socio-psychological ramifications of a violence Padilla said was becoming a “socializing” factor in the development of the future generation. Children and adolescents, the political scientist said, are first introduced to a pervasive violence as spectators, graduate to serving as its executioners and finally become its victims.

Although the Ciudad Juárez is experiencing these hard times in regards to crime and recession, it is important to mention that residents continue to live their everyday lives, as I will highlight in the qualitative results section of the thesis.

Scaling down to the study area for this project, this study took place in two poor colonias in Ciudad Juárez (Chihuahua, México), one that is more newly developed, known as Finca Bonita, and another that is older and known as Colonia Azteca. The homes in Finca Bonita are cinder-block row houses and the development is an INFONAVIT project. INFONAVIT is a government program that offers homes and financing options to those employed in the formal labor market (e.g., in maquiladoras) that qualify (e.g., have stable incomes between three and ten times the poverty level, or are members of
the military or the civil service) (Pezzoli, 1995). A typical INFONAVIT home is about 35 to 50 square meters and it is common for this space to be shared by 3 to 10 residents (Morales, Oscar, former Juárez INFONAVIT resident, personal communication, 25 June, 2010). Colonia Azteca is an older neighborhood that was not formally planned. Homes are generally self-constructed; over time, infrastructure (e.g., electricity, sewage) has been extended to the area. The relatively poor housing conditions (by U.S. standards) in both communities reflect two processes: 1) the limited housing assistance that is available to Mexican residents because of the few taxes paid by the wealthy and businesses, and 2) the rapid urbanization of the city, which means that many residents have limited access to basic services such as water, sewage and paved streets (Heyman, 2007).
Chapter 2

Data and methods

This chapter will provide the methods of the two phases of the study starting with introducing *Gente a favor de Gente* (a community group based in south Juárez) and my collaboration with them. I collaborated with this group on this thesis project. Afterwards I will describe the methods for the quantitative phase of surveys and development tests, and then the methods for the qualitative phase of in-depth and photo interviews will follow. The methods are geared to answer the following two research questions (RQ) related to the parenting field in Ciudad Juárez: RQ 1) For the quantitative phase, how does parents’ access to economic, social, and cultural capital compare between children with above average and below average development scores? RQ 2) For the qualitative phase, what are the key sources of social, economic, and cultural capital for these Juárez parents, and how have these sources been affected by the violence?

2.1 GENTE A FAVOR DE GENTE

*Gente a favor de Gente* (previously known as Kolping) is based in south Juárez (where the study communities are located). The southern part of Juárez is socially and politically marginal to the rest of the city. As an example, this district, with a population of 500,000, houses only one high school (Vasquez, Carlos, personal communication, 25 August 2007, as cited in Grineski and Collins, 2008). In this area, *Gente a favor de Gente* concentrates their efforts in reducing the effects of poverty on families through the use of targeted intervention projects. Dr. Sara Grineski and I have been working with this community group by assisting in the analysis area of their interventions since 2007.

After an intervention that focused on reducing the use of harmful pesticides in homes (see Hernandez & Grineski 2010), *promotoras* (community health workers) and group leaders Carlos
Vasquez and Vicky Ramos with *Gente a favor de Gente* noted that parents voiced concerns over the development of their children as they concluded the project in early 2007. Vicky said:

Parents kept telling us that they worried that all the time they have to spend at work might be causing them to pay less attention to their children’s development, especially the parents from families in which both parents work. *Los padres nos decían que les preocupaba que todo el tiempo que tienen estar en el trabajo podría descuidar el desarrollo de sus niños, especialmente los padres de familias en las que ambos padres trabajan* (personal communication, 12 October 2010).

In other words, parents were concerned that the long hours they spent at work negatively influenced their child rearing practices and that this adversely affected their children’s development. Both Carlos and Vicky have been working with poor Juárez communities for many years to reduce the negative effects of poverty on children and their families. Carlos has been working with poor communities for seventeen years and teaches literature at a local university in Ciudad Juárez. Vicky has been part of *Gente a favor de Gente* since 2003 and has dedicated her efforts to the community group ever since.

Both have expressed that their motive is to better the lives of children by providing services (i.e. daycare services, interventions, workshops) to prevent them from becoming victims or part of criminal activities in a city in which there are many opportunities to join criminal groups.

In order to address parental concerns about development, *Gente a favor de Gente* held educational workshops for parents and began the process of developing a survey and intervention (intervention results not discussed in this thesis) with a focus on assessing and improving children’s development. Carlos and Vicky applied for a grant with El Paso del Norte Health Foundation to provide the funds needed to facilitate the intervention. With the help of these funds and the support of psychologists and educators from UACJ (Universidad Autónoma de Ciudad Juárez, a local university), *Gente a favor de Gente* developed an intervention that included the implementation of two development tests, which I will introduce in the following quantitative methods section. According to Vicky:

The most important goal of the intervention was to try to address the developmental needs of children at the beginning in order to achieve greater future outcomes by attending to their developmental needs at an early stage in their life. *La meta con más importancia de la intervención*
fue tratar de arreglar los problemas del desarrollo, atendiendo a sus necesidades de desarrollo en una etapa temprana de su vida. (personal communication, 12 October 2010).
2.2 **Quantitative Phase: Data and Methods**

In this collaborative effort with *Gente a favor de Gente*, we worked with them on an analysis of survey data from the two Ciudad Juárez colonias collected as part of the intervention. Given that this project was a collaborative effort between *Gente a favor de Gente* (specifically Vicky Ramos and Carlos Vasquez), Dr. Grineski, and myself, I have decided to use “we” where appropriate in this thesis to reflect the collaborative nature of our work. While the community group designed the instruments and led the quantitative phase of the study, we (Dr. Grineski and I) handled the data analysis phase. *Gente a favor de Gente* enrolled parents with children between 0 to 3 years old in the study in 2008 and 151 completed surveys and development tests were collected between September 2008 and December 2009. While they had hoped to complete the data collection within a shorter time frame, it became increasingly difficult and more time-consuming to recruit families for the study as the city became more violent.

The parents were first surveyed about their home life and childrearing practices (e.g., discipline, day care, health care) and the child was given two developmental tests: Denver Developmental Screening Test and Doll Development Test. The Denver Test measures fine motor skills, language, gross motor skills, and social contact. This test is easy to administer and yields results that are strongly correlated with results from the Stanford-Binet Test (Frankenburg, Camp, & Natta, 1971). The Doll Test measures physical skills, intellectual skills, and social skills. Both tests measure children’s developmental age and are useful in determining a child’s developmental needs and if further evaluation is needed. Then the participating families were given an intervention based on the results of each child’s test results and needs. The intervention included educational toys and specialist health care, if needed, and parents were counseled about the child’s development results and developmental needs (See Figures 2.1 and 2.2).
The independent variables used are measures of economic, social, and cultural capital. Since the survey instrument was designed by the community group, these capitals were not part of the survey design. Based on literature and the available survey items, we constructed variables that are proxies for our theoretical concepts. Economic capital is measured using the reported total monthly income of the household. Income has shown to be important in child development literature, and is a good measure of material resources (Yudkin & Yudkin, 2010, Duncan and Brooks Gunn 2000, McCulloch & Joshi 2000, Houston et al. 1994, Duncan 1994).
Our social capital variables include number of adults in household, number of children 10-17 in the home, length of residence in the *colonia* (in years), access to health care, and whether they had a private doctor. The number of adults in the home and the number of older children both represent key sources of support within the family, and it has already been shown that family members help people in poverty cope with challenges (Portes, 1998). Length of residence in the neighborhood also represents social capital because we believe that longer time spent in the neighborhood could represent more social ties over time. We believe that access to health care is a good measure of social capital because having this can provide parents information regarding their child’s health and development. However access to a private doctor is also representative of social capital because it represents continuity of care and one person that can be counted on (Ramos, Vicky, *Gente a favor de gente, A.C.*, personal communication, 18 June 2010), with *Seguro Social* (the public health service), paramedical staff often changes.

Lastly, our cultural capital variables include education of head of household, length of residence in Juárez, number of children, media access (i.e., internet & cable), and the use of educational toys. These variables account for cultural capital because they represent legitimate knowledge learned from experience such as having other children and living for a longer period in the city (for this study specifically Ciudad Juarez) and formal education (i.e., years of schooling). Parental education has already been linked to development outcomes (Davis Kean, 2005). We believe that media access is also representative of cultural capital because it can allow parents to access information about child health and development. Use of educational toys represents cultural capital, as they help children acquire skills knowledge, important for school.
Then, we created scales for economic, social and cultural capital by combining all variables under each heading into one measure for a total of 3 factors. For each variable (e.g., number of children), we divided each value by the maximum value, this created a new variable on a scale of 0-1. This allowed each variable to contribute to the scale with equal weighing. Then we summed up the variables relating to each capital and divided by the total number of variables in that category (e.g., for cultural capital, it was 5 variables).

The two dependent variables come from the Doll and Denver Developmental Screening tests. We created each score by subtracting the child’s developmental age from his/her chronological age, creating a developmental age variable that represents the number of months above or below age level the child was for both tests. These two variables are a broad representation of development because they measure different areas of development.

Information about how each variable was measured as well as descriptive statistics for all variables is presented in Table 2.1. The mean income of our participating households was 4498 pesos per month. Depending on the value of the dollar, this is about $400 for households that could have a maximum of 7 children and up to 5 adults. Average household contained 2.34 adults and 2.59 children. Our survey participants averaged about 3 years in their current colonia. In terms of access to health care, most parents reported seeking care only when their child is ill. Only 30 percent reported to have access to a private doctor. The sample population is most likely to seek health services through Seguro Social (public health services) which has long waiting periods and a continuously rotating paramedical staff (Ramos, Vicky, Gente a favor de gente, A.C., personal communication, 18 June 2010). The average amount of time the sample population had resided in Juárez was only 4 years. This could be because of the regional employment opportunities that attract rural migrants to this area. Lastly, the education figures for the self-reported head of household indicate that, for most of our participants, their education ended after middle school. Data analysis consisted of correlations and independent sample t-tests. First,
we looked at each individual variable and its relation to both development tests. Second, we explored the
capital scales as related to both development tests.

Table 2.1 Summary Statistics for All Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Metric</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EC: Total monthly income for household</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18000</td>
<td>4998.42</td>
<td>3423.36</td>
<td>In pesos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC: How long have you lived in the colonia?</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>In years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC: Access to healthcare</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0=Never/Only when child was born, 1=only when sick, 2=Once a year/sometimes/health fair, 3= every month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC: Television</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0=no, 1=yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC: Private Doctor</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0=no, 1=yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC: Number of adults</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>≤1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC: Number of children 10-17</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>≤1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC: How long have you lived in Ciudad Juárez?</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>In years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC: Number of children</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>≤1-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC: Cable and internet</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0=no, 1=yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC: Use of Educational toys</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0=no, 1=yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC: Education of Head of Household</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>8.58</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>≤Kindergarten (0 years) to College (14 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronological Age</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>2.1315</td>
<td>.87811</td>
<td>Child's chronological age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver Development Age</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>-1.80</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>-1.32</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>Child's developmental age according to development test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doll Development Age</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>-2.00</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>-1.79</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>Child's developmental age according to development test</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: EC=Economic Capital, SC=Social Capital, CC=Cultural Capital

2.3 Qualitative Phase

To further explore the relationships between capital and childrearing and build upon the survey analysis, I chose to employ a photo-interviewing method, which includes in-depth interviews. Unlike the quantitative phase which was driven by *Gente a favor de gente*, I led this phase of the study, designing the data collection materials and methods. Grant funding from the HHDRC (Hispanic Health Disparities Research Center) at UTEP and the UT-Houston School of Public Health made this phase of the project possible. Photo-interviewing is a method in which the participants are empowered through taking pictures and reflecting on them, although we were limited in our ability to fully carry out the empowerment aim of this approach due to the current context in Juárez. Using this method, participants (N=16) took part in an in depth interview (during May and June of 2010) that explores their experiences in parenting, and a subgroup (N=9) from the in depth interviews were invited to take pictures of their lives with their children (October 2010). IRB approval was granted for the in-depth interviews and the photo methodology (as well as for the analysis of the social survey).

As the first step in the photo-interviewing method, in depth interviews averaging 1 hour and 12 minutes (range: 49 min. to 2 hours and 3 min.) were conducted with a subset (n=16) of parents participating in the survey to take an in-depth look at their experiences in parenting and child rearing practices and how their experiences relate to their capitals. See the Appendix for the interview schedule.
To select the 16 people for interviews from the pool of 300, we began by selecting all parents that had more than one child because we expected that selecting parents with more than one child would give the parent more to talk about an interview. Then from within that subgroup, we created two additional subgroups from which we randomly selected 8 parents from each group for the study. Using one of the caretakers employment as the key variable, we created the 2 subgroups, one in which caretakers (or head of household as referred to in the survey) are employed in a maquiladora and one in which caretakers are not employed in a maquiladora (these mothers either stayed at home or worked in another type of job, usually in informal employment). More specifically, we chose mothers who were employed in the maquiladora because maquiladoras are one of the main employers in the city and tend to provide their workers with resources such as access to the housing program (i.e. INFONAVIT) and free medical care (i.e. through Seguro Social). This strategy allowed for single- and two-parent families to be captured in both groups. Then, Vicky Ramos from Gente a favor de Gente, AC, a promotora, attempted to contact parents at random from those two subgroups (i.e., lists of names) to schedule an interview. If the selected parent was not interested in participating or unable to be located, another parent was selected at random to replace the uninterested parent until 8 interviews were scheduled to be conducted in each employment subgroup. All 16 participating parents agreed to schedule the interview in their home and each of them received a $20 gift card to SMART (a Mexican grocery) as an incentive for their participation.

The in-depth interviews, all conducted in Spanish, were transcribed, and were analyzed in Spanish using N*VIVO qualitative analysis software. Pre-existing topics that were coded and analyzed include the following, all related to child rearing practices: sources of economic capital, sources of social capital, and sources of cultural capital. Then, based on subthemes that emerged from this initial round of coding, I sub-coded (i.e., created child nodes in N*VIVO) the following themes within each of the preexisting themes:
• Economic capital (i.e., employment, financial difficulties, economic consequences of the violence)

• Social capital (i.e., familial assistance (mother, father, older children, grandparents, and other family members), assistance from friends, neighbors and community groups, assistance from institutions, impacts of violence on social networks)

• Cultural capital (i.e., impacts of parental education, socialization from grandparents)

In the second step in the photo-interviewing method, we invited a subset of in-depth interview participants (N=9) to take pictures of their lives with their children. They were asked to take photos that represented their everyday lives as parents, particularly focusing on their child rearing practices and factors that relate to the development of their children. This subgroup only included 9 participants because the violence in Juárez has continued to escalate since the interviews were conducted; therefore we only proposed 9 because participants might be reluctant to take pictures during this violent time in Juárez. In addition, some participants may have already moved from the city, and recruiting more would involve more labor on the part of Vicky Ramos (promotora). Since the photo subgroup was small, and many families in Juárez have relocated, Vicky just invited parents from the two interview subgroups at random until 9 agree to participate.

To begin the photo-interviewing, Vicky scheduled a visit to go over the project instructions, request consent to allow us to use their photos (with an option to hide any faces of people when the prints were used for research), and give each participant 2 (27 exp.) cameras. Then each participating parent was given 3 weeks to use the 2 disposable cameras before Vicky returned for them. Parents were asked to take pictures that reflect their everyday lives as parents in relation to their child’s development and their child rearing practices. During this visit Vicky also scheduled a 3rd visit to drop off the photo prints and follow-up. Ideally, the photos would have been taken in two separate sets, so that the participant and Vicky could reflect on the content of the first set before taking the second set. However,
I did not have enough funding to allow for additional visits. Double prints and digital copies of all photos were ordered. On the 3rd visit, mothers were be given a photo album of their photos. The 9 participating parents were also given a gift certificate of $10 from SMART (Mexican grocery store chain) to compensate them for their participation in the study after each visit with Vicky. During this visit Vicky also requested permission for the second time for our use of each specific photo in this research project with the option to hide the faces in individual pictures. All participants allowed us to use their photos in their original form. In addition, Vicky brought a set of prints and the mother was asked to provide descriptions for each image (caption written on back) for at least 8 of her photos. Descriptions were gathered by having the participant fill out a worksheet that we partially adapted from the Border TB Photovoice Project which uses methodology of taking photos and reflecting on them (De Heer, Moya & Lacson, 2009) in which participants were asked the following questions:

- What date was the picture taken?
- What was this day like?
- What is a potential title for this picture?
- What do you see here?
- What is really happening here?
- How does this relate to your lives?

In terms of analysis of the photo interview data, instead of analyzing the content of the actual photo, I analyzed the captions that the participants provided in relation to the above questions. This complements and extends information gathered through in depth interviews. The content in the photo captions was coded using the preexisting codes we used in the in-depth interviews.

Information about the characteristics of the 16 in-depth interview participants is presented in Table 2.2. Our participant pool includes interviews with 14 mothers and 2 fathers. While I had initially targeted mothers, 2 fathers chose to be interviewed instead; in these 2 cases, the mother was present and
participated too. The median income of our participating households was $220 per month with a range of $37-$413. Most of our participants (N=14) were two parent households in which the father was the main provider. Only 2 were single-mother households in which the mother was the primary breadwinner. In terms of employment, 9 participants reported working in *maquiladoras* at the time of the interview. In regards to education, the highest grade of education completed ranged from the 1st grade to technical training after high school; the median for our sample was the 8th grade. Our sample also includes 7 participants that have lived in Juárez for 5-10 years.

**Table 2.2 Summary of Participant Characteristics for Qualitative Phase**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>Monthly Income</th>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Number of Children</th>
<th>Number of Adults</th>
<th>Time in Juaréz</th>
<th>Experienced Violence/Crime</th>
<th>Participated in Photo-Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>6th Grade</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$188</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Lifetime</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josefina</td>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$263</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Lifetime</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Tech</td>
<td>Maquiladora</td>
<td>$225</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Lifetime</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jose</td>
<td>6th Grade</td>
<td>Maquiladora</td>
<td>$214</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6-10 yrs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luz</td>
<td>8th Grade</td>
<td>Maquiladora</td>
<td>$353</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1-5 yrs</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucero</td>
<td>8th Grade</td>
<td>Maquiladora</td>
<td>$243</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Lifetime</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monica</td>
<td>9th Grade</td>
<td>Maquiladora</td>
<td>$188</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lifetime</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>6th Grade</td>
<td>Maquiladora</td>
<td>$306</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6-10 yrs</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan</td>
<td>10th Grade</td>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>$216</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6-10 yrs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ana</td>
<td>9th Grade</td>
<td>Grocery</td>
<td>$188</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6-10 yrs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lupe</td>
<td>1st Grade</td>
<td>Maquiladora</td>
<td>$285</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&gt;20 yrs</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carla</td>
<td>6th Grade</td>
<td>Maquiladora</td>
<td>$188</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11-20 yrs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha</td>
<td>8th Grade</td>
<td>Mechanic</td>
<td>$37</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&gt;20 yrs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consuelo</td>
<td>6th Grade</td>
<td>Maquiladora</td>
<td>$113</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Lifetime</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosa</td>
<td>10th Grade</td>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>$263</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lifetime</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teresa</td>
<td>3rd Grade</td>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>$413</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&gt;20 yrs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This chapter will focus on answering the research questions. First, I will focus on our quantitative findings on how parents’ access to economic, social, and cultural capital compares among children with above average and below average development scores (RQ1). I will begin with our findings of the survey data in which we conducted correlations and t-tests for the Denver and then Doll development tests. Within each development test, I will discuss results for economic capital, then social capital, and lastly, cultural capital. Then, I will present the findings for the qualitative phase in which I will talk about parents key sources of economic, social, and cultural capital for our parents, and how have these sources been affected by the violence (RQ 2).

3.1 **Quantitative Results: Denver Test**

To begin addressing RQ 1, correlation and t-test findings of economic capital (e.g., household income) for the Denver Developmental Screening Test indicate a positive relationship between children who scored at or above their age level and households earning greater amounts of income than households with children who scored below their age level. Correlations for income were not statistically significant (see the first results column in Table 3.1). Families with children at or above age level earned about 873 pesos more per month but this difference was not statistically significant ($p=.32$) (see Table 3.2).

In terms of social capital, correlations point out that parents’ social capital was associated with better development outcomes (some of these approached $p<.20$). T-tests indicate that 36% of children at or above age level on the Denver development test had access to a private doctor compared to only 23% who were below age level. Children with development scores below age level had lived in their colonia longer (3.4 years as compared to 2.6 years) than those with above age level scores ($p<05$). A nearly
significant social capital finding \((p<.05)\) was that better development outcomes on the Denver test were associated with more children ages 10-17; correlations with this variable approached significance \((p=.12)\).

In terms of the cultural capital variables, in the t-test, greater percentages of children in households that reported access to internet and cable scored at or above their age level \((p<.05)\). While none of the other cultural capital variables were statistically significant at \(p<.05\) in the correlations (the first results column in Table 3.1) or t-tests, parental education was in the expected direction (more education = better development).
Table 3.1 Correlations for Individual Capital Variables and Developmental Screening Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Denver Test</th>
<th>Doll Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EC: Total monthly income for household</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC: How long have you lived in the <em>colonia</em>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC: Access to healthcare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC: Television</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC: Private Doctor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC: Number of adults</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC: Number of children 10-17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC: How long have you lived in Ciudad Juárez?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC: Number of children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-0.074</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC: Cable and internet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC: Use of Educational toys</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>150.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CC: Education of Head of Household</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>0.12</th>
<th>0.05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>143.00</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: EC=Economic Capital, SC=Social Capital, CC=Cultural Capital
Table 3.2 T-test results for Denver Developmental Screening Test and Individual Capital Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Denver Scores</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>σ</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EC: Total monthly income for household</td>
<td>At or above</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>5456.42</td>
<td>3556.26</td>
<td>405.27</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>4583.81</td>
<td>3212.51</td>
<td>376.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC: How long have you lived in the <em>colonia</em>?</td>
<td>At or above</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC: Access to healthcare</td>
<td>At or above</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC: Television</td>
<td>At or above</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC: Private Doctor</td>
<td>At or above</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC: Number of adults</td>
<td>At or above</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC: Number of children 10-17</td>
<td>At or above</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC: How long have you lived in Ciudad Juárez?</td>
<td>At or above</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC: Number of children</td>
<td>At or above</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC: Cable and internet</td>
<td>At or above</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC: Use of Educational toys</td>
<td>At or above</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC: Education of Head of Household</td>
<td>At or above</td>
<td>73.</td>
<td>9.01</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>8.14</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: EC=Economic Capital, SC=Social Capital, CC=Cultural Capital
In reviewing the findings for the capital scales, none were statistically significant at $p<.05$. Social capital was the closest to significance in our correlations ($p=.20$), and both social and cultural capital approached significance ($p<.22$) in the t-tests. But all findings were in the expected direction for t-tests and correlations, meaning that children with higher scores on development tests tended to have parents who reported greater amounts of economic, cultural and social capital (see the first results column in Table 3.3 and Table 3.4).

Table 3.3 Correlations for Capital Scales and Developmental Screening Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Denver Test</th>
<th>Doll Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Capital</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Capital</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Capital</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.4 T-test results for Denver Developmental Screening Test and Capital Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Denver Development Score</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic Capital</td>
<td>At or above</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Capital</td>
<td>At or above</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Capital</td>
<td>At or above</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2 Quantitative Results: Doll Test

Economic capital correlation and t-test findings for Doll Development test point out that there is a relationship between income and development scores (see second results column in Table 3.1 and 3.5). T-test results indicate that children with above average development lived in families that made about 900 pesos more per month than those with below average development, but this was not statistically significant ($p = .27$) for t-tests; and $p = .22$ for the positive correlation coefficient. Regarding social capital, we found that children with above average development scores lived in households with more adults ($p < .01$), and with more children ages 10-17 ($p < .01$) than those with below average development, and these findings are significant (in t-tests). Correlations were also approaching significance ($p = .10$ for children and $p = .24$ for adults).

In terms of cultural capital, none of the variables were significant (see second results column in Table 3.1 and Table 3.5). There was a positive relationship between children being at or above age level and more frequent use of development toys, but this did not approach significance in the t-test ($p = .51$). Also, better developmental results was associated with the child living in a household with a greater number of children, but this was not near significance ($p = .43$ for t-test). Similar to the Denver test results, our findings in the Doll test also indicate that there is a negative relationship between children’s development and length of residence in Juárez ($p = .29$ for t-test).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capitals</th>
<th>Doll Scores</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>σ</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EC: Total monthly income for household</td>
<td>At or above</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>5542.33</td>
<td>3554.36</td>
<td>437.51</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>4630.57</td>
<td>3257.72</td>
<td>355.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC: How long have you lived in the colonia?</td>
<td>At or above</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC: Access to healthcare</td>
<td>At or above</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC: Television</td>
<td>At or above</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC: Private Doctor</td>
<td>At or above</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC: Number of adults</td>
<td>At or above</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC: Number of children 10-17</td>
<td>At or above</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC: How long have you lived in Ciudad Juárez?</td>
<td>At or above</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC: Number of children</td>
<td>At or above</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC: Cable and internet</td>
<td>At or above</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC: Use of Educational toys</td>
<td>At or above</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC: Education of Head of Household</td>
<td>At or above</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>8.66</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: EC=Economic Capital, SC=Social Capital, CC=Cultural Capital

In the capital scale analysis, correlations for social capital was the closest to significance in our correlations (p=.09) (see Table 3.3, second column). Economic and social capital t-test findings (see
Table 3.6) were in the expected direction with better development outcomes being tied to more capital ($p = .29$ for both); cultural capital was in the reverse direction ($p = .34$ for t-tests) but the differences between children with above and below average development on the scale were quite small: .01 of a month (see Table 3.6).

Table 3.6 T-test results for Doll Development Test & Capital Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Doll Development Score</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic Capital</td>
<td>At or above</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Capital</td>
<td>At or above</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Capital</td>
<td>At or above</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In sum, the statistical relationships were relatively weak. Results suggest that social capital, and secondarily economic capital, might be important influences on child development. The number of older children and adults in the household, access to private doctors, and length of residence in the colonia served as significant (or nearly significant) factors related to social capital that affected children’s development based on t-test results. Correlations and t-test findings suggest that higher monthly incomes were related to better child development outcomes, although not significant at $p < 0.05$. There were not significant findings for cultural capital however findings were generally in the expected direction (more capital = better development). The lack of statistically significant findings in this section (especially for economic and cultural capital) does not mean that these capitals are not important in the parenting field. In the next section, I will use the qualitative data to further explore these relationships in answering RQ 2.
3.3 **Qualitative Results**

In terms of the influences of capital in the child rearing field, the following analysis of 16 in-depth interviews and sub-set of 9 photo interviews with parents focuses on sources of economic, social, and cultural capital and how they influence parents’ child rearing practices in order to answer RQ 2. The effects of the violence on each capital will be also included and discussed in each section. This analysis reveals the importance that economic, social and cultural capital have in the parenting field.

3.4 **Economic Capital:**

Economic capital was defined as the money and material resources that one possesses (Bourdieu, 1986). The following topics emerged, which are related to economic capital and its influence on child rearing practices: employment (i.e., earnings, instability, benefits, barriers) and financial difficulties (i.e., not earning enough to make ends meet, made more extreme by the current economic recession). The effects of violence on capital will be woven in to the sections on employment and financial difficulties.

3.4.1 **Employment**

Employment is an important source of economic capital that influences child rearing and development. In terms of employment, the main provider in 14 of the 16 families was the father of the children. However not all the families interviewed were two parent households, for the 2 single-parent homes, the mother was the main provider. The in-depth interview sample reported a mean household income of $617 pesos a week (approximately $51 in U.S. dollars) at the time of the interview; the range was $1350 pesos (approximately $94.50 in U.S. dollars) to 4,950 a month (approximately $414 in U.S. dollars). The household with the highest income had 10 members (i.e., Lucero’s). In comparing the mean income for these families between the survey, which took place 9-12 months before the interview, and the interview, it dropped from $1111 pesos a week to $617 pesos a week, reflecting the worsening economic conditions for families in Juárez. These incomes are quite low by Mexican standards, given
that commodities are similarly priced to those in the U.S: in Juárez, a gallon of milk costs $3.65 dollars and a liter of soda costs $1.50 at the time of this writing.

The low and falling incomes were due to a number of causes such as the recent recession, instability in employment, and low-wages. For instance, the instability in employment is illustrated by Josefina, a mother of three, as she told Vicky about her husband’s decreasing work hours:

A while ago more kitchenettes were sold, and not now. My husband used to work a lot, and even on Sundays, but not anymore. There are times that on Monday he will return [home] because there is no work. There are no kitchenettes [being built] because many people no longer buy them. Si tiempo atrás se vendía más cocinetas, y ahora no. Antes trabajaba así seguido y hasta los domingos pero ya no. Hay veces de que se va el lunes y luego regresa porque no hay trabajo. No hay cocinetas porque mucha gente ya no las compra.

Because the husband was not a salaried employee, the lack of demand for kitchenettes meant that he did not work. He did not get paid when he had to return home early from work. This meant that the family’s income was variable and that there were weeks when the children’s parents struggled to pay the bills and afford other basic needs, such as groceries. Difficulties caused by a lack of income will be discussed in more detail in the “Financial Difficulties” section.

Many parents attributed their employment struggles to the violence and the recession. Similar to Josefina’s statement, Maria, who is currently her grandson’s primary caregiver, shared her experience about her husband’s lack of employment opportunities:

Because employers that would give him jobs…to do just give him small jobs. Before he had a job because he knows architects and they would give him big jobs and all, but now with the violence, all they tell him is that right now there is no work, no work. Pues porque los patrones que le daban los trabajos a él… si le dan pero si puras cosas chicas. Antes tenía, pos si conoce arquitectos y todo que si le dan trabajos grandes y todo pero pos con la violencia no más le dicen que ahorita no hay trabajo no hay trabajo.

In Maria’s case, her husband could not provide a steady income because the demand for construction has decreased in Ciudad Juárez, therefore reducing the economic capital that Maria’s family possesses.
3.4.2 Mother’s Employment

From the working mother’s perspective, being employed is a trade-off as it provides important economic resources for the child, but this may have a negative impact on the child’s development as the mother is not there to spend time with him/her. The working mothers expressed that they wished that they had more time for their children. This reflects the reasons why 13 mothers in our sample were not working at the time of the interview, in addition to job loss due to the economic recession. When asked which she would select if she had the ability to choose between being a working mother or a stay-at-home mother, Consuelo, who used to be employed, but was not at the time of the interview, told us this:

It's hard, but I would prefer to have more time to be at home. I worked when one of my girls was little and I didn’t like it because I felt that I missed spending more time with her. I would prefer to be here [at home]. We struggle, but as I said before, I prefer to wait a little bit until my children grow older and are already in school and maybe then I will work, because right now, you can’t leave the children with just anyone. Es difícil pero me gustaría tener más tiempo en casa. Ta trabajé cuando la niña estaba chiquita y no me gustó porque sentí que me faltó convivir con la niña. Yo preferiría pues estar aquí. Batallamos pero como le digo prefiero esperar que mis niños crezcan poquito más y que ya estén en la escuela y a lo mejor trabajar porque ahorita no se puede dejar los niños con cualquiera.

So, although it might be an economic benefit for the mother to contribute to the household income, like Consuelo, all of the stay-at-home mothers expressed a similar response when asked what they would choose if they were given the choice to work or stay at home with the children. For the parents in our study, it was of importance for the mother to stay at home to witness and contribute to their children’s development, and this was a greater benefit than what an additional income in the household could provide, especially considering the cost of daycare. In addition, the fear of leaving them to go work “right now”, as Consuelo stated, also contributed to their decision not to work as they wanted to be close to their children in a time of high crime in the city.

Daycare could hypothetically serve as a facilitator for working mothers, allowing them to earn economic capital while keeping their children safe; however the participants expressed that the cost of day care was prohibitive and therefore working while leaving the children in daycare would not have
contributed much to their income. In addition, mothers expressed a lack of trust in daycare services, which can be attributed to the current unsafe state in Juárez because of the drug-related violence. This lack of trust was consistently apparent throughout the interviews. When parents were asked if they have ever used daycare services, (alguna vez ha utilizado las guarderías?) almost all (N=15) of them simply said things like, “no, I don’t trust them” (e.g., Lupe, a working mother: “no, no le tengo confianza”). This is concerning because having trust in such services could give parents the opportunity to work and earn much needed economic capital (as previously discussed in the economic capital section). Given the violent situation in Juárez and the rise in the extortion of businesses, which many times have ended up in killings due to businesses not paying quotas demanded by cartels, parents communicated that they are not comfortable leaving their children home alone, or in the care of non-family member, such as a daycare provider. They were concerned about extortion because even school administrators have been victims of shootings for not paying extortions, and parents have come to the realization that businesses such as daycares could also become victims of the violence. However, given the circumstances, the risk of extortion is too great for parents to consider using daycare services as their children might be harmed while left in the care of a daycare. This fear is rooted in the reality that businesses, regardless of presence of children, have been extorted and have become victims of violence during the current drug war in Juárez. Thus, mothers’ opportunities for employment (and families’ economic capital) are negatively impacted.

### 3.4.3 Financial Difficulties

The financial difficulties stemming from the lack of economic capital influenced child rearing in a negative way. Some of the financial difficulties that parents experienced included not having enough money to pay for utility bills and to pay rent, not being able to provide the children with healthy food options, and losing economic assets to crimes such as robbery. As Maria stressed, “Sometimes I worry that the kids don’t have what they need (Aveces me preocupo que los niños no tienen lo que necesitan)”.
Like most of the parents in the study, Maria worried that she did not have the financial capital to accommodate all of the day-to-day needs of her children and that this might be negatively affecting her children’s development. This was also mentioned by Laura in the photo interview, see figure 3.1. So, in addition to the material challenges, the lack of economic capital also causes worries for the parent.

Figure 3.1 My little Girl / My niña chiquita

As stated previously, the financial difficulties included not making enough to provide children with the adequate nutrition; this was described by Jose, a father of two. He explained: “months ago we were doing really bad and I could not force myself to tell them [his children] we are only going to eat beans and eggs (meses atrás estábamos bien amolados pero yo también pues no me podía forzar a decirles no mas vamos a comer puros frijoles y huevito)”. The photo interviews also revealed a child rearing practice that a parent used in order to cope with not being able to provide her children with a variety of food options. In the following picture (see figure 3.2), Laura illustrates how she deals with this difficulty:

“It is important that they develop their creativity by playing with what they have within their reach that is rocks or cans or whatever because sometimes there is no [money] to buy them other kinds of toys.”

“Es importante que ellas desarrollen su creatividad jugando con lo que tengan a su alcance así sea piedras o botes o lo que sea porque a veces no hay para comprarles otro tipo de juguetes.” -Laura-
In this case, Laura used an innovative strategy to minimize the effects of their lack of economic capital by encouraging her children to use their imagination.

One of the most mentioned problems stated by participants was having difficulties paying the utility bills, which could affect the children as this could lead the family to go without electricity, heat in the winter, and telephone service in a case of an emergency. When asked to talk about the financial difficulties, Consuelo described:

"We struggle a lot because it is only his [her husband’s] salary and we struggle quite a bit here because we also take care of my sister-in-law [whose husband was murdered] and my nephews. My husband, well, he earns very little, and so we struggle sometimes to pay the electricity, gas, telephone, water bills, and it's difficult because they always come together and we are like this all month, so we struggle, but we go on. Batallamos mucho porque nada más es su sueldo y si batallamos bastante por qué nosotros nos hacemos cargo como le digo de mi cuñada y de mis sobrinos. Mi esposo pues si gana cualquier cosita más pero pues si batallamos a veces que tenemos que pagar que la luz, el gas, el teléfono, el agua, y se nos dificulta porque siempre nos llegan juntos y estamos todo el mes pero pues batallamos pero pos hemos salido." –Laura-

Figure 3.2 Socializing at breakfast / Convivencia en la comida
In Consuelo’s case, the violence was making her family’s economic situation tougher because she and her husband have more people to support now that her brother is no longer alive. However, at the same time, the family was still able to continue to survive through the tough times with the little access to economic capital that they did posses.

For many families, the rise in crime because of the violent situation that Ciudad Juárez has affected the economic capital that they have very directly (see figure 3.3). When asked how the violence has affected them economically, Juan, a father of two, described how the rise in crime due to the violence has added to his family’s financial strains:

*We have been robbed here. We are living day-to-day and when we least expect it, we go through two or three little things. One time I saved [money] and had about $500 and they stole a tank of gas. So I go off to replace it, and buy a chain [to lock it up] and it’s an expense, then they robbed us again and we are struggling.* Ya nos han robado aquí. Estamos viviendo día a día y cuando menos queremos pasan no sé dos o tres cositas. Una vez ahorré y tenía unos $500 y nos robaron un tanque de gas. Y a comprarlo y comprar cadena es un gasto y pues ahí se fueron y luego nos robaron otro también y estamos batallando.

As Juan explained here, the rise in crime has directly affected them economically as his family has been robbed several times. This affects the children, as parents are already scraping by and then have to spend extra money to replace items that are stolen or sometimes even have do without them. When Juan’s home gas tank was stolen, the children had to go without warm water until the family could afford to replace the tank. Figure 3.3 shows a picture taken by Carla to show us one of the abandoned homes in her neighborhood. As can be seen, this home has been robbed of everything of value illustrating that when a robbery like this happens, it directly affects the families’ economic capital.
Overall, in terms of economic capital, employment was a source of economic capital that influenced parent’s child rearing practices as it was the main source for economic capital. The father served as the main provider for most of the families in the study (N=13). Working parents experienced low incomes due to a number of causes such as the recent recession, instability in employment, low-wages and the violence. The financial difficulties stemming from low incomes that influence child rearing practices included not having enough money to pay for bills, rent, and provide children with adequate nutrition, and losing economic assets to crimes, such as robbery. This is worrisome as the violent and economic conditions in Ciudad Juárez have continued to worsen since the interviews were conducted.
3.5 Social Capital

Social capital was defined as entailing support through relationships based on group membership and networks of influence. The following 3 sources of social capital emerged during the analysis of the interviews: (1) family, which include mothers, fathers, older children, grandparents, and other family members; (2) friends and neighbors; and (3) institutional sources, including doctors and Gente a favor de gente, the community group that ran the intervention that these parents participated in. Access to social capital provided families with a variety of resources, including emotional support, child care (including time spent with children), and socialization. Another notable dynamic that emerged as important is the impact of violence in Juárez upon the stated social capital sources, which will be discussed in each of the 3 sections. This analysis reinforces the importance that social capital has in the parenting field.

3.5.1 Family as social capital

When looking at social capital, I considered all adults within the family as potential capital, including immediate and supporting family members, which represented key sources of support. The following analysis will focus on the sources of social capital within the family.

Mother

In terms of social capital within the family, the mother represents the most important source of capital. She represents the biggest influence in the child rearing and development of her children as she is the person who spends the most time with them, tending to their needs, providing emotional/developmental support, and protecting them. Mothers generally described their day to be filled with child rearing activities such as preparing meals, getting the children bathed and dressed, transporting them to school, entertaining them, and to putting them to bed to name a few. When asked to describe what a typical day is like (¿Digame como es un día típico para usted?) Lucero and Rosa described their daily routines:
Lucero: We get up at seven, and we start [the day]. I start to feed my girls, and then wash the 
dishes, clean the table, I get to cleaning and sweeping, and I watch TV or entertain the girls. Nos 
levantamos como a las siete, y empezamos. Yo empiezo a dale de comer a mis niñas, y después 
lavo los trastes, limpio la mesa, me pongo a limpiar a barrer, y pos me pongo a ver tele o 
entretener a las niñas.

Rosa: Well, I get up at 6:30am because I make my husband lunch for work and for breakfast, my 
daughter gets up at 8:30 and then I make her lunch, I see to the child and then I do housework. 
Pues me levanto las 6:30am le hago lonche mi esposo para el trabajo y para almorzar, mi niña 
se levanta como las 8:30am y luego le hago de almorzar a ella, atiendo el niño y luego ya algo 
los quehaceres de la casa.

The routines described above were similar to what most mothers described, in which they actively take 
the main role in the housekeeping and rearing of the children. When Juan, one of the fathers, described 
his wife tending to the children, he described his wife as” very loving and patient with them (muy 
caritosa y paciente con ellos)”.

Children’s mothers are also a source of social capital for the fathers as they are the primary 
caretakers for the children while the father is at work. It was evident in the interviews, based on the 
mothers’ responses, that the fathers would prefer that their wife stays at home because the city is too 
dangerous to leave the children in someone else’s care. Although the wives of the two fathers 
interviewed were employed outside of the home, both fathers said they would prefer that their wife not 
work because it would be more beneficial for their children.

Due to the violence the mother’s time with the children is of importance as our interviews 
highlighted that mothers would choose to forgo the benefits of employment and the use of daycare 
needed to gain economic capital in order to stay home with the children at a time in which Ciudad 
Juárez is experiencing a very high rate of crime and violence. Because the violence limits parents social 
networks (will be discussed more in depth below), the mother represents the most important asset of 
social capital to the children and father as few other people could provide the children with the support 
that she can.
Father

One of the key sources of support noted by the mothers who took part in the in-depth interviews and photo interviews was the presence of the children’s father and his participation in child rearing. When mothers were asked to describe their husband’s role in child rearing and the development of their children, all mothers in two-parent families mentioned their husbands’ employment as means of support, thus recognizing that social capital in the form of the father translated into economic capital. Mothers also said that they appreciated the interaction between the children and their father (e.g., playing, lecturing on right or wrong behavior), and that fathers helped relieve the mothers of child-related responsibilities. For example, when asked to talk about the kind of support they receive from their husbands in terms of child rearing (¿qué tipo de apoyo recibe su esposo en relación a la crianza de sus hijos?) Ana, Josefina, Rosa, and Laura responded in similar manners:

Ana: Playing with him, I hardly play with the boy, and at the moment my husband is the one who plays with him and teaches him. He teaches him things. That he teaches him small things, so that the boy can learn. When he talks to him, he tells him, for instance, that the words that he says incorrectly are not correct.

Josefina (photo-interview caption, see Figure 3.4):
Rosa: Playing with them, because it is useful that he plays with them. That he spends time with them. Above all, that he spends time with his children, so they grow up in a good environment and that he works because he has to support them. He has to give them what they need. _Jugar con ellos porque pos sí es útil que juegue con ellos. Convivir. Más que nada convivir con sus hijos para que ellos crezcan en un buen ambiente y pos que trabaje porque los tiene que mantener ósea le tiene que dar lo que necesitan._

Laura (photo-interview caption, see Figure 3.5):
Figure 3.5 Father interested in daughter’s studies / Padre interesado en estudio de su hija

In Laura’s caption, the conversion of the father’s social capital into cultural capital for his daughter is also apparent as he helps her with school work (cultural capital will be discussed in more detail later).

As stated above, most mothers replied in a similar manner stating that they considered the time their husband spent with their children, generally after work, as well as providing income to the household, as helpful in the development of their children. However, in some families, the father was not able to assist with the children at the level that the mother needed. For instance, when mothers where asked if there is something that they would like their husband do in terms of child rearing (¿qué tipo de apoyo le gustaría recibir su esposo en relación a la crianza de sus hijos?), some mothers responded that they wished their husbands would spend more time with the children. Josefina and Laura each replied:

Josefina: Sometimes he comes home at 10 because has a lot of work, and I do get upset because he is not here with me and cannot help with them [the children], so in those days I would want him to have more time for them. Pero si hay veces que llega a las 10 porque se le junta el trabajo y sí me enojo yo porque le digo que no está conmigo y no me ayuda con ellos en esos días si quisiera que tuviera más tiempo con ellos.
Laura: Sometimes I would like him to spend more time with them. Yes, because most of the time, I'm the one with them. A veces yo digo que más tiempo para convivir. Sí porque la mayoría del tiempo pos yo estoy con ellos.

As noted from Josefina’s and Laura’s responses (note they were also appreciative of the support offered: see figures 3.4 and 3.5 ), both wish the father provided more support in terms of tending to the children, but sometimes the father of the children cannot contribute due to the long hours spent at work, which was necessary to support the family financially.

For those two families that did not have a father figure present, the single mothers expressed that they dealt with the child rearing and development responsibilities of their children on their own, as they lacked this important source of social capital. Both mothers expressed concern over the lack of a father in their children’s lives. For example, Lucero shared the following: “the girls only have me and my family, but they do not see their father. The little girl, he does not know her and he doesn’t come over to even see them. Las niñas no más me tienen a mí y a mi familia pero ellos no ven su papa. La niña chiquita, el no la conoce y no viene ni a verlas.”

In Lucero’s case, the father does not provide any support (emotional or financial); fortunately, she has found social support within her own family. While Lupe had similar concerns about the lack of a father, unlike Lucero, she lacked a familial support system. Lupe cried when she shared how difficult it was to take care of the children as a single parent without a support system:

My children have no father. I think that it is not the same because they do not have a father. They only have me. Maybe they do need him if he could give them attention. But I tell them that for them I do many things, [crying] I've done the impossible to bring them up. I never had support, not even from my mom or their dad. I have been a single mom since my kids were young. I have had to deal with everything on my own. Mis niños no tienen papa, ósea yo pienso que no es lo mismo porque ellos no tienen un padre. Nada más me tienen a mí. A lo mejor si lo necesitan para que les ponga atención. Pero yo les digo que por lo ellos hago muchas cosas (llorando), he hecho hasta lo imposible para sacarlos adelante, nunca tenido apoyo ni de mi mamá ni del papá de ellos. Sola. He sido madre soltera desde que mis hijos están chicos, tengo que vérmelas yo sola para todo.

Both single mothers, Lupe and Lucero, expressed fear that the children might not be receiving the necessary attention they might need. It is of importance to note the differences in access to social capital
that single mothers lack. The father of the children not only represents a direct source of social capital but also an indirect source through his extended family; at the same time, both he and his family can provide economic capital through these social networks. As Monica’s photo-interview points out (see figure 3.6), mothers who are fortunate enough to have the father as a source of social capital acknowledge this:

“Para mí es importante compartir lo sucedido (preparando comida) que sea consciente de que no solo tiene responsabilidad de traer dinero a casa, sino también de preocuparse por la familia y ayudar en los quehaceres aunque sea poco.” —Monica—

Figure 3.6 Sharing with my partner / Compartiendo con mi pareja

As Monica demonstrates, in addition to providing income, the father also shares the responsibilities of the home and family including child rearing. Therefore, the role of the father is a key source of social capital that single mothers lack.

**Older children**

As was also suggested in the quantitative results, interviews demonstrated that older children were key sources of social capital for the mothers and fathers in the child rearing field. For example,
older children help care for their younger siblings when their mothers are busy attending to other needs. Mothers also viewed the older children as a positive influence in the development of their younger children because they can socialize with them. When asked if the older children help in the care of the younger ones (¿los niños mayores ayudan con el cuidado de los niños menores?) Linda responded:

Well, for example, the older boy does help me. Because he helps me, for example, if I start to wash clothes and cook food, he helps watch the child to make sure he does nothing dangerous. So he does help because he looks after his brother. Pues si por ejemplo el niño el más grande pues si me ayuda. Porque me ayuda de que por ejemplo si me pongo así a lavar ropa o hacer comida el vigila al niño para que no haga nada malo. Y pues el si me ayuda porque si lo vigila.

For most mothers with older children, their older children helped in the child rearing field by looking after their children while they were busy.

When asked the same question, Martha responded:

Well, in looking after them. Well, the bigger one is about five years older than the middle child. The medium one is 12 years older than smallest child. So yes, the help is looking after them. What else? In protecting them. He advises them to beware of this and look at this, do not go there for this. Even in just speaking to them. Pos en cuidarlos verdad. Pos el grande le lleva casi cinco años al otro. El mediano le lleva 12 años al chiquito. Pos así es que pos cuidarlos. ¿Pos que más? Protegerlos. Cuidate de esto. Y mira esto, no andes ahí por esto. Solamente pues cuestión de platicarle verdad.

Martha pointed out that the simple act of communication can be of assistance in the development of her children because older children help with the socializing process of younger children. Additionally, Martha stated older children can help in the development of their siblings by protecting them from dangers and advising them through the growing process with the lessons they have learned in their own childhoods. While older children can be a helpful asset, they can sometimes set a bad example for younger children. For example, they may misbehave and do things that mothers do not see as helpful towards the development of the children, such as cursing or coming home late.

**Grandparents and other family members**

For those parents that had their child’s grandparents in the Juárez region (N=5) their relationship with them allowed them to access this form of social capital. The interviews revealed that grandparents
were social capital because they assisted with child care while both parents were at work and they sometimes provided economic capital (i.e., monetary assistance). When asked how the grandparents assist in child rearing and development (¿Cómo asisten los abuelitos con el cuidado y la crianza de los niños?), Martha replied,

Many times, well, they can always help when you really need to leave the children with them. Their maternal grandmother well, she is often grumpy and she lectures them. For instance, with the middle child, she tells him “try hard at school, and come on do this”. She also lectures the older one, and also lectures the little ones too. Muchas veces, siempre pos que nos pueden ayudar cuando uno necesita dejarlos con ellos verdad. Por parte de la abuelita materna pues muchas veces ella si es mas regañona y ella si me los regaña. Como el mediano le dice ‘échale ganas a la escuela hijo, ánale esto’. Al grande pues también lo regaña, a los chiquitos también los regaña.

In Martha’s case, the grandparents are social capital because they can take care of the children when she needs them to, even though her mother lectures the children more than she would like her to. Martha sees the grandmother as a generally positive influence in her children’s development.

As with the fathers and older children, the simple fact that these family members socialize with the children is of importance to the mothers when it comes to the development of their children. When asked the same question about the grandparents, Rosa described the following:

Oh my mom spoils my children very much. She is very affectionate with them and she teaches my daughter to count and the letters and colors. She teaches many things to my daughter. Ah mi mamá consiente mucho los niños. Es bien cariñosa con ellos y a mi hija le enseña a contar y las letras y los colores. Les enseña muchas cosas a mi hija.

Rosa’s mother not only serves as a source of social capital for Rosa as she helps with the children, but also cultural capital, to be discussed in the next section, because she positively influences their development through teaching them new things. Rosa considers these actions as contributing to the children’s success in school.

It is important to note that for a number of the families in the study, the children’s grandparents could not serve as powerful sources of social capital because they do not live in Ciudad Juárez (n=10); they could not provide child care or advise parents in the same ways as local family member could.
Because of the regional employment opportunities that attract rural migrants to this area, families migrate to Ciudad Juárez, leaving behind important family ties that would have served as key sources of social capital in the parenting field.

3.5.2 Violence and its impacts on familiar social capital

For all participants, the violence was a deterrent in being able to fully utilize the resources provided by family networks. For example, when participants were asked how their familiar social networks were affected by the violence (*Tiene la reciente violencia en Juárez afectadas tus relaciones por ejemplo con otros miembros de la familia porque hay mucha violencia?*), all participants shared that it limited the time they spent with family and friends. Therefore violence directly reduced the opportunities for children and parents to develop and utilize social capital. For instance, in the following picture (see figure 3.7), Teresa illustrates how the violence has affected her and her husband’s child rearing practices.
In other words, in Teresa’s case, she would rather their son be isolated from other people in order to protect him from the violence. The dog keeps him company because of the absence of friends, family, and neighbors. For Lucero, the violence has limited her relationship with her family in specific ways. Because her family lives too far away, but still within the city, they do not want to commute through the dangerous city to visit relatives. If they did visit, leaving after dark was out of the question for her family as they are afraid that they might have a dangerous experience driving to or from a relative’s home.

Given the violent situation in Juárez, the presence of family members close by can relieve some of the stresses that the violence has imposed upon parents and children. As Consuelo described when asked if there is something she would like for her family members to do in the rearing and development
of her children (¿Hay algo que te gustaría que hicieran tus familiares con el cuidado y la crianza de los niños?), she replied:

Well, the only thing I would like is that if something were to happen to me or something like that, you never know what could happen, for them to take care of my children because I would not like for them to end up in the hands of other people who are outside of their family. Well, my brother’s incident [murder] was unexpected and it can happen to any other person like us and, well, children are the ones who end up homeless. That's all I would like, just that they don’t neglect my children. Pues nada más lo único que me gustaría es que si a uno llegara pasarle algo así uno no sabe lo que le podría pasar, que estén cargo de los niños porque a mí no me gustaría que pudieran parar en manos de gente que no fuera su familia. Pues como lo de mi hermano fue algo inesperado y le puede pasar a cualquier otra persona así como nosotros y pues los niños son los que se quedan desamparados. Es lo único que me gustaría, nada más que no me los despreciaran.

In consideration that Consuelo’s brother was killed during the violence, her family is an important source of support because they help reduce her fears that if something were to happen to her, her children would be cared for. In the same manner, since her brother’s murder, she has been caring for her brother’s wife and children, serving as social capital for them. Lucero’s family also assists with alleviating fears instilled by the violence, she said: “Well, they distract them when I take a long time to come home and make sure they don’t cry and think that I won’t come back. Pues los entretienen mientras que yo llego que no lloren y piensen que no voy a llegar.”

3.5.3 Friends as social capital

An interesting finding worth noting is that most parents (N=14) mentioned that they do not have friends, which should theoretically be an important source of social capital. This could be due to the distrust caused by the recent violent situation in Juárez. However, it is still alarming that most of the participants mentioned that they do not have friends or neighbors in the city to rely on. For instance when asked how her neighbors assist in child rearing and development (¿qué tipo de apoyo recibe sus vecinos en relación a la crianza de sus hijos?), Linda responded: “Well the truth is, well also, because I do not have neighbors. They don’t even go outside or not even to walk, or anything. Pues la verdad, sí también porque pues no tengo vecinos. Casi ya ni salen afuera ni a caminar, ni nada.” Linda attributes
her lack of relationships with neighbors to the violence, because they are afraid to go outside, or socialize with someone who could be targeted by the drug cartel. Lucero explained the lack of relationships with her neighbors as she stated: “Well it is because I hardly know anyone. I don’t socialize much with the people here. Es que casi no conozco a nadie. No convivo mucho con la gente de aquí.” These feelings were reflected among the 14 participants who expressed that they did not have friendship networks to help them in developing and raising their children.

For Consuelo, the violence directly affected her social relationships with her neighbors. She and children witnessed her brother getting killed as he got caught in crossfire in front of her home. Not only was her family affected by the loss of her brother (a previous source of social capital) but the relationship her family had with the neighbors was affected poorly too. Consuelo described the stigma they experienced because the neighbors believed that her brother was involved in the drug business. When asked, “Has the violence affected your relationship with your neighbors?” (¿Ha afectado sus relaciones con los vecinos la violencia?), she replied:

Well, yes, it has affected us a lot. Like for example, not with the ones next door, but the other people are always pointing, as if we had something to do with what happened with my brother, but the same people know that what happened to my brother happened because of other bad people on the street, because my brother had nothing to do with it. He worked with a fair and had just come back from where he worked [seasonally], from a [traveling] fair and he earned little but had enough to move his children forward and well, he had nothing to do with violence. Pues si nos ha afectado mucho. Como por ejemplo no con los de enseguida no pero la demás gente pues siempre nos están señalando como si nosotros tuvimos algo que ver con lo de mi hermano pero la misma gente sabe que lo de mi hermano pasó por otra gente mala que anda en la calle porque mi hermano no tenía nada que ver. El trabajaba en unos juegos acababa de regresar de fuera, de unas atracciones de juegos y pues ganaba poquito pero con eso tenía para sacar a sus hijos adelante y pero pues todo tuvo que ver con la violencia.

As we can see in Consuelo’s testimony, the fact that her neighbors view them as somehow involved in the violence reduces their social capital and the potential to gain it from the neighbors. For Consuelo, it might be difficult to approach those neighbors for help, such as to ask someone to babysit the children or even to borrow something. This also might narrow her children’s opportunities to play with the neighbor’s children, thereby lessening their opportunities to socialize.
3.5.4 Institutional sources of social capital

Health care providers are hypothetical sources of social capital from institutions that were not present for the majority of the families, whereas the community group (Gente a favor de gente) served as social capital for the majority of the families. Although access to health care could be considered a source of social capital because it can provide opportunities for parents to develop social relationships with providers and access to child health-related information, the in-depth interviews suggested that participants are not satisfied with the health services they receive and they do not form close bonds with their health care providers; some even distrust the system. For Consuelo, her distrust of health care providers was attributed to her brother’s death as she explained what happened to her brother when trying to receive help after getting shot:

My brother went to the hospital and several clinics and they did not want to assist him. My brother was doing very well, and he got up on the bed. The only place where they would treat him was the General Hospital and they did not do anything for my brother. And they left him to die on the bed, lying there. I say that because, the doctors, if they see a gunshot wound, they think is that he is someone bad [related to the violence or a cartel]. Con lo de mi hermano fuimos al hospital y a varias clínicas y no me lo querían atender. Mi hermano iba muy bien y se levantó y se subió a la camilla y en el único lugar donde lo atendieron fue en el Hospital General y a mi hermano no le hicieron nada y lo dejaron morir en la cama ahí acostado. Yo digo que es porque para los doctores, si ven un herido de bala ellos piensan que es alguien malo.

Consuelo’s experience with her brother’s death demonstrated how once someone is viewed as being associated with the violence, one can be provided with subpar care because the health care providers are afraid of retaliation by the assailant. In the case of Consuelo, it might be hard for her to trust the medical services available in Ciudad Juárez, especially if she fears that she will be judged as being part of the violence. For her children, this could affect their health and development as she might be hesitant to trust medical institutions and she may not receive the best care because of her association with her brother.

In terms of health care services, the lack of continuity of care, which would allow parents to develop social relationships with providers, is the missing link when it comes to child rearing. Seguro
Social, because of the way it is organized, does not allow children to see the same doctors as they grow up, or even on consecutive visits. Therefore, families do not have the opportunity to develop a relationship with their doctor, thereby reducing the doctor/patient bond and opportunity to gain social support. For most parents, their dissatisfaction with Seguro Social is that it takes too long to receive service and patients end up losing a day waiting for care. For instance when asked to describe the services at Seguro Social, Luz responded:

Well, there is some paperwork that is time consuming and complicated, but the doctor that I got is very good. I like how she treats them and reviews and explains everything that is happening. Pues hay unos trámites que si son tardados y complicados pero la doctora que me tocó es muy buena. Si me gusta como los, pues si como los atiende y revisa y explica todo lo que está pasando.

Similar to Luz, many participants mentioned the long wait to receive care, which at times led them to seek care elsewhere.

An institutional source of social capital that arose in the analysis was Gente a favor de Gente’s support of the community. 14 of the parents interviewed mentioned that the only help from community groups that they received was from Gente a favor de Gente. This is a very unique source of social support that would not be common across the city, but it is relevant here as Gente works in the neighborhoods where the interviewed families live. When asked what type of help or support they have received from organizations in relation to her children’s development (¿qué tipo de motivación o algún apoyo ha recibido de organizaciones en relación a la crianza de sus hijos?), like many of the parents, Monica stated: “Well, the only support that we have had has been from you guys. Pues el único apoyo que hemos tenido ha sido el de ustedes.” Monica was recalling the assistance that Gente a favor de Gente gave her through an intervention (as discussed in the quantitative chapter). This suggests that the community needs more community groups such as that of Gente a favor the Gente because they can have a positive effect on child rearing by providing assistance to parents in need.
In terms of sources of social capital, family and to a lesser degree *Gente a favor de gente*, emerged as important during the analysis of the interviews as they assisted families with a variety of resources such as emotional support and child care. As the interviews point out, having the children’s father around served as a powerful source of social capital as he can provide social support and economic capital. A noteworthy aspect of social capital that emerged as important is the impact of violence in Juárez upon the stated social capital topics, as it is evident that it significantly limits parents’ access to social capital since parents are less likely to socialize with others as the violence continues to persist in Ciudad Juarez.

3.6 Cultural Capital

Cultural capital was defined previously as legitimate knowledge such as education (Bourdieu 1986). The following two sources of cultural capital emerged during the analysis of the interviews: (1) parent’s education and (2) socialization into parenting through experiences in parents’ childhoods. Education emerged more often during the interviews compared to socialization into parenting. Parents’ access to cultural capital was of importance as these resources influenced child care and child rearing practices. The impact of the violence on cultural capital will be discussed only briefly, as the parents did not speak directly about this theme.

3.6.1 Education as cultural capital

While looking at cultural capital, I began by considering the highest grade of education completed by the parent who participated in the in-depth interview. For those participants who reported this during the in-depth interview (N=10), the level of education ranged from no school to the end of high school. For half of this sample, their formal education ended in middle school. Parent’s education is an important source of cultural capital because it influenced child rearing practices and shaped the aspiration’s that parents have for their children’s future.
For all of the parents, their low levels of educational attainment (i.e., a lack of formal cultural capital) was a driving force that shaped their child rearing practices in terms of wanting their children to have educational opportunities that they did not have. In this sense then, it was the absence of education (a traditional source of cultural capital) that was important. Parents generally attributed their lack of educational opportunities to poverty during childhood and young adulthood. When parents were asked about their educational attainment (¿Hasta que año llegaste en la escuela?) and why (¿porque?), many responded in a similar way to Linda: “Only to middle school because there were no opportunities. Hasta la secundaria porque no había posibilidades.” Like Linda’s situation described above, for many of the parents, when asked why they stopped continuing their education (¿Porque dejaste de estudiar?), the reason was related to lack of money for daily necessities, which eventually led them to quit school to enter the workforce.

In a similar manner to Linda, entering the workforce was also the case for Lucero as she explained: “It’s because I had to start working. Es que me tuve que meter a trabajar.” Luz also responded in a similar manner in that she had to quit school and work at around the age of fourteen: “Well, I came over here [to Ciudad Juárez] to work in the maquilas. Pues me vine para acá para trabajar en las maquilas”. For Lupe, her lack of education was attributed to a lack of economic capital and the shame this caused her; she shared the following about her educational experiences:

Well you see, I did have the opportunity to go to school, but barefoot, barefoot. I only got to the first grade because, without shoes, they made fun of me. Pues mire si tuve oportunidad de ir a la escuela pero descalza, descalza. Nada más hasta el primero porque sin zapatos y se burlaban de mí.

The experience described above served as form of cultural capital for Lupe as it influenced her child rearing practices. She said that although she has few resources, she tries to not have her children barefoot and works to give them what they need for school so they could have what she was not given as a child.
Similar to Lupe’s case, Linda’s formal education ended in the fourth grade and because of this she motivates her children to continue in their education as she described below:

Well, I tell the older child to ‘put a lot of effort [into his studies], don’t fail because I want you to keep studying and furthering your studies, and if you are to continue with your studies, I will to support you.’ Pues si pues por ejemplo yo le digo el niño más grande que ‘échale ganas, no repruebes porque yo quiero que sigas estudiando y estudiando, y si tú vas a seguir estudiando yo te voy a apoyar.’

In the following photo captions, Laura (see figure 3.8) and Luz (see figure 3.9) reflect similar feelings to those of Linda in that they want their children to continue their education:

“It is good because I see that she has goals that she strives to achieve, even if she has to work hard for it.”

“Es bueno porque veo que tiene metas y se esfuerza por lograrlas aunque le cueste trabajo.” -Laura-

Figure 3.8 The studious one / La estudiosa
The aforementioned are noteworthy findings because as our interviews revealed, negative experiences (i.e., lack of educational opportunities) served as more powerful agents of cultural capital than positive ones (i.e., educational opportunities) because they impacted the parent’s drive and passion to raise her children well in order to provide them with opportunities that she did not have as children.

### 3.6.2 Socialization from parents as cultural capital

Another source of cultural capital in the child rearing field that arose in the analysis is the informal socialization related to parenting from the parents’ childhood. When parents were asked about where they learned about child rearing (¿de donde aprendiste a criar?), 13 mothers answered that they learned this from their mother. In many cases, parents told us that they learned their child rearing practices from their parents. For instance, Rosa explained:

> My mother, because with the girl [first child], I did not know about how to bring her up, or how to attend to her needs, how to bathe her, or feed her, and with him [a younger sibling] it is different because I no longer have to have my mom there telling me how, I like to see things and learn. *Mi mamá porque con la niña yo no muy bien sabía cómo criar aún, ósea no cómo criar o*
como atenderlo, que bañarlo, su comida y ya con el no allá con ellos ósea es más diferente porque ya no tiene que estar ahí mi mamá diciéndome ósea me gusta ver las cosas y saber.

In Rosa’s case, she had her mother at her side with her first child and was socialized into parenting by adapting child rearing practices from her mother. This reflects the experience of the parents who had their parents living in Ciudad Juárez. Also, as mentioned in social capital, for the families that had the children’s grandparents nearby, they served as cultural capital that positively influenced the children’s development through teaching them new things or helping with their homework.

However in those cases where the grandparents did not live in Ciudad Juárez and could not model good parenting practices directly, parents still attributed and compared their parenting practices to their parents by saying something similar to Linda’s response: “Well, everything that my mother taught me, I teach my children. Pues todo lo que me enseñó mi mamá pues si, ósea yo se lo enseño mis hijos.” In this way, non-Juárez resident grandparents were still a source of cultural capital for parents, although they were likely less powerful sources of cultural capital that those that lived close by.

It is important to note that not all parents’ reflections on their parents’ child rearing practices were positive. Parents indicated that they also learned from their parents mistakes in their upbringing (N=4). For instance, for Karla, her shaky upbringing taught her about the things that she did not want her children to experience. Karla explained:

When I was little, my mother was alone and there were more bad times than good because she did the work of two [mom and dad]. We did not have our own home and either lived with an uncle or sibling of hers, but in some way or another there were problems and we had to go and that’s why I, for example, I have my own house so I thank God that my children do not have to experience this problem. Cuando yo estaba chiquita lógico que como mi mamá estaba sola eran más las malas que las buenas porque ella hacía el trabajo de los dos. No teníamos casa propia y vivíamos ya sea con un tío o hermanos de ella pero por alguna o otra cosa había problemas y entonces era el hecho de que te tenías que ir y este yo por ejemplo tengo casa propia entonces gracias a Dios yo no les he dado ese problema a mis hijos.

As seen here, for Karla, these childhood experiences served as cultural capital as it was important that her children did not experience the instability of not having a home, as she did as a child. Another
similar example can be seen in Lupe’s case, as she told us, through tears, of the difficult times in her past:

Everything that I lived through, everything I went through as a child are things that were very hard for me, very hard. I want the best for them. If it’s for my kids, it is worthwhile. Todo lo que yo viví, todo lo que yo pasé de niña son cosas que fueron muy duras para mí, fueron muy duras. Yo quiero lo mejor para ellos. Si es por mis hijos si vale la pena.

As one can note from Lupe’s statement, Lupe’s negative experiences with her mother served as a cultural capital that shapes her childrearing practices, as she uses previous knowledge, gained from her negative experiences, in raising her children and attempting to give them the best she can. Negative experiences such as Rosa’s and Lupe’s influenced parents’ child rearing practices as parents worked to protect their children from the negative aspects of their childhood by providing them with stability, such as a home to call their own.

In general, parent’s education and socialization into parenting through their childhood were sources of cultural capital that emerged during the analysis. Analysis of the interview data did not reflect that the current violence impacted cultural capital directly. However, this may be because of the cross-sectional nature of the data collection, as impacts of cultural capital occur over time and its effects were not evident during the time of the interview. However, interviews did reveal that children spent the majority of their time outside of school in the home - not interacting with cousins or young neighbors that lived outside of their home or participating in sports in parks - due to safety concerns. This means that they will have fewer opportunities to learn practical skills (e.g., sharing with others, working together in teams, and “street smarts”), which would serve as cultural capital in their lives. At the same time, the limited nature of the time spent outside of the home limits their abilities to attend events (e.g., free concerts, soccer games, school programs, etc), where they could gain cultural capital. This portrayed by Josefina as she describes how her rearing practices have changed because of the violence:
They are prohibited from a lot and many things, like not hanging around alone, that they don’t go to the store alone, or go to the park with their friends, and in the past I would be confident to allow them to go but not anymore. Se les prohíben uno mucho y en muchas cosas, como no andar solos, de que no haden en la tienda solos, o vayan al parque con sus amigos, y antes yo nos dejaba irse con confianza pero ahora no.

In other words, Josefina isolates the children because the environment is too dangerous for her children to participate in what would be normal activities for children. Overall, most of the parents in our sample had limited access to cultural resources, such as formal education. While education was of importance, it became evident during analysis that the lack of cultural resources, such as the parents having bad childhood experiences, served as a more powerful source of cultural capital as parents demonstrated a stronger passion to protect their children from experiencing this.
Chapter 4

Discussion

Having provided answers to RQ 1 and RQ 2 in the results chapter, this discussion will focus on answering the following discussion-related questions: (1) what were key findings from the quantitative and qualitative sections of this thesis? (2) How do these findings relate to previous literature in regards to how economic, cultural, and social capital affect parenting and aid the understanding of families' experiences in child rearing and development in these Juárez colonias?

4.1 Economic Capital

Household income and employment (as a source of economic capital) were notable findings from the correlations, t-tests, in-depth interviews, and the photo-interview component as related to children’s development and child rearing practices. Related to correlations and t-test findings, higher monthly incomes were related to higher development outcomes, although not significant at $p < 0.05$. The direction of this finding aligns with findings in the literature as children from families with lower income were more likely to have detrimental development outcomes (Yudkin & Yudkin 2010; Aber et al. 2007; Lareau 1987, 2002, 2003; Duncan and Brooks Gunn 2000; McCulloch & Joshi 2000; Houston et al. 1994; Duncan 1994; Houston 1991). Previous studies have also found that children from more affluent households scored higher scores in development tests than their poorer counterparts (Duncan, 1994; McCulloch and Joshi, 2000).

Our qualitative findings can provide insights into the statistical findings related to income. In general, all the parents were poor and some contributing factors to parents’ low incomes are attributable to the instability in employment due to the recent economic recession and the current drug war. This coincides with Jimeno’s (2001) findings related to the effects of the violence in Colombia on families, in that these Juárez families were also negatively affected by the drug war by the rise in theft and unemployment. In addition, our in-depth interviews revealed that employment served as a source of
economic capital that influenced parents’ child rearing practices, but that the current situation in Juárez made it difficult for parents to maintain employment. In accordance with Berger (2009) and Lareau (2003), parents in our study tended to experience constant worry about their children’s well-being related to their poverty, however, this was more extreme for our families due to the violent environment in Ciudad Juárez, as many of them expressed that they struggled to provide their children with day-to-day needs. Therefore this negatively affected parents child rearing pursuits because they were not able to provide their children with the adequate nutrition, which was an evident concern for most parents in the in-depth and photo-interviews.

4.2 Social Capital

In terms of social capital, the findings from all three methods used in this study showed that social capital was very important to our participants as it provided them with people to spend time with the children and emotional support. The number older children and adults in the household, access to private doctors, and length of residence in the colonia served as significant factors related to social capital that affected children’s development and child rearing. Children who were above age level in their development were more likely to live in households with more children ages 10 to 17 and more adults than those who were below age level. In creating the older children variable, we assumed that older children assist with child-related tasks and household chores in a similar way to adults, which helps the child develop and frees the parent to spend more time with the young child; in-depth interview data supported this assumption. In the in-depth interviews, parents reported that their older children helped in the child rearing field by looking after their children while they were busy attending to other needs. Our finding that having more potential assistants in the home has a positive relationship to children’s development aligns with Lareau’s (2003) and Oyen (2002) findings that social ties can help lessen the negative effects of poverty, although they did not specifically focus on older children.
In regards social networks such as friends and neighbors, our findings are different than Oyen (2002) and Lareau (2003) because the families in our sample are currently experiencing a drug war that has caused parents to place limits on their and their children’s social lives, such as not socializing with friends and neighbors due to fear that they might become victims of violence though their associations. This made the mother the most important source of social capital related to development because she is the person who spends the most time with the children in which she actively tends to their needs, provides emotional/developmental support and protects them. As Kotchick and Forehand (2002) state, contextual factors, which could include the violent environment in Ciudad Juárez, influence parents’ child rearing practices as parents make decisions to limit their children’s social interactions with others. This further emphasizes that the mother is the principal source of social capital to the children as there few, and in some cases no other people, to provide the support for the children. Mothers appeared to actively make decisions about what was best for the children by trading access to certain capitals for others. For instance, as discussed in the economic capital results, mothers would trade their own economic capital in for social capital by choosing not to work outside of the home. These decisions represent the mother’s embodiment of social capital as many of them shared that they evaluated that the benefits of staying at home as greater than the economic gain that employment could offer for the family. Our findings are also in accordance with Portes (1998) and Lareau (2003) in emphasizing that family members serve as social capital because of the time they spend with the child as well as the support they provide to the parents which can help reduce the effects of poverty.

We also found that two parent households are better off than those of single parents because the father, who was the most important source of social capital for the mothers in our study, can provide other sources of social capital through his family, as well as economic capital as the father was recognized has the breadwinner in the family. In addition, similar to parents studied by Lareau (2003), parents in this study believed that kinship ties were beneficial in child rearing. However our findings
differ from Oyen (2002) and Lareau (2003) in that for our sample, this primarily pertained to immediate family because most parents lived away from their extended family.

While not a focus in the literature, above average development scores were associated with having a private doctor (as opposed to seeking care from a variety of providers through the public Seguro Social system or not having any source of health care) in the quantitative chapter of this thesis. In addition to providing higher quality care in many cases (which may connect to a child’s development), a private doctor also can become a trusted person in the parent’s social network (Ramos, Vicky, Gente a favor de gente, A.C., personal communication, 18 June 2010). In a study of mothers of children with asthma in Juárez, it was found that private doctors sometimes shared their cell phone number with trusted long-time patients and gave discounts on the cost of care (Forero, Grineski and Mendoza Reveles, In Review). Interestingly, none of the 16 parents interviewed used private doctors or reported a close relationship with their doctors, and only 45 of the 151 taking the survey reported having a private doctor. In general, the majority of parents (in our study) lacked social capital related to health care. Similar to Levethal and Brooks-Gunn’s (2000) findings related to poor families, our sample had little to no access to physical resources and social networks outside the home that assisted them in their parental pursuits. In fact, the majority of interviewed parents were reported to be very unhappy with the health care they received (although this was not discussed in the results chapter). Similar to Jimeno’s (2001) and McIlwaine and Moser’s (2001) studies on the effects of violence on social capital in Colombia, the qualitative analysis also revealed that parents had limited social networks outside of the house including institutional networks, and in this study, some parents lacked trust in institutions (i.e., Seguro Social and daycare services) due to fears caused by the drug war that is currently a very vivid part of parents and children’s everyday lives.

Also related to social capital, we found a negative relationship between the length of residence in a colonia children and Denver development scores (p<.05). This was in the opposite direction from
what had been hypothesized. Unfortunately, below average development scores were associated with longer residence in the *colonia* and in Juárez across both development tests. This could be because many residents living in these areas have migrated from rural areas, and therefore the longer they reside in the *colonia* (or the city), the more they may lose their social connections and support from home and not replace them with local ties. As Lareau (2003) points out, parents believe that kinship ties are beneficial to their children and families; as the in-depth interviews revealed, parents were not forming enduring relationships with friends and neighbors. Therefore, families that who live away from their extended relatives in rural México are likely be missing an important child rearing asset.

4.3 Cultural Capital

In regards to cultural capital, correlation and t-test findings indicated that children with above age level Denver development scores were more likely to have a head of household with a higher level of education, but results were not significant. The direction of our t-test findings for cultural capital (scale and individual variables) compare to that of Dumais (2002) in that the more cultural capital the parent possesses, the greater the development score. Apart from the Denver test result related to cable/internet, none of the cultural capital variables were significant (p<.05) in either test or in the correlations. Dumais (2002) and Lee and Kao (2009) can also help explain our lack of significant findings for cultural capital, in that perhaps the lack of economic resources limited the amount cultural capital that parents possessed.

In-depth interview findings suggest that cultural capital was not that important in the parenting field in this study, which could be attributed to the lack of schooling among all participants. Although some parents and grandparents did assist children with their homework, thus demonstrating that they had some cultural capital in the form of academic skills to pass to their children, which was very evident in the photos. Similar to what Lee and Kao (2009) suggested in their research, parents from disadvantaged childhoods tended to have few formal cultural capital resources, such as educational
experiences. The qualitative findings suggest that the lack of cultural capital from formal education and negative childhood experiences (e.g., such as having to go to school barefoot, experiencing stigma due to poverty, and lacking the economic capital to be able to continue schooling past elementary or middle school) served as driving forces that affected parents’ child rearing practices, as parents showed a strong passion to provide the cultural resources to their children that they lacked in their childhoods.

Parents’ passion suggests that these parents’ bad experiences as children can serve as a powerful agent of cultural capital as it seems to drive parents to work hard to provide better outcomes for their children. This illustrates how cultural capital is acquired and used in parents’ daily lives (Lareau 2003). The fact that these parents were poor as children and are still poor today as adults supports Walker’s (2007) assertion that poverty tends to continue from generation to generation. However, at the same time, our findings are more hopeful than Walker’s (2007) in that although the parents have limited incomes, their responses during the in-depth interviews suggest that parents are very motivated to keep their children in school. Qualitative findings hint at the effect that the violence has had on the parents’ and children’s access to cultural capital in that children have become isolated in their homes due to the violence and they suggest that this could become more evident over time. If the violence continues, it is likely that cultural capital will continue to deplete, as the isolation (month after month, and year after year) can have negative effects on child rearing and child development.

4.4 IMPORTANCE OF CAPITAL AND RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN CAPITALS

This study provided insight into how economic, social, and cultural capital influenced parents’ child rearing practices and children’s development. Social capital emerged as the most important capital that influenced child rearing and development in both quantitative and qualitative findings as they suggest that social capital, especially the family members in the household, had a positive relationship on children’s development and parents’ child rearing practices amongst this group of poor parents in Juárez. In terms of social capital within the family, the mother represents the most important source of
capital as she represents the biggest influence in the child rearing and development of her children. The interviews suggest that they are representative of social capital in the form of their decisions of child rearing ranging from forgoing income, to limiting the children’s socialization outside of the home because of the violence, to limiting their own social and economic capital in order to provide their children with greater safety by staying at home rather than risk becoming a victim of the violence. The presence of the father also emerged as an important source of social capital for the families in my study, as he can provide other sources of social capital (through his extended family), as well as economic capital.

In terms of economic capital, there was not much variability between parents’ incomes, however, findings suggest that the families with more social capital tended to have more economic capital as family members can not only provide emotional support, but also financial assistance that can reduce the effects of living in poverty. As our findings illustrate, the violence has mostly affected parents’ social and economic capital. Parents have significantly reduced their interactions in order to minimize their risk of becoming victims of the drug violence and, because the violence has forced many businesses to close or reduce hours of work, parents’ access to economic capital has been negatively affected, causing them to struggle to meet their children’s day-to-day needs.

Similar to Lareau (2003), this study expands the knowledge of how differing access to economic, social, and cultural capitals give individuals varying cultural skills, social connections, and economic resources that can be translated into different forms of capital, although the differences would likely have been larger had the sample been more economically diverse. Qualitative findings suggest that parents’ lack of cultural capital was attributed to their lack of economic capital as children. Parents’ lack of cultural capital continues to affect the amount of economic capital that they possess as adults, illustrating that the differences in parents’ access to one capital consequently affects their access to other capitals.
Chapter 5

Conclusion

To summarize, we found that social capital, and secondarily economic capital, were important influences on child development and child rearing practices. Both the quantitative and qualitative findings suggest that social capital—through having more potential assistants such as the father, older children, and other family members in the home—has a positive relationship to children’s development. The mother as a means of social capital emerged as most important in the in-depth and photo interviews as in our study as she spends the most time with the children, takes care of the children while the father is at work, provides other sources of social capital (e.g., her parents), and provides economic capital through her employment. In a similar manner the father is also an important source of capital within the family because of the time he spends with his children and provides economic capital through his employment. In regards to economic capital, household income and employment emerged as notable influences based on the t-tests and in-depth interviews as related to children’s development and child rearing practices. Children with better development outcomes came from families with higher incomes.

It is interesting and worth noting that we found differences in development scores (t-test results) based on capital in such a small and generally poor population, especially regarding several of the social capital variables. It is likely that if the study was done with a sample including both poor and wealthy participants, the differences would be greater. In our study, working with a community group provided us with the opportunity to provide information directly to interested parties. At the same time, our applied focus in analyzing data they collected meant that the survey was not designed with Bourdieu’s capitals in mind, although the interview guide was. While we did find survey variables that served as useful proxies with our framework, variables that were missing from this analysis but should be included in future studies include marital status, mother’s education (as opposed to just head of household’s education), parents’ age, social ties, specific questions related to how the children are reared on a day-to-
day basis, and variables measuring father’s support in the development of the children. The small sample size also limited our abilities to do a more advanced statistical analysis. In our qualitative phase we attempted to address some of the limitations mentioned above, however a larger follow up sample would be needed in order to statistically address the limitations of our survey sample.

Institutional restrictions at UTEP prohibited students and faculty from crossing into México for school-related business due to the drug war and related violence, which limited our ability to interact with the community group at their center and conduct interviews alongside the *promotora*. Although we utilized emails, phone calls, meetings at the international bridge to exchange materials, as well as meetings on U.S side as needed to keep the collaboration moving forward, this placed limits in the study. We were limited to one visit in the qualitative portion of the study in order to minimize risks, which could only provide us with a snapshot in time as opposed to Lareau’s (2003) longitudinal observations which could have allowed us to record changes in parents’ access to capital over time. In addition, due to the relative homogeneity and small size of the sample, variation was relatively limited among the participants. In the future, a larger, more socially diverse sample and a longitudinal study design could provide a better understanding of how differences in access to capitals influences child rearing.

As our results suggest limited access to these capitals, amplified by the current violence can cause detrimental effects on children’s developmental outcomes; we can predict that access to economic, social, and cultural capital will indeed reduce. This calls for the need for further research in these areas, such as a comparative study with a broader border sample between the U.S. and México focusing on the differences in parents’ access to capital in order to target findings towards policy changes that could benefit these areas. Our findings indicate that parents’ economic capital, due to low incomes, was not enough to cover families’ day-to-day needs; therefore, I suggest policy changes geared at raising the minimum wage paid at *maquiladoras*. Although México’s low wages keep *maquiladora* businesses in
México, *maquiladoras* could invest in providing their workers, if not with higher wages, with other benefits that could improve their livelihoods. Providing them with better quality medical services or a safe daycare in the facility could improve parents’ lives significantly.

As our interviews suggest, parents are in need of social support, especially during this difficult time in Juárez. Our findings imply that the support parents have received from from *Gente a favor de Gente* has improved children’s development and parents’ child rearing practices. 14 of the participating parents mentioned that the only help from community groups they have received was from *Gente a favor de Gente*, suggesting that community groups such as *Gente a favor de Gente* are needed as they can serve as social capital that can help reduce the burdens of poverty of parents and children. This is especially important given that interviews revealed that parents are highly motivated to give their children a better life, but that they lack the resources to do so. In response to concerns voiced by the mothers during the implementation of the survey about the high costs of daycare and their lack of trust in them, *Gente a favor de Gente* opened a daycare center in September of 2009 and currently provides services. They are open from 5am-5pm, and they supply meals as well as transportation to and from school for the children. In addition, our findings suggest that parent’s lack of cultural capital is linked to their lack of other capital, such as economic capital and social capital. Services such as the ones provided by *Gente a favor de Gente* can help parents keep their children in school as opposed to having them have to work in order to make ends meet. This leads me to recommend there be more investments in education, especially for poor children, as this can provide children with better opportunities to overcome poverty as adults.

In terms of lack of social capital, my recommendation is for the government to invest in expanding the social services available in Juárez to reduce the burdens of poverty and the current violence. Although México’s current President Felipe Calderon has implemented policies to extend *Seguro Popular* to the uninsured, this is not sufficient to address the violence more directly. Parents and
children are in need of safe places to socialize in order to develop supportive social networks. Safe community places are of importance, not only to help families cope with the violence, but also protect the youth from falling victims of the violence or even worse, to keep them from becoming part of the criminal activity. However, as our findings indicate, the possibility of falling victim to drug related violence hinders parent’s willingness to create and maintain social networks; therefore it is imperative to put an end to the drug war.

Lastly, all residents of the United States and México should be aware of the impacts that the lack of economic, social, and cultural capital, amplified by the current violence, has on the lives of children and their families in Ciudad Juárez. Although our data reflect the situation of parents residing in Juárez, it is likely that this is the case for many families across México. Research in this area geared towards poverty reduction, providing public services, and policy change can provide a better quality of life for families and children living in colonias in Ciudad Juárez.
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Appendix

Interview Schedule (in English and then Spanish)

Let’s begin by you telling me about your daily life and parenting

1. Who lives in the home?

2. What is a typical day like?

[PROBE] What time do you get up?

[PROBE] Who gets the child/children ready?

[PROBE] What happens in the afternoon?

[PROBE] What is the night time routine like?

[PROBE] Who is in charge of making dinner?

[PROBE] Tell me about the bedtime routine?

4. What do you find most rewarding in parenting?

5. Are there things that are challenging or frustrating about being a parent? If so, what are those things?

[PROBE] What do you find most difficult in parenting and developing your child?

[PROBE] What are the difficulties you encounter on a daily basis in general?

7. Do you have time constraints related to child care? If so, please tell me about them

[PROBE] Do you have a hard time making meals or keeping up with the household? If so, why?

[PROBE] Do you have a hard time managing work and childcare? If so, why?

Economic

Now we are going to talk about economics and how they relate to child care and rearing

8. Tell about your economic situation in general.

9. Do you have financial difficulties? Tell me about them

10. Where do the kids receive healthcare? Do they have health insurance?

11. Do they have health insurance?
12. Is it expensive? If so, describe?

13. What are the most common financial difficulties you encounter? How often does this happen? How do the financial difficulties affect your parenting?

[PROBE] Use previous answers to ask how the difficulties mentioned could affect parenting.

14. Has the recent rise of violence in Juárez affected you economically? How?

[PROBE] How has this impacted your parenting?

15. Are you employed formally or informally? If so, please describe your employment (formal and/or informal). How many hours you work? What you are paid for that work?

A. If employed, how does working affect your parenting?

[PROBE] What are the advantages? Does it facilitate daycare options or money for food or other household expenses?

B. If unemployed, what is it like being a staying at home mom? (Skip to question 18)

16. Please tell me about balancing work and home responsibilities. How does this work?

17. Has the recent rise of violence in Juárez affected your employment? How?

18. Who else works in the household? Please describe

19. If you had a choice, would you choose to be a stay at home mom or a working mom, why?

20. In thinking about your experiences as a child compared to your children’s experiences, how has the economy changed from when you were a child?

[PROBE] How has the cost of living changed?

[PROBE] How has the cost of daycare changed?

[PROBE] How does your current economic situation differ from your childhood?

Social

Now, tell me about family, neighbors, friends and organizations or services in your community and how they relate to child care and rearing
21. Now let’s talk about the support you receive from those who live with you (such as your husband, or older children). We are specifically interested in what things they do that you consider to be helpful in taking care of and developing your young child (or children) and what they do that is not helpful.

A. (If relevant for all the items on this list) What does your husband do that is helpful?
B. What does he do that is not helpful?
C. What do your older children do that is helpful?
D. What do your older children do that is not helpful?
E. What do the other adults in the home do that is helpful?
F. What do the other adults do that is not helpful?
G. Are there any other people in the home that you receive support from? Who are they and how do they help or not help you

22. Is there something that you wish that the people in YOUR HOME would do for you related to the children?

[PROBE] Go over the list of home members mentioned in question 1.

23. What about family members not in the home (like grandparents, cousins, or aunts), is there something that they do that helps?
   A. (if relevant) What do your parents do that is helpful?
   B. What do your parents do that is not helpful?
   C. What do your other family members such as cousins and aunts do that is helpful?
   D. What do your other family members such as cousins and aunts do that is not helpful?

24. Is there something that you wish that your family (not in the home) would do for you related to the children? If so, please describe it.

25. Do your friends or neighbors do something in particular that helps you? Or something in particular that does not help you? If so, what are those things?

26. Is there something that you wish that your friends or neighbors would do for you related to your children? Please describe these things.

27. Has the recent violence in Juárez affected your relationships? If so, how has the violence impacted your relationships?

[PROBE] Has it impacted:

- Family members
- Neighbors
- Friends
- church
- community center
- maquila
- women’s group
- health care service
[PROBE] Have these changes in relationships impacted your parenting? How?

28. What type of support or motivation have you received from organizations or institutions in your community and/or neighborhood, such as daycare or your church?

B. Are there ways their services could be improved?
[PROBE] How about at:

- church
- community center
- maquila
- women’s group
- health care services

29. Do the children have a health care provider that supports them? If so, please describe.

30. Do the kids have any chronic illnesses or problems? If so, what kind?

[PROBE] Do they receive the recommended treatment?

Cultural

Now, we are going to talk about your upbringing

31. Tell me about your upbringing. How did your childhood compare to your children’s?

A. How does the following compare from your upbringing to your children’s?

- parenting style
- economic situation
- education/schooling experiences of the children
- parental employment
- family situation (divorce, single parents)
- relationships with extended family
- values/morals
- neighborhood/community environment

32. How far did you get in school? Why?

33. In relation to parenting, where did you learn things about parenting?

34. From whom did you learn them?

[PROBE] What did you learn about parenting from your parents?

[PROBE] What have you learned from church, neighbors, friends, or other sources?
35. How would you describe your parenting style?

Now, we are going to talk about your community

36. How long have you lived in Juárez? How familiar do you feel with your neighborhood? Why?

37. How familiar do you feel with Juárez in general? Why?

[PROBE] Do you feel comfortable getting the things you need?

38. How long have you lived in your home?

39. Please describe your home.

[PROBE] What are the living conditions in your home?

40. How do your living conditions affect your parenting?

41. Has the increase in violence in Juárez changed the way in which you raise your children? How has it changed?

42. How is this different from how previous children were raised?
   [PROBE] What is the difference between this child and another child?

43. How is it different from when you were raised?

44. Has the recent violence had an impact on your child’s education? How?

45. Is there anything else that you would like to add?

46. If we have any additional questions as we review your interview, can we call you again?

Thank you very much for your time and sharing your experiences. We appreciate your collaboration in conducting this investigation.

Notes and observations from interviewer:

**Spanish Interview Schedule**

Comencemos: qué me puede decir acerca de su vida cotidiana y la crianza de los hijos

1. ¿Quién vive en el hogar?

2. ¿Qué es un día típico?

   [PROBE] ¿A qué hora se levanta?
[PROBE] ¿Quién prepara a los niños?

[PROBE] Cual es la rutina en la tarde?

[PROBE] ¿Cuál es la rutina de la noche??

[PROBE] ¿Quién está encargado/a de hacer la cena?

[PROBE] Hábleme sobre la rutina a la hora de acostarse?

4. ¿Qué le parece más gratificante en la crianza?

5. ¿Hay cosas que son difíciles o frustrantes de ser padres? Si es así, ¿cuáles son esas cosas?

[PROBE] ¿ en su punto de vista, que es lo más difícil sobre la crianza y el desarrollo de su hijo?

[PROBE] ¿Cuáles son las dificultades que encuentran a diario?

7. ¿Tiene limitaciones de tiempo relacionadas con el cuidado de niños? Si es así, por favor dígame acerca de ellas

[PROBE] ¿Tiene dificultades para hacer las comidas o mantenerse al día con la familia? Si es así, ¿por qué?

[PROBE] ¿Tiene dificultades para balancear el trabajo y cuidado de niños? Si es así, ¿por qué?

Economía

Ahora vamos a hablar de la economía y cómo se relaciona con el cuidado de niños y su crianza

8. Cuénteme acerca de su situación económica en general.

9. ¿Tiene problemas financieros? (PROBE)…Hábleme de ellos

10. ¿Dónde reciben atención médica los niños?

11. ¿Tienen seguro de salud?

12. ¿Es caro? Si es así, describámelo?

13. ¿Cuáles son las dificultades financieras más comunes que ustedes frecuentan?? ¿Con qué frecuencia ocurren? ¿Dígame, cree que las dificultades financieras afecten su posición como padres?

[PROBE] Utilice las respuestas anteriores a preguntar cómo las dificultades mencionadas podrían afectarlos como padres.
14. La ha afectado a usted económicamente el reciente aumento de la violencia en Ciudad Juárez? ¿Cómo?

[PROBE] ¿Cómo la ha afectado como madre o padre de familia?

15. ¿Está usted empleada formalmente o informalmente? Si es así, por favor describa su empleo (formal y/o informal). ¿Cuántas horas trabaja? Por favor platíqueme cuanto le pagan por ese trabajo?

A. Si está empleada, ¿cómo es que afecta a su trabajo como cría a sus hijos?

[PROBE] ¿Cuáles son las ventajas? ¿Le facilitan opciones de guardería o de alimentos o dinero para otros gastos del hogar?

Si no está trabajando, ¿cuénteme cómo es ser madre de casa?

16. Por favor dígame sobre cómo concilia el trabajo y las responsabilidades del hogar. ¿Cómo funciona esto para usted?

17. Ha afectado su trabajo el reciente el aumento de la violencia en Ciudad Juárez? ¿Cómo?

18. ¿Quién más trabaja en el hogar? Por favor, cuénteme

19. Si usted pudiera elegir, elegiría ser madre de casa o una madre que trabaja. ¿Por qué?

20. Cuando piensa en las experiencias de su niñez, frente a las experiencias de sus hijos, ¿cómo ha cambiado la economía de cuando era niña?

[PROBE] ¿Cómo ha cambiado el costo de vida?

[PROBE] (Pregunte si a caso usan guardería) ¿Cómo ha cambiado el costo de guardería?

[PROBE] ¿Cuáles son las diferencias acerca de su situación económica actual y de su infancia?

Social

Ahora vamos a hablar sobre la familia, vecinos, amigos y organizaciones o servicios en su comunidad y cómo se relacionan con el cuidado de niños y la crianza de tales (o de ellos o algo así)

21. Ahora vamos a hablar sobre el apoyo que recibe de las personas que viven con usted (como su marido, o niños mayores). Estamos interesados en que cosas hacen que usted considere útil en el cuidado y el desarrollo de su niño (o niños) y lo que hacen, que no es útil.

A. (si es relevante para todas las personas en esta lista) ¿Qué hace su marido que es útil?
B. ¿Qué es lo que hace que no es útil?
C. ¿Qué hacen los niños mayores que es útil?
D. ¿Qué hacer a sus hijos mayores que no es útil?
E. ¿Qué hacen los otros adultos en el hogar que es útil?
F. ¿Qué hacen los adultos o otros que no es útil?
G. ¿Existen otras personas en el hogar de las cual recibe apoyo? ¿Quiénes son y cómo ayudan?
Como no ayudan?

22. ¿Hay algo que usted desea que la gente en casa haría por usted en relación con los niños?

[PROBE] Repase la lista de miembros de la casa mencionados en la pregunta 1

23. ¿Y los miembros de la familia que no viven en la casa (como abuelos, primos, tíos o), ¿hay algo que hacen para ayudar con los niños?
   A. (si procede) ¿Qué hacen sus padres de que es útil?
   B. ¿Qué hacen sus padres de que no es útil?
   C. ¿Qué hacen otros miembros de su familia como primos y tíos que es útil?
   D. ¿Qué hacen otros miembros de su familia como primos y tíos hacer que no es útil?

24. ¿Hay algo que usted desea que su familia (no en el hogar) haga por usted en relación con los niños? (En caso que sí), por favor cuénteme

25. ¿Sus amigos o vecinos hacen algo en particular que le ayuda? O algo en particular que no le ayuda? Si es así, ¿cuáles son esas cosas?

26. ¿Hay algo que usted desea que sus amigos o vecinos que hagan por usted en relación con sus hijos? Por favor, describa estas cosas.

27. Tiene la reciente violencia en Juárez afectadas sus relaciones? Si es así, ¿cómo ha impactado la violencia sus relaciones?

[PROBE] ¿Ha afectado:

• Miembros de la familia
• Vecinos
• Amigos
• Iglesia
• Centro de la comunidad
• Maquila
• Grupo de mujeres de
• Servicio de cuidado de la salud

[PROBE] ¿Cómo han afectado estos cambios en sus relaciones la crianza de sus hijos?

28. ¿Qué tipo de apoyo o motivación, ha recibido de las organizaciones o instituciones de su comunidad y / o barrio, como por ejemplo la guardería o su iglesia?

B. ¿Hay alguna manera en que sus servicios se podrían mejorar?
   [PROBE] ¿Y en:

• Iglesia
• Centro de la comunidad
• Maquila
• Grupo de mujeres de
• Servicios de atención de la salud

29. ¿ Los niños tienen un proveedor de cuidado de la salud que los apoya? Si es así, por favor describa.

30. ¿ Tienen los niños enfermedades crónicas o problemas? (En caso afirmativo) de qué tipo?

[PROBE] ¿Reciben el tratamiento recomendado?

Cultural

 Ahora, vamos a hablar acerca de su educación

31. Hábleme de su educación. ¿Cómo fue su infancia en comparación con sus hijos?

A. ¿Cómo se compara lo siguiente de su educación con la de sus hijos?

• Estilo de crianza
• Situación económica
• Educación / experiencias de escolarización de los niños
• De empleo de los padres
• Situación familiar (divorcio, padres solteros)
• Las relaciones con la familia ampliada
• Valores / morales
• Barrio o del medio ambiente de la comunidad

32. ¿Hasta que año llego en la escuela? ¿Por qué?

33. En relación con la crianza de los hijos, ¿dónde aprendió cosas sobre la crianza?

34. ¿De quién lo aprendió?

[PROBE] ¿Qué ha aprendido acerca de la crianza de sus padres?

[PROBE] ¿Qué ha aprendido de la iglesia, vecinos, amigos, o de otras fuentes?

35. ¿Cómo describiría su estilo de crianza que le da a sus hijos?

 Ahora, vamos a hablar acerca de su comunidad

36. ¿Cuánto tiempo ha vivido en Ciudad Juárez? ¿Qué familiarizada se siente con su vecindario? ¿Por qué?

37. ¿Qué tan familiarizada se siente usted con Juárez en general? ¿Por qué?
[PROBE] ¿Se siente cómoda cuando sale por las cosas que usted necesita?

38. ¿Cuánto tiempo ha vivido en su casa?

39. Por favor, describa su casa.

[PROBE] ¿Cuáles son las condiciones de vida en su casa?

40. ¿Cómo afectan sus condiciones de vida de su padre?

41. Cree que el aumento de la violencia en Juárez cambió la forma en la que cria a sus hijos? ¿Cómo ha cambiado?

42. ¿Cómo es esto diferente de la anterior a los niños cómo se plantearon?

[PROBE] ¿Cuál es la diferencia entre este niño y otro niño?

43. ¿Cómo es diferente de su niñez?

44. Cree que la violencia ha tenido un impacto en la educación de su hijo? ¿Cómo?

45. ¿Hay algo más que le gustaría compartir?

46. Si tenemos preguntas adicionales al revisar su entrevista le podemos llamar de nuevo?

Muchas gracias por su tiempo y por compartir sus experiencias. Agradecemos su colaboración en la realización de esta investigación.

Notas y observaciones de la promotora:
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