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Overview of Dissertation

My dissertation research examines conflict between family and academic obligations – what I term *home-school cultural value conflicts* - during the transition to college. In Study 1, I utilized group interview methodology to evaluate how home-school conflicts can serve as a barrier for Latina/o first-generation college students’ academic progress and well-being (Vasquez-Salgado, Greenfield & Burgos-Cienfuegos, 2015). My qualitative analyses revealed that Latina/o students often experience home-school conflicts (e.g., having to choose between attending a family event or studying) and they reported that these conflicts led them to experience heightened psychological distress and subpar academics (i.e., inability to concentrate or study, poor grades). My analyses also revealed that students who lived geographically closer to their parents’ home experienced more direct home-school conflicts than students that lived further from home. The findings are important because cultural barriers are often overlooked in trying to understand the poor college adjustment of Latina/o students.

In Study 2, I extended the generality of my findings with a large-scale survey administered to a multiethnic sample. The survey included a new measure of home-school cultural value conflicts that was based on my qualitative results, as well as measures of psychological and academic distress. Three separate causal models assessing predictors and consequences of home-school cultural value conflict were conducted. In the first model, Latinas/os more frequently experienced home-school conflicts relative to their Asian and European American counterparts. The greater frequency among Latina/o students was partially explained by causal pathways involving their first-generation college status and low-income background, as well as their endorsement of family obligation values. To demonstrate the generality of the model across ethnic groups, I constructed a second predictor model that was identical to the first but without Latino background as a variable. Again, the model demonstrated
that being a first-generation college student and having parents with relatively low income predicted to stronger family obligation values, which in turn related to more home-school value conflicts. My final model, which assessed the consequences of experiencing home-school conflicts, demonstrated that the conflicts were associated with higher psychological distress, which then predicted attention and school problems; these problems related to lower college GPA. I also found that students who lived closer to home experienced more home-school value conflicts. These quantitative findings parallel my prior qualitative findings. A new finding was that females experienced higher levels of home-school value conflict than males.

Causal modeling enabled me to go beyond the first qualitative study of home-school conflict in the transition to college and take a first step toward establishing causality. The survey results reveal the mechanism for antecedents and consequences of home-school value conflicts and extend the generalizability of the focus-group study to a diverse sample. The findings are important because they reveal that socioeconomic factors (i.e., first-generation college status, low-income) are a main contributor to students’ susceptibility to conflicts between family and academic obligations; this has allowed me to generalize the phenomenon of home-school value conflict to low socioeconomic youth from diverse backgrounds.

In Study 3, I created a behavioral experiment to establish a causal relationship between home-school cultural value conflict and poor college adjustment. I leveraged the knowledge gained from my prior qualitative and survey studies to create a laboratory paradigm that primes some of the home-school conflicts identified in the qualitative study and to measure whether home-school conflict creates a disruption in attentional control. I asked Latina/o first-generation college students to write down a list of either: 1.) family obligations; 2.) school obligations; 3.) instances where they had to choose between family and school obligations (home-school cultural value conflict condition) or 4.) favorite restaurants in Los Angeles (control condition). Following
list construction, students engaged in an attentional control task in order to capture the lack of concentration and attention associated with home-school conflicts found in the first two studies.

Because my prior qualitative and survey results indicated that distance and gender played a role in experience with home-school value conflicts, I integrated these factors as quasi-experimental variables. Thus, my experiment consisted of a Distance (close, far) X Gender (male, female) X Condition (home-school value conflict, family obligation, academic obligation, control) design.

An additional quasi-experimental variable emerged as a result of Trump being inaugurated as president half-way through my data collection. My hypothesis was that fear of deportation of undocumented family members would cause the family condition to elicit more attentional disruption after, compared with before Trump's election and inauguration.

Results demonstrated a significant effect of condition on students living within 50 miles of their parents’ home. For students living closer to home, writing about home-school conflict caused significantly more attentional disruption than writing about school obligations or writing about favorite restaurants (control condition). The difference between attentional disruption in the home-school conflict and family obligation condition was in the predicted direction, but not significant. There was also evidence that female students living close to home may have been the main contributors of this significant condition effect.

The lack of significant difference between the conflict and family obligations condition was largely due to the pre-and post-Trump finding, whereby performance on attention significantly worsened in response to the family obligations prime after the election and inauguration.

These results reaffirm the need to create interventions that aid Latina/o first-generation college students in harmonizing their home and school cultures, especially those living close to
home. They also point to a need to create interventions that aid Latino college students in negotiating their fears about family deportation, now that Trump is President.
Exploring Home-School Value Conflicts: Implications for Academic Achievement and Well-being Among Latino First-Generation College Students (as submitted for publication)


Abstract

U.S. colleges place a high value on the fulfillment of academic obligations by their students. The academic achievement of each individual student is the institutional priority; this is an individualistic frame of reference. However, many Latino first-generation college students have been raised to prioritize family obligations; their home socialization is collectivistic. Our exploratory study investigated how Latino first-generation college students experience home-school value conflict between family obligation and individual academic achievement during their transition to college. A group interview followed the prompt of a conflict scenario that each group member first responded to in writing. The written responses provide evidence of the prioritization of school or home and the conflict that can arise in making these decisions. The group discussions that followed identified multiple types of home-school conflict and provide insights into how these conflicts are experienced. Conflicts revealed by the data included: attending family events or visiting parents vs. doing academic work, family assistance vs. focusing on academics; allocating money for travel to see family vs. allocating money for educational expenses. In turn, these home-school value conflicts were experienced both as lasting over time and as playing a negative role in students’ academic achievement and sense of well-being.
Introduction

Although schooling everywhere is based on individual academic achievement, many immigrant groups, such as those from Latin America, hold strong collectivistic values. Often these collectivistic values center on the importance of the family collectivity (e.g., spending time with family, assisting family; Fuligni, Tseng, & Lam, 1999). In elementary school, this situation results in a cultural mismatch between values learned at home and school (Greenfield & Quiroz, 2013; Raeff, Greenfield, & Quiroz., 2000). From a developmental perspective, the potential for home-school value conflict – conflict between the individualistic behavioral demands of college and collectivistic behavioral demands of family – could peak in a four-year college where the demands for individual academic achievement become noticeably greater than in high school, while spending time with family and assisting family with tasks becomes much more difficult. We conceptualize this as a conflict between internalized demands for family obligation behaviors and internalized demands for academic performance.

What happens when Latino first-generation students from a collectivistic/familistic home environment enter college, with its extreme value emphasis on the individualistic behaviors of academic achievement? Our study explored inner conflicts between internalized values that require in-person interaction with and help to family members at home and internalized values that require devotion to academic performance. These are personal inner conflicts, but they were often closely interrelated with family conflicts, because of the reciprocal nature of family obligations – i.e., the obligations felt by the student are experienced precisely because they are also expected by the family. Indeed it is the family that has socialized them to internalize the sense of family obligation. We explored this conflict during the transition to college by recruiting a sample of Latino first-generation college students from immigrant families who were in their first year of college.
Our study was inspired by Greenfield’s (2009) Theory of Social Change & Human Development. In the theory, collectivistic values are an adaptation to ecologies in which education is predominantly informal and at home, material resources are low, family relationships are close and at the center of social life, and a goal of development is the interdependent individual. In contrast, individualistic values are an adaptation to ecologies in which formal educational opportunity is great, material resources are more abundant, social relationships are both extrafamilial and relatively impermanent, and a goal of development is the independent individual.

Immigrant Latino parents in California typically have lacked educational opportunity in their countries of origin (Fuligni, 2001; Guan, Greenfield & Orellana, 2014), while permanent family relationships are central to social life. Values are therefore generally collectivistic (Raeff et al., 2000; Greenfield & Quiroz, 2013). In contrast, the college environment is organized around higher education; social relationships are with nonfamily members and often impermanent, e.g., classroom teachers and fellow students in a class; academic performance by each individual is the central organizing principle. Therefore, values are generally individualistic.

Another influence on whether values will be more individualistic or more collectivistic is relative wealth, with greater economic resources associated with individualism and lesser economic resources associated with collectivism (e.g., Park, Twenge & Greenfield, 2013). Latino immigrants in California have the lowest incomes of all ethnic groups. Hence their collectivism is multiply determined.

Therefore, the theory predicts that, when transitioning to college, Latino first-generation college students will experience a cross-cultural value conflict between internalized demands for family obligation behaviors and internalized demands for academic behaviors. We expected that
this situation would lead to inner turmoil and family conflict, which in turn would have implications for development. While many Latino parents immigrated to give their children opportunity to get ahead through formal education, they see family-centered values and academic achievement as a unified whole (Reese, Balzano, Gallimore, & Goldenberg, 1995); they therefore do not realize that academic achievement and family values may be partially incompatible. Latino immigrant parents, moreover, prioritize family values over academic values (Reese et al., 1995). This priority is quite different from that of the faculty teaching their children in college. Latino youth from immigrant families want to repay their parents by doing well in school. Therefore they are caught between two conflicting definitions of family obligation: aiding the family directly and aiding the family in a long-term sense by doing well in school.

We apply the theory to a new developmental period – the transition to college. We also apply it to new areas of development, namely academic achievement and well-being.

**Rationale for Latino First-Generation Latino College Sample**

Latino college students surpass European Americans (67%) in college enrollment rates but lag behind all groups in earning a bachelors degree (Pew Hispanic Center, 2013). This pattern suggests that Latino youth want to attend college, but may be having difficulty adjusting to the environment. One reason may be that most Latinos are first-generation college students (i.e., neither parent attended college nor had any form of post-secondary education; Saenz, Hurtado, Barrera, Wolf & Yeung, 2007); first-generation students lag behind other students in graduation rates (Stephens, Hamedani & Destin, 2014). First-generation students also have fewer resources (e.g., financial – Saenz et al., 2007; parent knowledge about college – Tienda & Mitchell, 2006) that predict college adjustment. However, we explored the possibility that value differences might also come into play.
Indeed, first-generation college students typically have more collectivistic motives for attending college and lower grade-point averages than other students (Stephens, Townsend, Markus & Phillips, 2012; Saenz et al., 2007). Most pertinent, the relationship between college-generation status and college grade point average (GPA) is mediated by motives for attending college – individualistic motives for attending college are positively related to GPA, whereas collectivistic motives are negatively related (Stephens, Fryberg, Markus, Johnson & Covarrubias, 2012). Consequently, one reason first-generation college students have difficulty adjusting to an individualistic college environment stems from the collectivistic values they bring with them to college. We explore this issue in depth with first-generation Latino college students from immigrant families. We also differentiate various forms of family obligation, rather than utilizing the general concept of collectivism.

**Family Obligation Values vs. Family Obligation Behaviors**

Family obligation values are defined as youths’ attitudes towards respecting and assisting family members, both now and in the future (Fuligni et al., 1999). Family obligation applies to both immediate and extended family members and is a central feature of Latino families (Fuligni, 2001), especially immigrant families (Fuligni, 2007; Tseng, 2004). The behavioral component of family obligation, known as family assistance (Telzer & Fuligni, 2009a; 2009b; Tsai, Telzer, Gonzales & Fuligni, 2013) or family behavioral demands (Tseng, 2004), is also prominent among immigrant Latino families; it consists of spending time with family (Sy & Brittian, 2008), running errands for family, helping siblings with homework (Telzer & Fuligni, 2009a; Tseng, 2004), or helping one’s family financially (Tseng, 2004; Vallejo, 2012). Youth who value family obligation are more likely to engage in these behaviors on a daily basis (Hardaway & Fuligni, 2006). This relationship suggests that family obligation values and behaviors are connected; it
supports research attempting to understand values through self-reported behaviors, as we do in this study.

Quantitative surveys have been the primary means to assess youths’ family obligation attitudes and behaviors. We have learned a great deal from such surveys, but they cannot assess how youth handle family and school demands when they are in competition. Do students experience internal conflict, regardless of whether they choose to fulfill family or school demands?

**Family Obligation and Personal Inner Conflict**

The increase in family obligation during the transition to young adulthood (Fuligni & Pedersen, 2002), especially pronounced among youth from Latino and Filipino backgrounds, provided further motivation for our study because of its potential to clash with school demands when transitioning to college. A few case studies have documented that Latino students face difficulties when having to choose between moving away to college and remaining closer to home so that they can be with family (Lara, 1992) or assist family (London, 1989). Qualitative work with Mexican-American youth has shown that they feel torn in choices between going to school and working to help their families (C. Suárez-Orozco & M. Suárez-Orozco, 1995). We extend this work to explore the same type of inner conflict when Latino students from immigrant families have made the commitment to higher education.

We have developed a novel way to operationalize the experience of inner conflict in choice situations between family obligation behaviors and academic behaviors: the existence of stimuli that function as triggers to reinstate rumination or reflection of the conflicts after they occurred (Nolen-Hoeksema, Wisco & Lyubomirsky, 2008). If a conflict is reinstated outside the situation that originally instigated it, it must be internal rather than external. Such reinstatement
at a later point in time is also evidence that an internal conflict is long-lasting rather than transitory. Hence, our study explored situational triggers for reinstatement of an inner conflict.

**Family Obligation and its Relation to Academics and Well-being**

Family obligation has a complex relationship to academics (Fuligni et al., 1999; Fuligni, 2001; Telzer & Fuligni, 2009b; Tseng, 2004) and well-being (Fuligni & Pedersen, 2002; Telzer & Fuligni, 2009a; Fuligni & Telzer, 2013). Although immigrant Latino youth hold high values for family obligation and frequently engage in these behaviors, values and behaviors lead to different academic outcomes. Latin American, Asian American and European American youth who reported high family obligation values also reported being more academically motivated and studying for longer periods of time than other youth (Fuligni et al., 1999; Fuligni, 2001). These values also helped buffer the decline in academic motivation that adolescents experience during high school (Fuligni, 2001).

On the other hand, behavioral engagement in these values was related to negative academic outcomes: adolescents who reported spending more time assisting family experienced declining grades in both high school (Telzer & Fuligni, 2009b) and college (Tseng, 2004). For Latino immigrant youth, differential academic outcomes of family-obligation values vs. family-obligation behaviors are explained by their awareness of their parents’ sacrifices for them to have a better future and their consequent motivation to give back to their families by working hard in school (Fuligni, 2001; M. Suárez-Orozco, 1991; C. Suárez-Orozco & M. Suárez-Orozco, 1995; Tseng). However, family behavioral demands disrupt their capacity to fulfill their academic goals both in high school (Telzer & Fuligni, 2009b) and college (Tseng). Thus, one perspective on home-school conflict is that it is a conflict between two ways of contributing to the family.

Even if conceptualized in this way, the conflict is nonetheless stressful. On the one hand, family obligation values and behaviors are related to positive emotional well-being (Fuligni &
Pedersen, 2002; Telzer & Fuligni, 2009a). On the other hand, helping family too much is related to increases in biomarkers of stress (Telzer & Fuligni, 2013; Fuligni, Telzer, Bowe, Irwin, Kiang & Cole, 2009), which can, in turn, lead to detrimental health outcomes (Nater, Skoluda & Strahler, 2013). Our study extends the current body of work by exploring the subjective experience of these conflicts and their subjectively felt connection to academic achievement and sense of well-being.

**Family Obligation and Distance From Home**

Because of higher family obligation values, emerging adults from Filipino and Latin American backgrounds were more likely to live with their parents compared with East Asian and European American youth (Fuligni and Pedersen, 2002). Likewise, among Latin American, Asian American, African American and European American first-year students at a four-year university, residing with parents was one factor that led immigrant youth to report higher levels of engagement in family behavioral demands than non-immigrant youth (Tseng, 2004).

Although fruitful, the aforementioned studies are restricted to a binary residential status variable (i.e., living with parents versus not) and do not take geographical distance into account (e.g., living 30 minutes away from parents vs. 10 hours away). They also do not consider how distance from home could lead to different forms of home-school conflict. Our study fills this gap. Exploring the role of geographical distance is also interesting because about half of first-generation students live within 50 miles of their parents’ homes (Saenz et al. 2007).

**Family Obligation and Parent Level of Education**

Greenfield’s theory of social change and human development also predicts that Latino students with more highly educated parents would have fewer conflicts because their parents would themselves have more individualistic values. Other studies have shown that individualistic values are significantly stronger with higher parental education levels (Raeff et al., 2000;
Considering the relationship between family obligation behaviors and parental education, we see that one important form of family obligation behavior in immigrant families, translation assistance (otherwise known as language brokering), occurs more often when parents have less education (Guan et al., 2014). How does parent education relate to the experience of home-school conflict? We explored this issue with a sample in which the highest level was high school completion.

**Current Study**

The increase in family obligation demands over developmental time (Fuligni & Pedersen, 2002), combined with an increase in school demands as one enters college, points to a need to examine the experience of Latino first-generation college students in facing these two conflicting sets of behavioral expectations. It is, moreover, crucial to understand the developmental role of these inner conflicts, in relation to both academics and well-being. Relying primarily on qualitative discourse analysis, the present research begins to fill this gap.

**Research Questions**

1.) Do Latino first-generation college students from immigrant families prioritize individualistic demands of college or collectivistic demands of their families? Do they experience inner conflict no matter which choice they make?

2.) How do Latino first-generation college students experience the demands of home and school during their first year in college?

2a.) What types of conflicts do they experience?

2b.) Do they later reflect on those conflicts? What triggers this reflection?
3.) What are the implications of those conflicts for their academic achievement and well-being?

4.) How does geographical distance from home and parent level of education relate to their experiences with these conflicts?

Method

Participants

During the Spring quarter of their first year of college at the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA), Latino college students were recruited via the psychology subject pool, campus flyers, and friend recommendations. Participants had to: (1) have two parents who migrated from a Latin American country; (2) be a first-generation college student (i.e., have parents with no form of post-secondary education); (3) be in their first year of college.

Fourteen of the 18 students who participated in our study met all criteria; the other four students were not used in any data analysis (See Table 1 for sample details.). Thirty-six and 29% of the eligible students reported that their mothers and fathers highest level of education was “high school”, respectively. Twenty-one percent of mothers and 14% of fathers had attended middle school in Mexico (grades 7-9). Thirty-six percent of mothers and 43% of fathers had attended elementary school in Mexico or had never been to school (ranged from 0 years of education to grade 6). Education levels were not reported for one mother and two fathers. These education levels are similar to that of a recent study that included Latino college students from immigrant families at UCLA (Guan et al., 2014).

A small sample is useful in qualitative research as it facilitates a close relationship between the researcher and participants; it also enhances the potential for fine-grained, in-depth inquiry (Crouch & McKenzie, 2006). Additionally, a small sample is valuable for exploring a wider range of participant experiences, instead of focusing on a narrower range with a larger
sample (Russell & Gregory, 2003). Finally, because qualitative data is not, by definition, subject to data reduction, a small sample allows for a more complete presentation of the data.

**Individual Data: Home-School Conflict Scenario**

Students were presented with the following home-school conflict scenario and responded individually in writing. The scenario depicted a situation in which they had to choose between attending a family event and studying; it was developed out of our prior ethnography with Latino first-generation college students, indicating that it was a commonly experienced conflict situation.

David is a first-year student at UCLA. He lives on campus and his parents live in Ventura, California (about two hours away from campus). It’s Saturday afternoon and he receives a call from his mother, requesting that he attend a family reunion on Sunday. The only issue is that David has an important math exam on Monday morning that cannot be rescheduled; he hasn’t even started studying! On Saturday night, he spends a few hours studying for his math exam but still finds himself extremely behind! It’s Sunday morning and his mother calls him again, asking him whether he will attend the event.

What would you do? Why?

The scenario produced individual data that could serve as a baseline before interactive processes began; even more important, it served as a prime to get the group conversation going. The leader was able to start group discussion by asking whether the students in the group had ever experienced such a situation; it was thus a springboard to discussing their own personal experiences.

There were three categories of response to the question “What would you do?”: 1) prioritize home: attend the event; 2) prioritize school: stay at school to study; and 3) prioritize both equally: find a way to do both.
Qualitative analysis of students’ choice and response to the question “Why?” yielded one of two alternative codes – conflicting priorities or clear choice. A case of conflicting priorities was identified when the student anticipated a negative consequence to occur as a result of the choice taken or when the way they expressed their choice and/or the reason for it expressed conflicting priorities. Clear choice meant that the student did not express conflicting priorities or a negative consequence of the choice. Examples of the two codes will be provided in the results section.

**Interrater reliability.** The first author inductively developed the “What would you do?” codes and coded all responses. The first and second author developed the “Why” codes and coded all responses collaboratively. The third author was then given a definition of each code for both variables and independently coded all data. Cohen’s kappas for responses to “What would you do” and “Why” were 1.00 and .84, respectively. These kappas are both in the “excellent” range (Landis & Koch, 1977).

**Group Discussion**

The individually administered written scenario was the starting point for semi-structured group interviews. Four group interviews of three to seven students each were conducted. These discussions got at the lived experience of Latino first-generation college freshman and provided the material for our qualitative analysis. Group discussion was a powerful tool to elicit these experiences because students could see that they were not unique in experiencing home-school conflicts. Also, the semi-structured group interview (Aurbach & Silverstein, 2003) enabled us to incorporate the concept of collectivism into our methodology. Harmonious group interaction is more highly valued by Latino immigrants with collectivistic values than is one-on-one interaction (Quiroz, Greenfield & Altchech, 1998). Therefore we expected that a social atmosphere would be more conducive than a survey or one-on-one interviews to elicit the voices
of Latino first-generation college students. In addition to group support, the presence of a Latina leader who told each group that she was also a first-generation college student added to the available social support. Finally, group interviews are particularly useful for facilitating research that reflects the social realities of a cultural group (Hughes & Dumont, 2002); they allow researchers to delve into the group thinking that constitutes shared culture (Johnson & Turner, 2003).

**Group Interview Format**

Based on the initial written scenario, the group leader (first author) provided a set of probes tailored toward answering our research questions: “Have you ever experienced these types of situations in college?,” “Can you share some of your experiences?,” “Do you continue to reflect on your decisions after making them?,” and if so, “Is there anything that triggers this reflection?,” “Do you feel as though these home-school conflict situations impact you in any way?,” “Have these home-school conflict situations impacted your academics?,” and “Have these home-school conflict situations impacted your well-being?”. Beyond these probes, the conversation was open-ended. The scenario was designed to elicit responses to a hypothetical situation; the group interview discussion elicited lived experience.

**Procedure**

After signing consent forms, students were told a set of group interview rules that were meant to foster a psychologically safe environment. In an effort to build an open and comfortable environment, the researcher (the first author), told all students that she had a similar background to theirs and that it was a personal topic for her. Participants in each group interview were then given the above scenario and responded individually in writing. A second scenario exploring possible cross-cultural value conflict in peer relations was also administered and discussed;
findings concerning cultural issues in peer relations will be the topic of a second paper and are not discussed here. The group interview followed data collection on the individual level.

At the end of the group interview, students were given a short demographic survey containing questions about their living situation, immigration history, and parents' education. Each student was given either two movie tickets or research credits for their participation. An audio recording of each focus group was made. On average, data collection took 1 hour and 20 minutes.

**Data Analysis**

Each group interview was fully transcribed verbatim. Any potentially identifying information has been changed for this article. Commas or semicolons are used to segment an utterance and make its meaning clearer, where necessary. Discourse material between brackets means that it was added by a researcher when something seemed to be missing. The first author read each transcript three times. Themes were considered important or notable if they appeared in three of the four group interviews. Also, subthemes were identified in the discourse in order to specify the types of conflict experienced by students and the types of stimuli that served as triggers, as well as the way in which these conflicts impacted students’ development – namely their academics and well-being (See Table 2 for a full list of themes and subthemes). The Results section contains illustrative examples of each theme and subtheme and is organized in the order presented in Table 2. Our standard for selecting themes has been used in previous group interview studies (Ulhs & Greenfield, 2012; Manago, Graham, Greenfield & Salimkhan, 2008).

In reporting the discourse, the gender (F or M) of the participant is labeled (and numbered if more than 1 person of their same gender participated in the group interview), and a Roman numeral, shown in Table 1, labels groups at the end of each conversational extract. F [?] in one case indicates the particular female could not be identified on the audio file. L labels the
leader of the group interview (the first author). In order to make a certain theme or subtheme clear to the reader, irrelevant information was eliminated from a participant’s response; these omissions were denoted by three dots (i.e., …). If a line of several dots appears within a conversation, this convention denotes that an intervening participant’s remarks were eliminated. If a speaker paused during his or her response during discussion, two dots were utilized (i.e., ..). When several students spoke at once, the label “All” is used.

**Interrater reliability.** After the first author had identified group interview themes, interrater reliability was assessed. For example, in order to assess reliability of identifying home-school conflict, the first author extracted 25% of data that she had identified as a home-school conflict, and, thereafter, randomly selected discourse that did not consist of a previously identified home-school conflict. A randomly ordered list was compiled so that 50% would consist of instances of home-school conflict and 50% would not. The third author was then given the list as well as a definition of the theme and told to code “1” when a section of the transcript signified a home-school conflict and a “0” when it did not. The same procedure was conducted for assessing the reliability of the three remaining themes: continued reflection via triggers, impact of home-school conflict on academics and impact of home-school conflict on well-being. Cohen’s kappas for identifying home-school conflicts, triggers, their impact on academics, and their impact on well-being were .83, 1.00, 1.00 and 1.00, respectively, all in the “excellent” range (Landis & Koch, 1977).

**Results**

**Prioritizing Home vs. School: Individual Results**

Responses to the written scenario. In response to the scenario, 11 of 14 college students, or 79%, said that they would stay at school to study, signifying that students’ selected and therefore prioritized the individualistic option in response to the scenario. Deciding to stay at
school occurred significantly more often than expected by chance (with three possible values, the chance value is 33%; binomial test, p = .001). Clearly, the students understood what was expected in a highly selective college.

However, qualitative analysis of their choice and the follow-up question, “Why?,” elicited an expression of conflicting priorities or a negative consequence for 5 of the 14 students. The remaining students (9 of 14) did not express conflict. However, later group discussion of personal experience showed that the type of conflict represented in the scenario, while the most frequent, was only one of five types experienced. Including all five types in the qualitative analysis, in addition to the expressions of conflict in response to the scenario, we found the experience of home-school conflict to be unanimous in this group.

Table 3 and the following examples provide evidence that conflict can be experienced regardless of whether one chooses home, school, or both.

*Prioritizing school, experiencing conflict.* This student’s response manifests conflict because she anticipated a negative consequence to result from her decision to prioritize school. In response to the question, “Why?,” she replied: *Many times I find I don’t make time for family and they look down on that, but I tell them I have priority things to do*  [F1, Group 2]. Here the student indicates a negative consequence – disapproval from the family - because of a discrepancy between her priorities and her family’s expectations.

*Prioritizing family, experiencing conflict.* This student’s response illustrated conflict in her decision to prioritize family.

“What would you do?” *I would attend the reunion, but let my mother know to let me know with more time in advance.*

“Why?” *It’s important and family fun. I understand school is 1st but I can’t overdo myself too much.*  [F3, Group 2]
Here conflict is expressed both in the implication that, although she would choose to go to the reunion, she feels the mother did not give enough notice and in her statement that school is #1, a statement that is in direct conflict with her choice to go to the family reunion.

**Prioritizing both home and school, experiencing conflict.** This student who prioritized both family and school also illustrated conflict in her response.

“What would you do?”  …*I would go with only one condition that I’ll show up for a few hours and then leave again [to study at school]*

“How?” *I would go to the family event because I wouldn’t want my family to think they aren’t important to me but they have to understand education is as important as family reunions.* [F4, Group 2]

The fact that she had to enforce conditions on her family in order to have the needed study time and the implication that her family does not understand the importance of school indicated both inner conflict and tensions with the family.

**Personal Experiences of Home-School Conflict: Findings from the Group Interviews**

**Types of home-school conflict.** In each group interview, students unanimously said that they had experienced a situation similar to the scenario during their first year of college. Thirteen out of 14 students (93%) shared at least one example of a home-school conflict they experienced. Their own experiences included the type presented in the scenario (attending family events vs. doing academic work), as well as four other types (see Table 2). The distribution of subtypes over the 13 participants who shared examples is shown in Table 4. Examples of how students experienced the first three types of conflict (attending family events vs. doing academic work, visiting family vs. doing academic work, assisting family vs. focusing on one’s academics) in their own lives follow. Examples of the fourth (allocating money for travel to see family vs. allocating money for educational expenses) and fifth type (homesickness) of conflicts will be
provided in connection with the role of geographical distance from family and its impact on type and frequency of home-school conflict.

**Attending family events vs. doing academic work.** This was the most frequent subtype (Table 4). Here is an example

[M] *It was… my nephew’s baptism… during October… that’s…the beginning of school and … that’s when I was getting adjusted and… I had told my sister I was gonna be for sure his godfather..and … I had… some test or… quiz or something.. and that was kind of tough.*

[L] *But you went?*

[M] *I went either way.. yeah.*

[L] *How did you feel during that time?*

[M] *I was… not really into the event… I was… more focused like, okay you know I need to get back to studying … I was trying to get back to my studying but it was not possible… I was kinda worried… it threw me off schedule.* [Group I]

The example given here illustrates the challenge felt by the student vis-a-vis competing demands between his nephew’s baptism and studying for a test. Although he attended the family event, he could not stop thinking about studying; in the end, he did not fully enjoy the event, and he also did not prepare for the academic test, as he had hoped to. Family events were not restricted to religious rites of passage: other students experienced similar conflicts for other family events (e.g., Thanksgiving, Mother’s Day).

**Visiting parents vs. doing academic work.** The conflicts between home and school demands were not restricted to family events, as several students described a sense of obligation to visit their parents and how this obligation conflicted with their academics. Here is an example:

[F4] *…Even though… my mom’s proud that I am here and she understands that like I have a lot of work to do,… it’s hard … to explain to her, like I can’t come all the time when you want*
me home and ... sometimes I guess it makes her feel like I don’t want to be home and...that’s why I would choose to go, but...with the condition...you bring me back to campus like...a few hours later or no deal, so you know you would get both, so that that’s what I would say.

[L] So you would kinda find a way to do both?

[F4] Yeah...I always find myself in that situation, like this weekend I have to go home and I have a midterm on Monday, and, like, I told my mom already, like I can’t be home, like it’s...stressing there, like with the little kids around, like I can’t, I can’t concentrate, like I can’t study, so I told her as long as you bring me back to campus like really early then I can go home, then she was like ok. [Group II]

This example describes the obligation the student felt to visit her mother frequently and how it conflicted with her academic work. Although she made arrangements to fulfill both obligations, it was still a conflict for her: she did not want to hurt her mother’s feelings by not going home; yet she did not have conditions that allowed her to study at home.

**Family assistance vs. focusing on one’s academics.** Students also felt conflict between obligations to assist their family with tasks back at home and their academics:

[F6] I was actually thinking about...transferring because...my mom was diagnosed with cancer my sophomore year in high school and...she got cleared...Winter quarter when it ended...I hadn’t gone home in a few weeks, so I hadn’t really...seen her much, so I get home and...I guess she was diagnosed again and she was gonna start chemotherapy, and no one had told me anything...I went through that my sophomore year [in high school]...my mom went to Mexico for like two months, so I was...the one ...cooking for my dad and...taking care of my sister, getting her ready for school and stuff...I had to kinda take her role, and then it’s...my sister, she’s like fourteen, and she was the one that was gonna have to do that and I thought that’s not fair,...I should be there...I feel really guilty...
The same thing happened to me but my mom she passed away my senior year [in high school] so that’s partly the reason why I chose to go to UCLA to be close to home...initially I wasn’t supposed to...dorm, but a lot of my...teachers from high school and counselors were, like, you really need to get away because your family is basically suppressing you, they are not gonna let you, you’re not gonna be able to study, going to college with all that stress.

My brother...he was like, yeah, just go to a community college there and...stay at home, get a job, help out, and I’m just like ok,...I talked to my counselor and stuff like that, but I could do so much more if I go to UCLA, like go to medical school, getting a better job...no offense to anyone going to community college, but it’s just like UCLA can give you better opportunities, and it’s...something they don’t understand, like every time I go home, like, yeah, you should just...transfer, like go to UCI or...go to a community college here, so you can stay at home and help out your mom and...you’ll be fine, but I’m just like, no,...I don’t know if I’ll even be able to do that.

For me, it’s not just my family, my close family, like my dad, [or] brothers...it’s my entire family like my aunties, my grandmas,...they expected me to stay home and take my mom’s role, and I did take it when I was in high school and I was doing it, but it was different, like, honestly, high school was much easier than college, and this is not just this regular college, it’s UCLA and...I’ve talked to friends who are going to other universities and they’re like, yeah, it’s so chill, and I wish it was like that too, but it’s not, it’s different; it’s more competitive here, harder, more challenging...I’m struggling and just to make it hard, like your family puts this pressure, so yeah it’s hard. [Group II]
This dialogue describes the pressure each experienced from family members to live at home so that they could assist them; each notes how living at home conflicts with their academics goals. For one student, living at home meant she would have to transfer to a different campus or even to community college. At some point in their academic careers, both students met with academic counselors who encouraged them to pursue their academic goal of attending UCLA and/or to live on campus instead of at home. Although both students pursued their academic goals, pressure to assist their family continued.

**Continued reflection via triggers.** Almost all students said that they continued to reflect on their decisions or second-guess themselves after having made them, and many shared triggers that reinstated this reflection (Table 4). These examples show that these situations are indeed inner conflicts because they do not go away after they occur. Instead, they are triggered by particular stimuli. As shown in Table 2, emotional reinstatement was triggered by three types of stimuli:

**Tests and grades.** Seeing tests or grades at the end of the quarter was one type of trigger:

[M] ...Sometimes when you’re...taking the test, like for...today, ... like you just look at the test like ..oh maybe I could have studied this more if I wouldn’t have...called during the time ..or like if I wouldn’t have gone to the event, like that’s what kinda triggers...my reflection.[Group I]

[F4] ...This week I broke down because...I got put on academic probation cuz of, by point zero one of my damn GPA, but, yeah, so like I broke down and I was...oh my god...it really brought me down because...I started thinking...I’m away from my family like most of the time, I’m like here on my own. I’m always stressing over all this, all these other things that I shouldn’t be thinking about, and on top of that...school, and...yeah this week I broke down.

[Group II]
Family Updates. Receiving updates about family events or activities forced students to reflect on their decisions.

[M] When I call during the event, and then…they’re telling you you’re missing out ..or so and so is here, that you probably haven’t seen in so long.. that’s what kind of triggers me to reflect on should I have gone or should have I stayed.. like was it okay for me to stay? [Group I]

[F 1] Well ever since we got text...my mom texts me...so many pictures from back home ..oh look what I cooked today...or... just pictures of my sister or my family or...how...everything at home is...so, yeah, that triggers me... I should’ve gone home. [Group III]

[M 2] I can definitely identify with the social media thing..like my sisters post a lot of pictures too, like, oh look we went to Chinatown..like oh we went here..I wasn’t there... [Group IV]

Development in family back at home. Students felt as though growth or changes in family members that they could not be there to see in person served as triggers:

[F 2] ...the trigger for me is my little brother... he has...track meets or football stuff ...it’s... one of those things, like he’s growing up so fast and you’re not..I’m not able to see him grow up so fast (laughs), so...all these videos that he posts online, like, oh I just got second place or something..It’s just one of those things..I could’ve been there cheering him on. [Group III]

[M] Like my uncle just had a baby like and its like, oh you should see the baby’s... starting to walk and this and that and I’m like, you’re missing stuff. [Group III]

These examples illustrate that students continued to reflect on whether they made the correct decision and that specific environmental stimuli triggered this reflection. In other words, they second-guessed themselves around their decisions when they faced their low grades, when they heard about what they were missing out in family events, or when they realized that they missed out on witnessing the development of family members back at home. These three types of triggers were most frequent across the sample. Lower-frequency triggers included being
compared to other family members who fulfill family obligations while attending less rigorous colleges, not getting enough schoolwork completed, studying at the last minute, and feeling fatigue from last-minute study.

**Academic achievement.** Almost all students felt as though these conflicts had a negative impact on their academics (Table 4). As outlined in Table 2, sometimes the impact came because the student was **unable to concentrate or study**, as in this example:

[L] *Do you feel these home-school conflicts impact you in any way?*

[All] *Yes, definitely.*

[L] *How so?*

[F?] *Grades.*

[ ]

[F 4] *Yeah, focusing on school in general...if you’re having problems at home...you’re like sitting down at lecture and you’re like, shit, all this is going on and I can’t, I’m not even paying attention to what the professor is saying...so much going on that you don’t focus on anything at all, you’re just like stuck and confused and like super stressed.*

[ ]

[F 1] *I guess the example would be like not being able to, you know, study or concentrate like you have all these things bugging you ...* [Group II]

As outlined in Table 2, students also felt that these conflicts led them to **earn poor grades** on homework assignments, tests or courses, as in the following example:

[F] *Like..again with the studying...how my decision to choose the parties or like the family reunions over studying and then...seeing my midterm.. and...seeing my grades like go down and go down*

[L] *Okay..anybody else?*
[M 2]: *I think yea just the school aspect.. grades.. homework grades.. tests.*

[L] ... *When you say that do you mean that if you go home you notice that you didn’t get the grade you wanted or?*

[M 2] *Yeah, because I spent less time.. doing school work and more time socializing..yeah.*

[Group IV]
The objective measure of grades reinforces the students’ subjective experience: the group’s average self-reported high school GPA was 4.03, whereas their average self-reported UCLA GPA for their first two quarters was 2.36. Although this GPA is lower than that of a recent study conducted with Latino college students at UCLA (i.e., 3.05), the students in their sample included students whose parents went to college while ours did not. Their sample also contained significant numbers of upperclassman (mean age = 21); they have had a chance to adjust to college that the freshmen in our study did not yet have (Guan, Orellana, & Greenfield, 2014).

Lastly, some students experienced both an inability to concentrate and earned poor grades on their tests or courses.

[F 5] *I remember once, not once but multiple times, like I dunno why it’s so hard for me to actually study and dedicate myself to studying but, things like this would happen, like my parents would want me to go home and...half of me would want to go and like half of me would be so strict on myself to force myself to stay, but...I couldn’t do my work because in my mind I was like I should have gone home, I should have done this and that, and...in the end...I did really bad because...I couldn’t be there and I had to be here. [Group II]*

Overall, students shared experiences indicate that their grades suffered if they adhered to family behavioral demands, but if they did not engage in these demands, they could not concentrate or study. Lack of concentration or studying, in turn, negatively impacted their grades.
**Sense of well-being.** Almost all students felt that these conflicts negatively impacted their well-being (Table 4). Students’ interpreted well-being in various ways (Table 2). Some focused on the stress these situations produced; others focused on the guilt or negative emotions elicited by the conflicts, while still others focused on physical health.

**Stress.** The following example illustrates that aside from feeling academic stress, Latino first-generation college students can experience additional psychological stress from not being able to engage in family obligation behaviors at home.

[M] *I know like family situations...add on to...stress...not being able to be there and help..like I know I was like.. [pauses to clear throat] umm a big help to my family when I was there..but like not being able to be there and like help them out..with what they need..especially my dad..umm..like..it stresses me out...I’m always like under that constant pressure, like I could be you know helping him, I could be doing this for him..but yet I’m here and..so it’s that kind of situation is hard.* [Group I]

**Feeling guilty, bad, or like they disappointed family.** Students also shared different types of negative feelings they experienced when undergoing these conflicts. Here is an example of one student who felt guilty and bad about not visiting her mother:

[F 4] *Like she guilt trips me and I’m like, don’t, it’s not gonna work, stop; but it does work and I feel guilty and...even when I try to get stuff done like study, I can’t focus cuz I just feel so bad.* [Group II]

Another student felt guilty about not doing schoolwork:

[F 1] *I guess...I feel guilty, like I’m here instead of studying or sometimes...I’m there, and I’m just...sitting by myself...I’m not doing anything there, and I feel like I could’ve been studying right now..It shouldn’t have mattered that they were pressuring me so I start like getting mad at myself.* [Group IV]
Emotionality. Students sometimes became emotional while talking about these conflicts, as in the following dialogue:

[F 1] The fact that I couldn’t go home, that conflict between there... it brought me... I was sad and it really did... I don’t know how to really express it that well... to put into words...[student’s eyes became very watery]

[F 2] …I understand [students eyes also became watery]... I guess it’s... breaking your heart just to know that you can’t... go with them, I guess it makes you very emotional sometimes, like I have to admit I break down sometimes... I just start bawling out of nowhere and I am just like, oh my god, stop, stop Jessica. [Group III]

Perceived negative impact on physical well-being. Students also shared their perception of a negative impact on physical well-being. Here is one example:

[F 5] [I] was just trying to balance everything off, and after a while I just, I completely didn’t want to eat anymore, and I think... sometimes, you don’t care about your health or anything, that’s the last thing on your mind; ...[It] is really bad because you... should focus on yourself first and that is something that I didn’t do. Like even if I was sick like no, who cares if I was sick, like I have to do my work, like I have to do this I have to do that, so there is no time for, well for me. [Group II]

Taken together, students subjectively described these conflicts as having a negative impact on their well-being, especially when they could not engage in family behavioral demands.

Geographical distance from home. Students who lived closer to home experienced direct conflicts with their family more frequently; students who lived further from home experienced this type of conflict less frequently, but paid different prices: (1) extreme homesickness and (2) conflicts between allocating money for travel to see family vs. educational
expenses. A comparison of four girls who have different degrees of geographical separation from their parents shows this relationship.

Lives with her parents, 40 minutes away from campus: Direct conflict between family demands and academic demands.

[F] There’s always things like this with my family..They never plan things..It’s kind of like..oh we’re going to a party this weekend like..really when did this happen? And..I feel...when I don’t go, the people that go to the party..like the host, they’re, like, oh where’s your daughter? So I feel guilty...[and] pressured...,so I end up going instead of, like, studying and doing homework.

……

For example this weekend is my little sister’s birthday party.. and, like this whole week, my mom’s like, oh when you get home from school, go to, like, downtown and buy this, this and this; and I was, like, okay mom, I’ll do it, but then, like, I’m done with that..and then I still have to study; but then I still have to help her prepare, like, food, and then I still have to do all this, and it just, like...it’s overwhelming. [Group IV]

Lives in dorm; parents live 40 minutes away: Direct conflict between family demands and academic demands.

[F 5] Well, I remember that last two quarters I would always go home...every weekend because my mom would never stop bugging me because she’d be, like, so...you’re gonna come home, right? And I’d be like, no mom, and sometimes I would see that she would be upset...I think that is part of the reason why I didn’t do so well the last two quarters [Group II]

Lives in dorm; parents live 7 hours away: Extreme homesickness.

[L] Okay..um..can you share some experiences of how ..you feel these situations impact you?
...I feel homesick when... when my mom like sends a picture of my favorite food or...or just like my sister or something um ..and then like sometimes I'm in the middle of reading ...um like reading a textbook or something and then like I get the text message; I see it and then its just like oh I feel homesick sometimes ..and... sometimes [it] makes me unfocus and...think about...the times.. like the previous times that I've had with my family and how I can’t really be experiencing.. that with them right now.. just because I’m over here..like far away.

Lives in dorm; parents live out of state. [F 2]: Extreme homesickness. F2 then responds to F1:

[F 2] Think it uh..it blocks you from doing so much work..it just blocks your mind and makes you, like I don’t know..every time I talk to my grandma I just..I make sure I talk to her, like, between classes because I know I won’t do anything after I talk to her..like ...it’s just so hard like

[L] What do you mean, like, you like talk to her between, like?

[F 2] ...Class is over, so I call her just because I know, like, if I was studying.. like, I wouldn’t do anything; I would just, like..go look at family pictures and be, like, oh I miss that, like just my grandma reminds me of, like, just the whole family, so it’s..it just makes you want to stop doing work and just.. think like, oh what if I.. chose to just stay over there, like it would’ve been different [Group III]

Lives in dorm; parents live out of state: Money to travel to see family vs. educational expenses.

[F 2] For spring break.. I had the opportunity of...either going home or staying here ..um, but it’s not more, like...choose between school versus family; its more...like money for school or money to go home, ... just because I’m so far away...it’s such a big trip... My mom had said, like don’t come for spring break, like save your money, we understand...You know...it is
Thus, students reported different types of conflict, depending on geographical distance. The student who lived with her parents reported two types of home-school conflict: attending events vs. doing academic work and family assistance vs. focusing on one’s academics. The student whose parents lived 40 minutes away but resided in the dorms reported conflict between visiting home to see her parents and doing academic work during her first two quarters; during discussion she mentioned that she stopped visiting home as often – a choice that was not possible for the student who lived at home. The student whose parents lived 7 hours away said she experienced one conflict during her first year in college – attending a family event (i.e., Thanksgiving) vs. doing academic work (and she chose to stay at school). The student whose family lived out of state shared two instances of conflict in regards to travel costs for visiting home vs. educational costs. Finally, these last two students, the ones who lived the farthest away, also reported extreme homesickness. Evident in their responses, when this extreme conflict arose, students seemed almost incapacitated to complete schoolwork. Interestingly, both students had a GPA that was below the 2.36 average of the sample, with F 1 (the student whose parents lived out of state) having a 1.1 GPA, the lowest of the entire sample.

**Parental education.** A careful examination of students at two extremes (i.e., lowest and highest parent education level in the sample) revealed that parent education might play a role in the frequency of home-school value conflicts. A comparison of four female students – two with the lowest levels of parental education (F 4 and F 5, Group II) and two with the highest levels of parental education (F 1 and F 2, Group III) in the sample – makes this relationship visible. On the low end, F4’s mother had a second grade education (her father’s education was unknown).
F5’s mother had an elementary education; her father had never been to school. On the high end, both F1 and F2 had two parents who had completed high school.

Students whose parents had lower educational levels had stronger familistic expectations to meet than those whose parents had higher educational levels. As noted in earlier sections, F4 and F5 in Group II both mentioned that their mother always called them about visiting home. The young women (F1 and F2) in Group III reported the exact opposite. Their mothers never pressured them to visit home and often understood that academic achievement was a priority. For example, F1 mentioned that her mother rescheduled her younger sister’s first-holy-communion mass to occur during summer, so that it did not interfere with her school obligations. It is also significant that the two sets of parents with the highest level of education had allowed, or possibly even encouraged, their daughters to attend college the farthest away from the family home (a seven-hour drive in the case of F1, out of state in the case of F2).

Discussion

It has been generally assumed that the low college completion rate of Latino students is due to academic issues. However, this study illuminates what may be the biggest barrier of all: cultural conflict between the collectivistic demands of family relationships and the individualistic demands of school achievement. In response to a hypothetical scenario that depicted a conflict between family and school demands, students tended to prioritize school; however, regardless of their decision (i.e., school, family, both), a number of students expressed personal inner conflict. Considering both individual responses to the scenario and the group interviews, we found that all students experienced conflicts between the demands of home and school. Five different kinds of conflict emerged. These results provide a unique perspective that is not captured in current measures of family obligation (Fuligni et al., 1999; Telzer & Fuligni 2009a; 2009b; Tseng, 2004). Current measures assess only whether or not one sees family
obligations as important or engages in them behaviorally. They therefore miss the inner conflict
or family tensions experienced by students in making decisions between family obligation and
academic obligation. Our study suggests that these choice situations between home and school
obligations are indeed experienced as conflictual and produce inner turmoil, as well as family
tension.

The negative emotional experience of home-school conflict situations was not transitory. After students first experienced a given conflict situation, they continued to ruminate on their
decision to act in accord with either family values or school values. This continued reflection, or
second-guessing one’s decisions, was stimulated by situational triggers: tests and grades, family
updates, and development in family back home. Continued post-decision reflection reinstated the
emotions engendered by the original conflict; this post-decision reflection and second-guessing
suggest that these choice situations between family obligation and academic obligation do indeed
lead to inner conflict. The documentation of situational triggers that reinstate the subjective sense
of conflict was an original and unique contribution of this study.

Although previous literature has suggested that engagement in family behavioral
demands is related to a decline in grades (Telzer & Fuiligni, 2009b; Tseng, 2004), our study
suggests a new psychological mechanism that contributes to this effect. If students fulfill
behavioral demands, their grades suffer. However, if they do not engage in these demands, they
cannot concentrate on their studies; this lack of concentration is later reflected in their grades.
This latter dynamic is the new mechanism.

Students’ sense of well-being was negatively impacted by these conflicting situations, mostly when they were not able to be with or assist family. This finding reinforces previous
research, which has found that assisting family members in adolescence and young adulthood is
related to more positive emotional well-being for Latino young people from immigrant families
(Fuligni & Pedersen, 2002; Telzer & Fuligni, 2009a). Therefore, it is not surprising that an inability to fulfill family obligations has a negative impact on one’s sense of well-being. Overall, our results contribute to the literature by documenting that conflict between family and school demands plays a negative role in students’ perceptions of their psychological and physical well-being.

While previous research has documented that youth who choose to live with parents fulfill more family behavioral demands (Tseng, 2004), it has not documented the inner conflicts associated with living at various geographical distances from parents. The case analysis presented here illuminates that, while living at home presents Latino first-generation college students from immigrant families with more opportunities for direct home-school conflicts, living far away also has an extreme disadvantage. That is, living far away makes it nearly impossible for Latino students to fully engage in familistic practices, such as visiting their family and attending family events; this situation results in extreme feelings of homesickness. The GPA evidence suggests that this geographical distance (i.e., being very far away from ones family) might also play a negative role in students’ academic work.

**Generalization of Greenfield’s Theory of Social Change and Human Development**

These findings align with the theory of social change and human development (Greenfield, 2009), which states that conflict can occur when one transitions from an environment that encompasses collectivistic values to one that encompasses individualistic values. Our research provides new evidence for the theory by documenting cross-cultural value conflict at a different developmental period (i.e., the transition to college) and with outcomes not previously tested (i.e., academics, well-being). In line with the theory, the research also suggests an important sociodemographic influence on the conflicts, parent education level. Parents with more formal education were more understanding of students’ school obligations and need for
independence while at school. In contrast, parents with little or no formal education were very demanding of students to visit home and did not fully understand their children’s academic obligations. In line with the idea that formal education develops the value of independence (Greenfield), parents with more formal education also encouraged their children’s independence by supporting their decisions to go to a college further from home.

Prior research indicated that, in Mexico, a high school education (compared with leaving school after elementary) led adolescents to more independent values (Manago, 2014). The present study suggests that increasing parent education to the high school level can have a similar effect on their children. We have a tendency to regard college as higher education, but we fail to realize the fact that high school can function as higher education among Latino immigrants from Mexico and Central America where college education is rare. Because of the unavailability of secondary education in Mexico at the time our students’ parents immigrated to the U.S., the completion of high school can be a great success for them and for their children’s education.

**Developmental and Applied Implications**

The transition to college has important developmental significance because it lays the foundation for future success (Hurtado, Laird, & Perorazio, 2003). The negative effect of internalized home-school value conflicts experienced by Latino first-generation college students on their academic achievement and sense of well-being, suggests the need to develop early interventions for these youth in order promote their future college success.

One promising route might be to design an intervention that has a similar group interview format as the current study. The group interview format elicited sharing; in each group, students shared a similar experience with at least one other person. One group was very cohesive, with many members sharing similar experiences and supporting one another. The discourse indicated
that this cohesion helped one student to harmonize her home-school conflicts, “…thinking that no one else has the same problems I do and then coming to things like these, I see that there’s other people who either have it easier or have it worse or have it just like me, so knowing that we are struggling in the same way or knowing that we are struggling in different ways, and we’re all coping in different ways… is helping me understand that I can do it in some way…” [F3, Group II]. Given the beneficial nature of the group interview itself, one potential avenue may be to alter it slightly, so that it could serve as an intervention. The effectiveness of group discussion as an intervention that integrates students’ backgrounds has recently been implemented and found to be effective for increasing the grades of first-generation students during their first year of college (Stephens, Hamedani et al., 2014).

Although we do not know whether students had ever spoken about these conflicts prior to our group interviews, previous research has found that first-generation students typically do not talk about issues at school with either family members or peers (Barry, Hudley, Kelly & Cho, 2009). We also know that disclosure about circumstances that students find stressful is vital for academic success and overall health (Pennebaker & Francis, 1996). Thus, it is likely that students had not discussed these conflicts sufficiently, a circumstance that might explain, at least partly, the negative impact these conflicts have had on their academics and sense of well-being.

Another possible intervention might be for high school and college academic counselors to make Latino students from immigrant families aware of the potential home-school conflicts that might arise, depending on how far they choose to live from their parents during their first year of college. Students who lived closer to home experienced more frequent direct home-school conflicts and students the furthest from home experienced these less frequently, but paid a different price (i.e., conflict between allocating money for travel costs to see family or for educational expenses, and extreme homesickness). This is important because one of the biggest
decisions that college bound youth make is where they will attend college and whether or not they should attend a college that is closer or further from home. Latino (Fuligni & Pedersen, 2002), immigrant (Tseng, 2004), and first-generation college student populations (Sanez et al., 2007) typically decide to attend a college that is close to home. This decision is not surprising given the familistic (Fuligni & Pedersen; Tseng; Arnett, 2003) or collectivistic (Stephens, Fryberg et al., 2012) values that these populations hold. Moreover, since home-school conflict seems to take its most extreme forms at both ends of the distance continuum, counselors should make clear that neither living with parents nor living very far from home is optimal. Instead, our case analysis indicates that living within driving distance, but not with parents, seems optimal. This is because a student who lives within driving distance can still have the opportunity to engage in family obligation behaviors and, at the same time, have the opportunity to choose when he or she wants to engage in these behaviors. This choice is less available to students who live either with their parents or very far from their parents. If students decide to select either of these latter two geographical options, perhaps counselors could provide Latino students with more resources to aid them in coping with the extreme home-school conflicts that they might experience (e.g., homesickness resources for those living far away; involvement in a peer group of students living at home for those living with their parents).

Limitations and Future Research Directions

One might suggest that the frequency of conflicts in our sample was due to the social pressure of hearing other students speak about them. Our students’ comments suggest otherwise: that sharing experiences encouraged the expression of feelings that might have gone unexpressed because of their social undesirability in a college situation. However, this study was primarily qualitative and exploratory; it was not designed to assess prevalence. Follow-up research will assess these conflicts with a large-scale survey in order to examine the issue of prevalence.
In addition, although we were able to understand Latino college students’ experiences with home-school conflicts, our study did not include other ethnic groups. In order to determine the role of sociodemographic factors and values more generally, as well as the role of ethnicity, follow-up research will examine these relationships quantitatively with a diverse sample. For example, a large-scale survey currently in progress will allow us to test the generalizability of our observation that more parent education led to fewer conflicts because parents encouraged more independent behavior from their children.

While it is clear that these inner value conflicts played a role in Latino students’ subjective sense of their academics and well-being, this phenomenological relationship is not sufficient to establish objective causality. A future behavioral experiment will examine the causal path from students’ experiences of home-school conflict to academic achievement and well-being.
Table 1.

*Gender, Number, Age, Living Situation, Distance from Home, Parent Demographics & Scenario*

**Value Choice**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Living Situation</th>
<th>Distance from Home</th>
<th>Parent Education (mo/fa)</th>
<th>Parent Place of Birth</th>
<th>Value Choice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>Fem.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19-yrs-old</td>
<td>Dorms</td>
<td>30 minutes (L.A.)</td>
<td>Elementary 9th/3rd</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td>19-yrs-old</td>
<td></td>
<td>4-hours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>Fem. 1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19-yrs-old</td>
<td>Dorms</td>
<td>40 minutes (L.A.)</td>
<td>9th/4th</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fem. 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>18-yrs-old</td>
<td>Dorms</td>
<td>4-hours</td>
<td>4th/6th</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fem. 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>18-yrs-old</td>
<td>Dorms</td>
<td>40 minutes (L.A.)</td>
<td>Unknown 2nd/unknown</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fem. 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>18-yrs-old</td>
<td>Dorms</td>
<td>30 minutes (L.A.)</td>
<td>Elementary/0</td>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fem. 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>18-yrs-old</td>
<td>Dorms</td>
<td>40 minutes (L.A.)</td>
<td>M.S./H.S.</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fem. 6</td>
<td></td>
<td>18-yrs-old</td>
<td>Dorms</td>
<td>2 ½ hours</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18-yrs-old</td>
<td>Dorms</td>
<td>1 hour (L.A.)</td>
<td>H.S./M.S.</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fem. 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>18-yrs-old</td>
<td>Dorms</td>
<td>7-hours</td>
<td>H.S./H.S.</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fem. 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>18-yrs-old</td>
<td>Dorms</td>
<td>14 hours (Out of state)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.</td>
<td>Fem.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18-yrs-old</td>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>40 minutes (L.A.)</td>
<td>H.S./M.S.</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>19-yrs-old</td>
<td>Dorms</td>
<td>30 minutes (L.A.)</td>
<td>3rd/6th</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>18-yrs-old</td>
<td>Dorms</td>
<td>16 minutes (L.A.)</td>
<td>H.S./H.S.</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: M.S. stands for middle school and H.S. for high school. Unknown suggests that students were unsure about their parents exact education level and “0” means that a parent had no formal education. L.A. represents Los Angeles, California.*
Table 2.

*Qualitative Analysis: Themes and Subthemes*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Subthemes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Types of home-school conflict</td>
<td>Attending family events vs. doing academic work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visiting family vs. doing academic work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assisting family vs. focusing on one’s academics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Allocating money for travel to see family vs. for educational expenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Homesickness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continued reflection via triggers</td>
<td>Tests and grades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family updates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development in family back at home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on academics</td>
<td>Unable to concentrate or study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Earned poor grades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on well-being</td>
<td>Stress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feeling guilty, bad, or like they disappointed family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emotionality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perceived negative impact on physical well-being</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.

*Individual Responses to Home-School Conflict Scenario*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Prioritize School</th>
<th>Prioritize Family</th>
<th>Prioritize Both</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Conflict</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* Columns represent students’ decisions in response to “What would you do?”; Row represents conflict identified through qualitative analysis of the way they expressed their decision and their reason for it.
Table 4

**Reported Home-School Conflicts, Triggers, and Impact on Academics and Well-being Expressed During Group Discussion**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Home-School Conflicts</th>
<th>Triggers</th>
<th>Academics</th>
<th>Well-being</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>Fem.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>Fem. 1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fem. 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fem. 3</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fem. 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fem. 5</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fem. 6</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fem. 1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fem. 2</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.</td>
<td>Fem.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male 1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male 2</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: FE = Attending family events vs. doing academic work; V = Visiting family vs. doing academic work; FA = Assisting family vs. focusing on one’s academics; T = Allocating money for travel to see family vs. educational expenses; H = Homesickness; A star denotes that the student gave an example of the theme or subtheme during group discussion.*
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Cultural Value Conflicts Between Home and School:
Predictors and Consequences During the First Year of College

Abstract

Qualitative work has documented home-school cultural value conflicts – conflict between family and academic obligations – experienced by Latino first-generation college students during the first year of college (Vasquez-Salgado et al., 2015). This follow-up surveyed a larger, more diverse sample of students. Models assessing predictors and consequences of home-school value conflict were tested. In Model 1, Latino background predicted more frequent home-school conflicts. This relation was partially explained by the fact that the overwhelming majority of Latino participants were first-generation college students from economically challenged homes. This ecology, typical of the Latino population in Southern California, related to strong family obligation values for future support, which, in turn, was associated with frequent experiences of home-school value conflict. In the consequences model, frequent home-school conflicts predicted psychological distress, which then predicted attention and school problems; these problems related to lower GPA during the first year of college.


**Introduction**

I remember…multiple times…my parents would want me to go home and…half of me would want to go and…half of me would be so strict on myself to force myself to stay, but…I couldn’t do my work because in my mind I was like I should have gone home, I should have done this and that, and…and in the end…I did really bad because….I couldn’t be there and I had to be here.


Even though more Latinos are enrolling in college than ever before, they continue to have significantly higher college drop-out rates compared to their other-ethnic peers (DeAngelo, Franke, Hurtado, Pryor, & Tran, 2011). This situation might occur because the majority of Latinos are first-generation college students and first-generation college students typically lack resources (e.g., financial – Saenz et al., 2007; parent knowledge about college – Tienda & Mitchell, 2006) that predict college adjustment.

However, there is another possible factor: cultural conflict between collectivistic values (i.e., focus is on the family and family goals) and individualistic values (i.e., focus is on the self and personal goals) of the university environment (Vasquez-Salgado et al., 2015). This conflict occurs because Latino students are typically raised in home environments that teach them to put family obligations first (e.g., spending time with family, assisting family, supporting one’s family in the future; Fuligni, Tseng, & Lam, 1999; Greenfield & Quiroz, 2013; Telzer & Fuligni, 2009a); and this priority conflicts with the individualistic values of the university environment that require students to put their academic obligations first. This situation creates the potential for *home-school cultural value conflict* – conflict between collectivistic family obligations and individualistic academic obligations (Vasquez-Salgado et al., 2015).
We focus on students’ experiences with these conflicts during the first year of college, an exploratory period that is typical of emerging adulthood. Emerging adulthood is characterized by identity exploration and a focus on the self in order to prepare for adult roles (Arnett, 2000). Emerging adults explore several pathways (e.g., attend college) in order to figure out who they are and would like to become in the future; being able focus on oneself makes this exploration possible (Arnett, 2014). We argue that the sociocultural context of Latinos creates a different experience during this period in development. Though a desire to eventually give back to their families may have motivated them to get to college (Fuligni, 2001; C. Suárez-Orozco & M. Suárez-Orozco, 1995), family obligation values potentially make it difficult for them to focus entirely on self-development once they arrive. Specifically, they may become caught between two different forms of family support: engaging in immediate family obligations or developing their individual selves through academic study, an activity that is in line with the university culture and will eventually position them to support their families in the future. Prior qualitative research has indicated that such conflicts result in poor college adjustment (Vasquez-Salgado et al., 2015); we now test this idea with a quantitative study, extending the sample beyond Latinos to an ethnically diverse group of first-year college students.

It is imperative that the antecedents and consequences of home-school conflicts be examined during this time because events that take place during this period have important developmental significance. They lay the foundation for future success (Hurtado, Laird & Perorazio, 2003). If one does not perform well in academic courses during the first year of college, one is likely to drop out the next year (Gray, Vitak, Easton, & Ellison, 2013; Ishitani & DesJardins, 2002; Nora & Cabrera, 1996), thereby, altering one’s future pathway (Arnett, 2014).

**Theoretical Perspective**
Greenfield’s (2009) Theory of Social Change and Human Development provides a framework for our research on home-school cultural value conflict. According to the theory, *collectivistic values* are an adaptation to ecologies in which education is predominantly informal and at home, material resources are low, family relationships are close and at the center of social life, and a goal of development is the interdependent individual. In contrast, *individualistic values* are an adaptation to ecologies in which formal educational opportunity is great, material resources are more abundant, many social relationships are both extrafamilial and relatively impermanent, and a goal of development is the independent individual.

These two ecologies represent the patterning of environmental variables that make a complete environment. Because sociodemographics are at the top of the causal chain, the theory can predict and explain value similarities among members of different ethnic groups and value differences within the same ethnic group on the basis of similar or different sociodemographic characteristics (Greenfield, 2009). This is an important characteristic of any theory that addresses the relation between ethnic diversity and human development (Garcia Coll, 1996); and it was important in the multiethnic design of our study.

In addition, the theory predicts that, when transitioning from a lower socioeconomic status (SES) ecology characterized by collectivistic values to a higher SES environment that is more individualistic, cultural conflict can occur (Greenfield, 2009); and this conflict may affect development (Vasquez-Salgado et al., 2015; Burgos-Cienfuegos, Vasquez-Salgado, Ruedas-Gracia, & Greenfield, 2015). Thus, cultural conflict might occur more often for Latino college students (Vasquez-Salgado et al., 2015; Burgos-Cienfuegos et al., 2015) during the transition to a university environment because their families typically have less access to education and income compared with other groups (Fuligni, 2001; Guan, Greenfield, & Orellana, 2014), and family relationships are close and central to social life (Keefe, 1984). These low socioeconomic
characteristics and close social relations are in stark contrast with the university environment, where professors and university administrators typically have higher education and income levels and many social relationships are with nonfamily members and often impermanent.

**Development of cross-cultural value conflict and cultural mismatch.** Beginning in elementary school, Greenfield and colleagues have documented cross-cultural value conflict between Latino families and schools (Greenfield & Quiroz, 2013; Greenfield, Quiroz, & Raeff, 2000; Raeff, Greenfield, & Quiroz, 2000). Their research demonstrates that Latino parents, predominately from low income and education backgrounds, have an interdependent or collectivistic frame of reference, while their children’s schools have an independent or individualistic one. Consequently, children are subjected to two conflicting socializing influences. Most pertinent, immigrant Latino parents prioritize family obligations (e.g., staying at home to help take care of a sibling rather than attending school) and teachers prioritize school obligations (e.g., attending school, regardless of family obligations; Greenfield & Quiroz, 2013). Moreover, this conflict becomes internalized in high school. Qualitative work with Latino youth has shown that they feel torn in choices between working to help their families or going to school (C. Suárez-Orozco & M. Suárez-Orozco, 1995). Furthermore, as Latino students enter college, this cross-cultural value conflict becomes intensified. Qualitative research suggests that Latino first-generation college students experience home-school value conflicts – conflict between collectivistic family obligations and individualistic academic obligations (e.g., choosing between attending a family event, visiting family, or family assistance vs. completing academic work) during the transition to college; and these conflicts negatively impact their academics and well-being (Vasquez-Salgado et al., 2015).

Similarly, Cultural Mismatch Theory generalizes this mismatch in cultural values to first-generation college students from all backgrounds. However, its focus on sociodemographics is
narrower, including only first-generation college student status. The theory posits that, across ethnic groups, first-generation college students are raised with an interdependent or collectivistic frame of reference and, students whose parents attended college are raised with an independent or individualistic frame of reference (Stephens, Fryberg, et al., 2012). For example, first-generation college students typically hold strong collectivistic motives for attending college (e.g., to support their families in the future) and continuing-generation students hold individualistic motives (e.g., to explore new interests). This difference creates a clash in values for first-generation college students when they transition to an individualistic university environment, but not for continuing generation college students, as their values align with those of the university (Stephens, Fryberg, et al.; Stephens, Townsend, et al., 2012). Like the Theory of Social Change and Human Development, Cultural Mismatch Theory posits that this mismatch in values results in poorer academic performance for first-generation college students; continuing generation college students are unaffected because they do not experience a mismatch.

We theorized that strong family obligation values for supporting one’s family in the future would result in more experiences with home-school value conflict because students would feel caught between choosing to engage in immediate family obligations back at home or focusing on their academic obligations so that they can help their families in the future. We also theorized that experience with such conflicts would result in poor college adjustment during the first year of college. The exact process by which we expected this to take fold will be further described in the sections below.

**Ethnic Differences in SES**

Socioeconomic means are not evenly distributed among ethnic groups; there are disparities. Among college students at UCLA, the source of our sample, Latino students, on average, have parents who have had less educational opportunity than students from Asian and
European American backgrounds (Guan et al., 2014). This pattern occurs at other universities as well (Saenz et al., 2007). In the context of the Theory of Social Change and Human Development, lower levels of education and income led us to expect that Latino college students would experience the highest level of home-school conflict. Thus, the sample of the current study was comprised of first-year students from Latino, Asian, and European American backgrounds because we predicted that disparities in socioeconomic status across and within ethnic groups would produce value differences that, in turn, would result in differential experience with home-school value conflicts.

However, it is important to note that Latino students are not the only first-generation college students; nor are they the only ones to come from working class families. Because we utilized a sample of first-year college students from diverse backgrounds, we are able to extend the generalizability of our findings to college students of other ethnicities who come from less wealthy or working-class families and whose parents have not gone to college.

**Predictors of Home-School Value Conflict**

Given the above, we predicted that compared with other ethnic groups, Latino students would more likely be first-generation college students (i.e., have parents that did not attend college). Because parents who have not been to college earn significantly less than parents who have attended college (Terenzini et al., 1996), we predicted a similar relation.

Based on all of the above, we hypothesized that having parents who did not attend college and who earned a low-income, would predict higher family obligation values for supporting ones family in the future (i.e., collectivistic family values); these values, in turn, would be associated with more experiences with home-school value conflict. Additionally, a second model tested the generality of socioeconomic predictors to students from other ethnic backgrounds by removing the Latino variable from the predictor model.
Consequences of Home-School Value Conflict

Our consequences model posits a specific series of paths from home-school value conflict to psychological distress to attention and school problems, ending in lower GPA. The model is theoretically grounded because both theories suggest cultural value conflict affects development. However, we relied on prior research, especially students’ subjective experiences with these conflicts, to form the specific paths noted in the model.

Home-school value conflict as a predictor of psychological distress. Individuals with a collectivistic orientation experience psychological distress when in an individualistic setting (Caldwell-Harris & Ayçiçegi, 2006; Stephens, Townsend, et al., 2012). Most pertinent to our study, this pattern has been observed at the college level via physiological measures (i.e., increases in cortisol; Stephens, Townsend, et al.) and subjective reports of distress among first-generation college students (Vasquez-Salgado et al., 2015). Several Latino first-generation college students in Vasquez-Salgado et al.’s (2015) sample reported distress when confronting home-school conflicts during their first year in college (i.e., stress, guilt, emotionality; perceived negative impact on physical health). We therefore predicted that a higher frequency of home-school value conflicts would relate to reports of more psychological distress.

Psychological distress as a predictor of attention and school problems. Correlational and experimental studies suggest that individuals who experience psychological distress are also prone to experiencing problems with regulating their attention (Meyers, Grills, & Zellinger, 2013; Liston, McEwen & Casey, 2008; Mathews & MacLeod, 1985; Yiend, 2009). Central to the current study, first-generation college students expressed in focus-group conversations that they were unable to concentrate or study because of the distress they experienced from home-school conflicts (Vasquez-Salgado et al., 2015). This lack of concentration was often coupled with other school problems, such as not understanding material and not completing assignments. Our
measure therefore grouped attention and school problems together. There were also indications that these attention and school problems lowered grade point average (GPA). Therefore, we hypothesized that frequent home-school conflicts would predict psychological distress. Psychological distress, would, in turn, relate to attention and school problems; these problems would be associated with low GPA.

**Resolution of Home-School Value Conflict and Outcomes**

Home-school value conflicts are stressful because they involve having to resolve a conflict; this situation involves a “choice” between engaging in family or school obligations. Prior to enrolling in postsecondary education, Latino students begin to face such choices. They face difficulties when having to choose between moving away to college and remaining closer to home so that they can be with or assist family (Lara, 1992; London, 1989). They also feel torn between going to school and working to help their families (C. Suárez-Orozco & M. Suárez-Orozco, 1995). However, these choice situations continue and even become more severe after making a commitment to higher education. For example, Latino college students have reported difficulty in choosing between attending family events and studying for an exam; or between assisting their family with tasks and focusing on their academics (Vasquez-Salgado et al., 2015).

Given the existence of home-school value conflict, we wondered about how different kinds of resolution strategies would relate to psychological outcomes. Prior research has suggested that though family obligation values are positively related to achievement motivation (Tseng, 2004), the behavioral engagement of such values detracts students from academics (Tseng, 2004; Telzer & Fuligni, 2009b). Interestingly, research also documented that though behavioral engagement in family obligation values is related to happiness, it produces stress if engaged in beyond a certain point (Telzer & Fuligni, 2009a). Therefore, it seemed clear that resolving conflicts in favor of family obligation would result in greater attention and school
problems and compromise GPA. But would it relate to greater psychological distress, given the mixed relation between behavioral engagement of family obligation and well-being? This was a question, but we did not have a hypothesis concerning the outcome.

**Comparing Home-School Value Conflict Across Genders**

Prior research has demonstrated that females might be more heavily burdened by family obligations than males (Stein et al., 2014). This may occur because of traditionally ascribed gender roles that raise girls to fulfill productive tasks at home and boys to fulfill tasks further from home (Manago, Greenfield, Kim & Ward, 2014). Indeed, qualitative research with Latina females (ages 20-45) suggests that they experienced less freedom, more household responsibilities (e.g., cooking, cleaning, taking care of siblings) and inculcation with traditional feminine skills (Raffaelli & Ontai, 2004). These ascribed gender roles may be problematic when we consider marianismo, a value held by the Latino culture that “emphasizes the self-sacrificing role of females and highlights the females’ role as family caretaker” (Sy, 2006; pg. 369). In other words, though collectivistic environments prioritize family needs over the needs of any individual family member, for females, this might be even more heavily emphasized. Thus, we predicted that females in our study would report more experiences with home-school value conflicts than males.

**Geographical Distance from Home and Frequency of Home-School Value Conflict**

The geographical distance that students live from their parents while attending college is related to family obligation values and behaviors, as well as to frequency of home-school value conflicts. For example, emerging adults from Latino and Filipino backgrounds are more likely to live with their parents because they hold high family obligation values (Fuligni & Pedersen, 2002). Similarly, residing with parents was one factor that led college students from immigrant backgrounds to report higher levels of engagement in family behavioral demands than
nonimmigrant youth (Tseng, 2004). In such residential situations, high family obligation values and behaviors may have the strongest potential to clash with the individualistic demands of a college setting. Indeed, Vasquez-Salgado et al. (2015) found, through a case-study analysis, that Latino students who lived closer to home experienced direct conflicts with their family more frequently (i.e., attending a family event or spending time with family vs. doing academic work; assisting ones family vs. focusing on one’s academics); in contrast, students who lived farther from home experienced conflicts between allocating money for travel to see family versus educational expenses. We predicted a similar pattern of findings to emerge in our quantitative study.

**Hypotheses and Research Questions**

**Ethnic differences.** Students from Latino backgrounds will more likely be first-generation college students compared to students from Asian and European American backgrounds. Latino students will also report significantly lower family incomes, higher family obligation values for future support, and more instances of home-school value conflict, compared to their other-ethnic counterparts.

**Predictors of home-school value conflict. Model 1.** Identifying as Latino (rather than Asian or European American) will be associated with having parents with no postsecondary education – that is, with being a first-generation college student. Having parents that did not attend college, in turn, will be associated with low parent income. Both these variables will then predict higher family obligation values for future support. The relation between having parents who did not go to college and family obligation values will be partially explained by low-parent income. Lastly, high endorsement of family obligation values will predict a higher frequency of home-school value conflicts during the first year in college (Figure 1). Because we expect this model to serve as the main mechanism that relates Latino background to experiences with home-
school value conflicts, we do not expect a direct effect of Latino background on conflicts. Instead, we predict that there will be a significant indirect effect of Latino background on home-school values conflicts through the paths of the intervening variables. Lastly, because Asian students have also been characterized as holding strong family obligation values and practices (Tseng, 2004; Fuligni et al., 1999), we will test an alternative model that groups Asian and Latino students together (versus European American students). **Model 2.** In order to demonstrate that the model predicting home-school value conflict generalizes across all first-generation students included in our sample, regardless of ethnicity, this model will be the same as Model 1, except that it will not include Latino ethnicity as a variable (Figure 1 without the Latino ethnicity variable).

**Consequences of home-school value conflict.** Home-school value conflicts will predict psychological distress. Psychological distress, will, in turn, relate to a higher level of attention and school problems. Attention and school problems will relate to lower GPAs during the first year of college (Figure 2). Because we expect this model to serve as the main mechanism that relates home-school value conflict to GPA, we do not expect a direct effect from conflict to GPA. Instead, we predict that home-school value conflicts will have a significant indirect effect on GPA through the paths of the intervening variables.

Here are additional questions and hypotheses:

1. Does students’ typical resolution strategy relate to psychological distress, attention and school problems, and college GPA?

2. Female students will report higher levels of home-school value conflict than males.

3. Students who live closer to home will experience higher levels of direct home-school value conflicts (e.g., conflicts between attending family events vs. doing academic work, spending time with family vs. doing academic work). However, this pattern will reverse with
conflicts between using money for college expenses vs. for transportation costs to travel home: students who live further from home will experience this conflict more frequently.

**Distinctive Contributions of the Study**

The current study has several distinctive contributions. Though Stephens and colleagues have broken new ground in demonstrating the separate effects of cultural mismatch during college on academics and physiological measures of well-being (Stephens, Fryberg et al., 2012; Stephens, Townsend, et al., 2012), our study attempts to establish the mechanism behind these relations; this mechanism is the link between well-being and academics. Our study also contributes to an understanding of underrepresented groups in higher education by pointing to the unique sociodemographic positioning of Latinos within the larger population of first-generation college students. In addition, our consequences model has the distinction of being grounded in students’ subjective experiences with home-school cultural value conflicts (Vasquez-Salgado et al., 2015). Our study is also the first to examine whether certain choices taken in order to resolve a cultural conflict relate to college adjustment outcomes. Last but not least, our study contributes to the understanding of how culture shapes the first year college experience for females versus males.

**Method**

**Participants**

During the Spring quarter of their first year of college at the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA), students were recruited via the psychology subject pool and flyers posted throughout campus. The only requirement was that participants had to be in their first year at UCLA. They could be transfer students, and there were eight transfer students in the final sample. The average age of our final sample was 18.82 (SD = 1.43). Ninety-nine percent of our sample was between the ages of 18 to 22; one participant was 30 years old. Though emerging adulthood
is characterized by ages 18-25, research suggests, “there are many...who continue their emerging adult lifestyle through their late twenties and into their early thirties” (Arnett, 2014, pg. 7). Thus, we decided to keep the 30-year-old in our sample because the fact that she is exploring the potential for college suggests she is still an emerging adult.

A total of 137 students completed the survey. However, since our study sought to make comparisons between the three major ethnic groups on campus – Asian, European American and Latino, we decided to limit our sample to these groups. The ethnic breakdown of our sample is similar to previous studies that have focused on family obligation (Fuligni et al., 1999; Telzer & Fuligni, 2009a; Telzer & Fuligni, 2009b). Thus, our sample size decreased to 103 (We use the term “Asian” rather than “Asian American” to include international students from Asia; however, only 6 students in our sample identified as international students, five of the six being Asian).

Our sample size further decreased to 102 because one student did not complete the entire survey (The first three columns in Table 1 provide additional sample details, including ethnic background.). One important point to note is though 35% of our sample were first-generation college students, this was comprised of Latino and Asian students; there were no European American first-generation college students. Thus, this information should be taken into account when reviewing our results and will be further considered in the Discussion section. Moreover, the majority of our participants were female (i.e., female, \( n = 79 \); male, \( n = 23 \)). In addition, a large proportion of our sample came from immigrant family backgrounds (i.e., at least one of their parents was born outside of the U.S.); more specifically, 94%, 100%, and 17% of Latino, Asian and European American students, respectively. Lastly, 22% of the students in our sample were psychology or psychobiology majors. They had the option of receiving two research participation credits or a movie ticket. Most participants chose the movie ticket.

**Procedure**
The UCLA Institutional Review Board approved all procedures of the study. Participants were told that the purpose of the study was to explore the occurrence, resolution, and developmental consequences of home-school and peer-peer value conflicts during the first year of college at UCLA. After giving consent, participants completed the 25-30 minute survey. For the current article, only questions relating to home-school conflicts were utilized; findings concerning peer-peer conflicts will be the topic of a second article and are not discussed here.

**Measures**

**First-generation college student status.** Students who reported that their parents’ highest level of education was “graduated from high school” were considered “first-generation college students”. Those that reported that at least one of their parents had “some college” education or higher were considered “not first-generation college students”.

**Parent-income.** Students were asked to respond to the question, “How much is your parents combined yearly income?” Responses ranged from 0, “Less than 10,000”, to 11, “More than 150,000”.

**Family obligation values for future support.** A combination of three items that centered on supporting or being motivated to support one’s family in the future was utilized to assess family obligation values. Two of the items were taken from Fuligni et al.’s (1999) subscale measure of future support for family. Participants were asked to report on a scale from 1 = not important at all to 5 = very important, “How important do you feel it is for you to engage in the following behaviors?” “Help your parents financially in the future.” “Have your parents live with you when you get older.” The third item was taken from Stephens, Fryberg et al.’s (2012) measure of collectivistic motives for going to college. Participants were asked to respond to the following statement, on a scale from 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree: “I decided to attend college so that I can help my family out after I’m done with college”. Because all of the
items were on a 5-point scale, participants’ responses were averaged. A Cronbach’s alpha of .72 indicated that there was an acceptable internal consistency among the items (Newton & Rudestam, 1999). In addition to the rationale outlined in the introduction, future family support was utilized in the measure because higher SES status among Latinos decreases this particular form of family support (Vallejo, 2012).

**Home-school value conflicts.** A 15-item measure assessing conflict between collectivistic family obligations and individualistic school obligations was created. The measure included six sub-scales of home-school value conflict. Four of these sub-types were conflicts that came up during focus groups of Latino first-generation college students from immigrant families (Vasquez-Salgado et al., 2015): attending family events vs. doing academic work (3-items; $\alpha = .71$), spending time with family vs. doing academic work (3 items; $\alpha = .92$), assisting family vs. doing academic work (4-items; $\alpha = .90$) and using money for transportation costs to travel home vs. for college expenses (1-item). Although sub-scales typically include multiple items, the use of a single item (in this case, using money for transportation costs to travel home vs. for college expenses) can be both appropriate and valid (Bergkvist & Rossiter, 2007); in the case of this subscale, a single item covered the entire domain of interest. Furthermore, two sub-types of conflict were based on Fuligni et al.’s (1999) measure of family obligation: living further from home vs. remaining close to home (2-items; $\alpha = .83$), using money to help family vs. for college expenses (2-items; $\alpha = .87$). Sample items included: “Since you started UCLA, how often have you had to choose between doing your academic work and” “attending family events”, “spending time at home with your family” and “helping take care of family members.” Responses ranged from 1, “Never”, to 4, “Frequently”. The Cronbach’s alpha for all items compiled as 1 measure was .88, indicating excellent internal consistency among the items. In all of the major analyses
(the models shown in Figures 3-5), a mean frequency across all 15-items and subtypes was used. In the analyses concerning geographical distance from home, the six sub-types of home-school value conflict were used. Please see Appendix for a complete list of items.

**Typical conflict resolution strategy.** In order to assess students’ typical choice when confronting home-school conflicts, they were asked, “Think about the time since you started UCLA…when you had to chose between something involving academics versus family…what did you typically choose?” Response choices included, “Family”, “Academics”, “I found a way to do both”, “I tried to do each of them some of the time”, and “Not applicable”. Students who selected “Not applicable” were not included in the relevant analyses.

**Psychological distress.** A seven-item measure captured students’ feelings of distressed mood since they started UCLA. Students were asked to rate the extent (1 = not at all to 5 = extremely) to which they felt “on edge”, “nervous”, “uneasy”, “unable to concentrate”, “sad”, “hopeless” and “discouraged”. This measure, previously utilized with a diverse sample (Huynh & Fuligni, 2010), is an adapted version of Lorr and McNair’s (1971) Profile of Mood States and yielded an excellent alpha of .91. The only change from the original measure was to direct participants’ attention to their time at UCLA by prefacing the instrument with “Since you started UCLA.”

**Attention and school problems.** A 6-item measure of attention and school problems was utilized. Students were asked to rate (1 = Never to 5 = Always) how often they experienced certain situations since they started UCLA. These situations included three attention problems; these were based on attention difficulties first-generation college students from Latino immigrant families discussed in focus groups (i.e., “had a difficult time focusing on studying”, “had a difficult time focusing in class, “had a difficult time focusing during an exam”; Vasquez-Salgado et al., 2015). The measure also included three items from Telzer and Fuligni (2009) pertaining to
other school problems (i.e., “did not understand something taught in class”, “did poorly on a test, quiz or homework”, “did not turn in homework that was due”). The Telzer and Fuligni items were adapted by adding the phrase “Since you started UCLA.” All items reflected students’ attention and school difficulties that came up in focus groups with first-generation college students from Latino immigrant families (Vasquez-Salgado et al., 2015). The Cronbach’s alpha was .84, indicating excellent internal consistency among the items.

**College GPA.** Students’ self-reports of their grade point average earned in the Fall and Winter quarter of their first year at UCLA were assessed using a scale ranging from 0.00 to 4.00.

**Geographical distance from home.** Geographical distance utilized an ordinal scale to capture the distance that students lived from their family’s home. The scale allowed us to account for students that lived with family members and those that had parents that lived outside of the country. If a student indicated that they lived with their parents or other relatives, their distance was coded as “0”. If a student indicated that their parents lived outside of the country, their distance was coded as “7”. Codes for the distances between these values were as follows: “1” (45 minutes or less), “2” (50 to 60 minutes), “3” (75 to 105 minutes), “4” (120 minutes to 180 minutes), “5” (249 to 480 minutes; most of these participants had parents that lived in-state but far away), and “6” (519 to 2280 minutes; mostly those with families living out of state).

The majority of students lived in the UCLA dorms (91%, n = 93). A few students reported that they lived with their parents (4%, n = 4), off-campus with friends (3%, n = 3) or other (2%, n = 2). Those that reported “other” indicated that they lived with “summer roommates” or “off-campus”. No students reported that they lived off campus with relatives who were not their parents.

**Design and Analysis**
Two separate processes were examined: predictors and consequences of home-school value conflict. Path analysis, a structural equation modeling (SEM) technique, using EQS 6.1 for Windows, was performed. Three separate models (two for predictors, one for consequences) were tested (Figures 1 and 2).

Data analytic techniques occurred in three major steps. In the first step, variables within each model were examined for significant linear correlations. If a variable was not linearly related to the other variables, it was removed from the model. All statistical assumptions for path analysis were assessed and met. In the second step, the hypothesized models were tested. Model fit was evaluated using chi-square ($x^2$), comparative fit index (CFI), and root mean square error approximation (RMSEA). The model is a “good” fit if the $x^2$ is not significant or near non-significance, the CFI is greater than or equal to .95, and RMSEA is less than or equal to .05 (Byrne, 2006). The model is of “moderate” fit when at least two of these are met. Finally, if the fit was appropriate, direct and indirect effects were examined. A direct effect is when one variable predicts another, and an indirect effect is when one variable predicts another variable through one or more intervening variables (Kline, 2011). In order to confirm whether an indirect effect was the main source of influence, a direct path between those variables must not be statistically significant. If the direct path is significant, this implies that the indirect effect only explained part of the relation between one variable and another (Kline; Kohen, Leventhal, Dahinten & McIntosh, 2008).

Means, standard deviations, and zero-order correlations for all variables of interest are presented in Tables 2 and 3. One variable (i.e., Fall quarter GPA) was removed from the consequences model due to a lack of correlation with frequency of home-school value conflicts. Overall, all three models (Figures 3, 4, and 5) fit the data well.

**Results**
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Ethnic Differences

Socioeconomic status, family obligation values, and home-school conflicts. Seventy-six percent of Latino, 26% of Asian and no European American youth, respectively, were first-generation college students. As expected, a chi-square test revealed that Latino students were first-generation college students significantly more often than either European American students, \( \chi^2(1, N = 63) = 37.76, p < .001 \), or Asian students, \( \chi^2(1, N = 73) = 18.78, p < .001 \). In addition, Asian students were first-generation college students significantly more often than European American students, \( \chi^2(1, N = 68) = 8.72, p = .003 \).

Ethnic group differences in mean parent income level, family obligation values, and number of home-school conflicts reported by participants was assessed with a MANOVA. Ethnic group differences were significant overall, \( F(6, 196) = 11.39, p < .001 \). Ethnic group differences were also significant for each of the individual variables, as reported below.

There was a significant difference among the various ethnic groups in reported parental income, \( F(2, 99) = 18.06, p < .001 \). As predicted, Latinos reported significantly lower parent income than did Asian and European American youth, \( t(99) = 3.80, p < .001 \), and \( t(99) = -5.93, p < .001 \), respectively. The income reported by Asian youth was also significantly lower than that reported by European American youth, \( t(99) = -2.47, p = .015 \) (see Table 1 for means and standard deviations).

The ethnic groups also differed on family obligation values for future support, \( F(2, 99) = 16.84, p < .001 \). As hypothesized, Latinos reported mean family obligation values that were significantly higher than that of European and Asian youth, \( t(99) = 5.66, p < .001 \), and \( t(99) = -1.68, p = .048 \), respectively. Youth from Asian backgrounds also reported family obligation values that were significantly higher than those reported by European Americans, \( t(99) = 4.22, p < .001 \) (see Table 1 for means and standard deviations).
Finally, the ethnic groups differed in mean frequency of home-school conflicts experienced, $F(2, 99) = 8.29, p < .001$. As predicted, Latinos reported more home-school value conflicts than did European Americans, $t(99) = -4.06, p < .001$, or Asians, $t(99) = -2.26, p = .03$. There was no significant difference between the mean number of conflicts reported by Asian and European American students (see Table 1 for means and standard deviations). Taken together, these results indicate that, as predicted, youth from Latino backgrounds were significantly more likely to be first-generation college students, come from a home with low parental income, have the strongest family obligation values for future support, and experience the most home-school value conflicts. Note however that these conclusions apply to ethnic groups with typical (for Southern California) but different sociodemographic characteristics.

**Predictors of Home-school Conflict**

**Model 1.** This model examined predictors of home-school value conflict during the first year of college. The path model (Figure 3) fit the data well, $\chi^2(4, N = 102) = 3.60, p > .05$, CFI = 1.00, RMSEA = .00. Having a Latino background, compared to an Asian or European American background, was associated with having parents who did not attend college (i.e., being a first-generation college student); having parents who did not attend college related to lower parent income. Moreover, being a first-generation college student and reporting lower parent income predicted stronger family obligation values for future support. There was also a significant indirect effect of first-generation college status on family obligation values through parent income (unstandardized indirect effect = .28, $p = .034$; standardized indirect effect = .15). Together, these pathways indicate that part of the reason why first-generation college students held high family obligation values is because of low parent income. As expected, stronger family obligation values for future support predicted more home-school value conflicts.
Contrary to expectations, a direct path linking Latino background with more frequent home-school value conflicts was significant. However, as expected, an indirect path from Latino ethnicity to more frequent home-school value conflicts was also significant (unstandardized indirect effect = .10, \( p = .010 \); standardized indirect effect = .07). These paths suggest that Latino background directly and indirectly (i.e., through the statistical paths of the intervening variables involving first-generation college student status, lower parent income, and stronger family obligation values for future support) predicted more home-school value conflicts (Figure 3).

Because Asian students have also been characterized in the literature as collectivistic, we tested an alternative model that included a comparison between Asian and Latino versus European American students, but the model did not fit. Thus, the original variable included in the model appears to be the most appropriate one.

Overall, 37% of the variance in students’ generation status, 44% of the variance in reported family income, 22% of the variance in family obligations for future support, and 17% of the variance in home-school value conflict was explained by the model. Variances were significant for all variables.

**Model 2.** In order to generalize our predictors of home-school value conflict model to all first-generation college students in our sample (relevant for the Latino and Asian students in our sample), we tested a model that was the same as Model 1, but eliminated the Latino ethnicity variable. The path model (Figure 4) fit the data moderately well, \( \chi^2(1, N = 102) = 1.79, p > .05 \), CFI = .99, RMSEA = .09. All direct and indirect paths were significant as in Model 1. For example, being a first-generation college student and reporting lower parent income predicted stronger family obligation values for future support, and these values in turn, predicted more home-school value conflicts.
Like Model 1, we also tested whether there was an indirect relation between the two outer variables. First-generation college status did not relate to frequency of home-school conflicts. Instead, there was a significant indirect effect of first-generation college student status (parents had no post-secondary education) on home-school value conflicts through the pathways of the intervening variables involving low parental income and strong family obligation values; unstandardized direct effect = .18, \( p = .006 \); standardized indirect effect = .13), suggesting these paths as the main source of influence that predicts first-generation college students’ experiences with these conflicts (Figure 4). Taken together, our sociodemographic predictors of home-school value conflict generalize beyond Latino students to other first-generation college students in our sample.

Overall, 44% of the variance in reported family income, 22% of the variance in family obligation values for future support, and 13% of the variance in home-school value conflict was explained by the model. Variances were significant for all variables.

**Consequences of Home-school Conflict**

This model examined consequences of home-school value conflict during the first year of college. As predicted (Figure 2), the path model (Figure 5) fit the data well, \( \chi^2(2, N = 102) = .07, p > .05, \) CFI = 1.00, RMSEA = .00. More home-school value conflicts predicted higher levels of psychological distress. In turn, high levels of psychological distress predicted greater attention and school problems. Finally, greater attention and school problems related to lower college GPA during winter quarter of the first year.

As expected, there was no direct relation between home-school value conflict and GPA. Instead, there was a significant indirect effect of home-school value conflicts on college GPA through the statistical pathways of the intervening variables (i.e., home-school conflicts \( \rightarrow \) higher levels of psychological distress \( \rightarrow \) greater attention and school problems \( \rightarrow \) GPA;
(unstandardized indirect effect = -.05, \( p = .012 \); standardized indirect effect = -.06), suggesting these paths as the main mechanism by which these conflicts relate to academic performance (Figure 5).

Overall, 11% of the variance in psychological distress, 39% of the variance in attention and school problems, and 13% of the variance in winter quarter GPA was explained. Variances were significant for all variables.

**Typical Resolution Strategy and Outcomes**

A MANOVA was utilized to assess the effects of students’ typical mode of resolving home-school value conflict. The way in which students resolved these conflicts made a significant overall difference for psychological distress, attention and school problems, and GPA, \( F(12, 267) = 2.16, p = .014 \). Post-hoc analyses with Bonferroni correction revealed that when family was reported as the typical choice, outcomes were, overall, more negative (see Table 4 for means and standard deviations).

**Psychological distress.** The typical choice students made yielded significant differences in psychological distress, \( F(3, 90) = 6.59, p < .001 \). Students who typically selected family reported significantly higher levels of psychological distress than students who typically chose academics or both, \( d = 1.04, p = .029 \), and, \( d = 1.14, p = .003 \), respectively.

**Attention and school problems.** The typical choice students made also yielded significant differences in attention and school problems, \( F(3, 90) = 4.84, p = .004 \). Students who typically chose family reported significantly higher attention and school problems than those who typically selected academics or those who found a way to do both, \( d = .70, p = .020 \), and, \( d = .89, p < .001 \), respectively.

**College GPA.** Students’ typical choice resulted in significant mean differences in college GPA during fall quarter, \( F(3, 90) = 2.83, p = .043 \), but no significant mean differences during
winter quarter. More specifically, students who typically selected family had significantly lower GPA than students who found a way to do both, $d = -.61, p = .038$.

**Comparing Home-School Value Conflict Across Genders**

An independent samples t-test was conducted in order to examine whether males and females differed in their experiences with home-school value conflicts. As predicted, female students ($M = 2.52, SD = .67$) reported experiencing higher levels of home-school value conflict than males ($M = 1.91, SD = .58$), $t(100) = -3.98, p < .001$, during the first year of college.

**Geographical Distance From Home and Types of Home-School Value Conflict**

Students who lived closer to home reported more frequently experiencing four of the five types of home-school conflict. As hypothesized, students who lived closer to home more frequently reported experiencing conflicts between attending family events vs. doing academic work, spending time with family vs. doing academic work, assisting family vs. doing academic work and remaining close to home vs. living further from home, $r(102) = -.24, p = .007, r(102) = -.28, p = .002, r(102) = -.26, p = .004$, and $r(102) = -.24, p = .008$, respectively. Contrary to expectation, there was no relation between distance and using money for college expenses vs. using money to help family, $r(102) = -.12, p = .115$.

As expected, the relation between another type of home-school conflict - using money for college expenses vs. transportation costs to travel home – was significant in the opposite direction, $r(102) = .19, p = .027$. That is, students who lived further from home experienced more situations of having to choose between using money for college expenses or to travel home.

**Discussion**

We have shown that two forms of socioeconomic status (i.e., no parent college education, low parental income) play a role in students’ cultural values for future family support, and such values make students susceptible to *home-school cultural value conflict*, a conflict between
family obligations and academic obligations. Our findings also demonstrate that compared with members of other ethnic groups, Latino students in our sample come from family backgrounds that more often contain the sociodemographic influences (i.e., parents with no college education, low parent income) that produce strong family obligation values for future support. Though the disparities in education attainment for Latino youth have primarily focused on academic barriers (e.g., limited parental socioeconomic resources), our findings suggest a different phenomenon that might explain Latino students’ difficulties during the first year of college: Compared to their other-ethnic peers, Latino students held significantly stronger family obligation values, values that are known to conflict with the individualism of a university environment (Stephens, Fryberg, et al., 2012; Vasquez-Salgado et al. 2015). Consequently, they more frequently experienced home-school value conflicts and such conflicts had negative repercussions for well-being and academic development.

But students from other ethnic groups also have parents with low educational levels and incomes; and these findings should apply to them as well. Like Latino students, the findings in Model 2 (Figure 4) imply that socioeconomic variables play a role other first-generation college students experiences with home-school value conflict (particularly, Asian students, as there were no first-generation college students in our European American sample; Table 1). However, the direct link from Latino ethnicity to home-school conflicts in Model 1 (Figure 3) implies a commonality among all Latino students, both continuing and first-generation; this commonality exists despite sociodemographic variation within the Latino sample. The fact that the model did not work when Asian students were grouped with Latino students implies that, unlike Latino ethnicity, Asian ethnicity does not in itself produce home school value conflicts; sociodemographic factors are required.
The heart of our study assessed predictors and consequences of home-school conflicts. Our first predictor model was in line with expectations and prior research (Greenfield, 2009; Guan et al., 2014; Park & Millora, 2010; Stephens, Fryberg, et al., 2012; Terenzini et al, 1996). Latinos more than Asian and European Americans, were first-generation college students; first-generation college student status was related to lower parent income. Moreover, having parents who did not attend college and had low incomes predicted stronger family obligation values for future support. High endorsement of family obligation values, in turn, predicted greater experience with home-school value conflicts during the first year of college. On average, Latino students experienced each of 15 specific home-school conflicts “sometimes,” with a mean close to 3. On average, other groups experienced each of 15 specific home-school conflicts “rarely” with a mean closer to 2. These findings imply that Latino students’ sociodemographic backgrounds (i.e., parents with no college education, low parent income) is an important force that leads them to a strong sense of family obligation for future support. It is one factor that relates to experiencing a higher frequency of home-school value conflicts during the first year of college. In other words, Latinos’ low socioeconomic backgrounds is a factor in their motivation to give back to their families in the future, and such values for future family support make them more susceptible to situations that involve a choice between engaging in family obligations or focusing on their academic studies, an activity that may enable them to eventually support their families in the future.

The consequences of home-school conflicts were also as hypothesized. Reported experiences with home-school value conflicts predicted reports of psychological distress. Psychological distress, in turn, related to higher reports of attention and school problems; these problems, in turn, were associated with lower GPAs during the first year of college. This model, based on the notion that cultural conflict may affect development (Greenfield, 2009; Stephens,
Fryberg et al., 2012) and grounded in the experiences of participants in a prior qualitative study, provides quantitative support for the mechanism by which these conflicts relate to academic performance during the first year of college (Vasquez-Salgado et al., 2015).

We found that students who typically resolved the conflict by choosing family were the worst off on all outcomes. Specifically, compared to those who typically chose academics or found a way to do both, those who typically chose family reported they had experienced more psychological distress and attention and school problems. This finding makes sense since choosing family over academics is an extremely divergent choice to make at a university that prioritizes individual academic achievement; students are going against the normative behaviors that are expected in this individualistic setting.

As expected, we also found that females experienced a higher frequency of home-school value conflicts than males. This is understandable since females are typically raised to fulfill productive tasks at home and males are typically raised to fulfill productive tasks further from home (Manago et al., 2014). In other words, because females are more heavily burdened by family obligations (Stein et al., 2014), it makes sense that they would experience more conflicts during the first year of college.

Lastly, the geographical distance from one’s family home played a role in students’ experience with conflicts. As a whole, these results align with prior qualitative work suggesting that students who live closer to home experience direct conflicts with their family more frequently (e.g., attending a family event vs. doing academic work); students who live further from home experienced this type of conflict less frequently.

**Contribution**

We show that low socioeconomic students’ strong collectivistic family obligation values for future support relate to experiences with home-school value conflict during the first year of
college. These results align with findings concerning cross-cultural value conflict at an earlier developmental stage between Latino immigrant parents and their children’s teachers (Greenfield, 2009; Greenfield et al., 2000; Greenfield & Quiroz, 2013; Raeff et al., 2000). Those studies showed that Latino immigrant parents, predominately from low income and education backgrounds, held collectivistic values, while their children’s teachers held individualistic values.

Though prior work has demonstrated the effects of a general mismatch in values on students’ academics and well-being (Stephens, Fryberg et al., 2012; Stephens, Townsend, et al., 2012), our study is unique because it utilizes theory and students’ prior qualitative experiences (Vasquez-Salgado et al., 2015) to demonstrate, quantitatively, the mechanism by which this clash in values relates to these outcomes. The links from collectivistic family obligation values for future support (predominately held by students from low socioeconomic backgrounds), to home-school value conflict, to psychological distress, to attention and school problems, and to lower academic grades are the mechanism by which collectivistic values relate to poor well-being and academic outcomes in college. The multiethnic sample allowed us to extend this conclusion to Asian students whose parents did not attend college.

Our study reveals that negative outcomes are at their worst when family values win out in the clash of values, and outcomes are consistently better when one is able to fulfill both family obligations and academic obligations. At the same time, this study establishes the special vulnerability that Latino students have for home-school value conflict, because of combining parents’ limited educational opportunities and income with other unidentified cultural or sociodemographic factors implied by the direct link from Latino ethnicity to home-school conflicts in Model 1 (Figure 3). This implies that aside from socioeconomic status, there is something about the Latino ethnicity not captured in this model that makes them particularly susceptible to experiencing these conflicts.
Furthermore, our findings signify that home-school value conflict is a very important topic for further scientific discussion because of the pervasive role it plays in college adjustment outcomes during emerging adulthood. If these conflicts impede students’ adjustment, students may interpret academic and social problems as signs that college is not for them. This is especially true for students living closer to home, females and the Latino student population since home-school value conflicts were more prevalent for these groups.

Though our study was conducted at a public research university, with strict criteria for gaining entry (e.g., superior high school GPA and standardized scores), we believe that our results generalize to students’ attending selective private institutions and less selective public universities (Stephens, Fryberg, et al., 2012). In fact, our results might be even more applicable to students at less selective colleges, such as community colleges or state schools, because those students typically commute to and from school and thus, live much closer to home.

**Limitations and Future Directions**

Because our measure of family obligation centered on future family support, it is more tied to low SES than other forms of obligation (companionship, etc.). But in terms of globalized social change, this form of family obligation is exactly the type that shifts as people become wealthier, more urbanized, and more formally educated (Greenfield, 2009; Kağıtçıbaşı & Ataca, 2005). Indeed, as Latinos in Southern California become more upwardly mobile, it is this form of family obligation that virtually disappears (Vallejo, 2012). Thus, this form of family obligation fit most appropriately with theory and prior research. Future research should examine how other forms of family obligation relate to conflicts experienced during the first year of college.

The main dependent measure (home-school cultural value conflicts) was developed based on the experiences of one specific ethnic group (Latinos) and of one specific socioeconomic class (first generation college students) and then applied to other ethnic groups (i.e., Asian, non-
Latino Whites) and socioeconomic classes. Therefore, because the measure was developed with a specific sub-group in mind, it may not include other home-school conflicts that would be relevant for youth from other ethnic groups or social classes and thus not be appropriate to generalize to a broader sample of students. Nonetheless, we can conclude that the measure works as predicted in our multiethnic sample. Future research should continue to test whether the measure operates appropriately for all ethnic groups.

Reflecting the sociodemographic composition of California, but, at the same time, limiting the disentanglement of SES and ethnicity was the fact that Latinos constituted most of the low SES portion of our sample. Though Asian students contained a reasonable proportion of first-generation college students, there were no first-generation college students among the European Americans. A larger sample with an equal proportion of students whose parents did and did not go to college across the various ethnic groups would make possible an analysis of within-group variability in each ethnic group (García Coll et al., 1996) and how it relates to experience with home-school conflicts.

Another limitation of our study was its cross-sectional nature. This is important to point out for three different reasons. First, though we used path analysis to document the mechanisms in antecedents and consequences of home-school value conflicts, the cross-sectional nature of our study prevents us from claiming these mechanisms as a process that unfolds over time (Selig & Preacher, 2009). Thus, the links represented in our models represent a series of correlations that are consistent with but do not prove causal relations. Second, the cross-sectional nature of our study made it difficult to understand the differing relation between certain variables with GPA. For example, it is unclear why home-school value conflict was correlated with Winter GPA but not Fall GPA. It might suggest that these conflicts do not immediately begin to affect students’ grades but the design of our study does not permit us to conclude this. Finally, the fact
that we had access to only Fall and Winter GPA made it difficult to obtain a complete portrait of GPA during the first year of college. Nonetheless, despite these limitations, our results are a first step to providing quantitative evidence for the mechanisms in antecedents and consequences of home-school value conflicts, as well as the relations between typical resolution in a conflict situation and college adjustment outcomes. In order to address these limitations, future research should have a longitudinal design (e.g., assess students’ GPA at the end of each quarter and use a daily diary to measure conflicts, distress, and attention and school problems).

**Potential Application**

Our findings can be used to help spawn institutional changes, such as making home-school conflicts explicit to students themselves, as well as to the stakeholders of educational institutions. An understanding of home-school value conflicts can be highly useful for high school guidance counselors dealing with socioeconomically and ethnically diverse students - particularly in preparing first-generation and low-income students for universities.

This understanding can also lead to greater cross-cultural sensitivity on the part of postsecondary faculty, graduate teaching assistants, and perhaps residential life staff (e.g., resident advisors, directors). More generally, our findings indicate the need for interventions that will alleviate home-school value conflict and provide coping strategies, in order to enhance the well-being and academic achievement of first-generation college students.
Table 1.

*First-Generation College Status, Parent Income, Family Obligation Values and Home-School Cultural Value Conflicts Among the Various Ethnic Groups*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Bkgd.</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>First-Gen. College (Yes/No)</th>
<th>Parent Income</th>
<th>Family Obligation Values</th>
<th>Home-School Conflict</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>10/29 7.39 (3.84) 3.85 (.73)</td>
<td>2.11 (.62)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European America</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0/29 9.46 (3.39) 3.03 (.93)</td>
<td>2.35 (.69)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26/8 4.35 (2.87) 4.17 (.73)</td>
<td>2.72 (.62)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>36/66 6.97 (3.95) 3.73 (.91)</td>
<td>2.38 (.69)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* First-Gen College (Yes/No) = First-generation college student status (First-generation college student/Not a first-generation college student); Mean (Standard deviation); for Parent Income: 4 = 30K to 39,999K, 7 = 60,000 to 69,999 and 9 = 80,000 to 89,999
Table 2.

Means, Standard Deviations and Zero-order Correlations for Variables of Interest in Model Assessing Predictors of Home-School Cultural Value Conflict

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
<th>4.</th>
<th>5.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Latino Ethnicity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. First-Gen. College</td>
<td>.61***</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Parent Income</td>
<td>-.47***</td>
<td>-.66***</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Family Obligation</td>
<td>.35***</td>
<td>.44***</td>
<td>-.41***</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. H-S Conflict</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>-.29***</td>
<td>.35***</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean

| Mean | .33 | .35 | 6.97 | 3.73 | 2.38 |

Stand. Dev.

| .48 | .48 | 3.95 | .91 | .69 |

Note: Latino Ethnicity = Latino background (coded as 1) vs. not (coded as 0); First-Gen. College = First-generation college student (coded as 1) vs. not (coded as 0); H-S Conflict = Home-school cultural value conflict; $p < .001***$, $p < .01**$, $p < .05$; one-tailed; entire sample was included
Table 3.

*Means, Standard Deviations and Zero-order Correlations for Variables of Interest in Model Assessing Consequences of Home-School Cultural Value Conflict*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
<th>4.</th>
<th>5.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. H-S Conflict</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Psychological Distress</td>
<td>.34***</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Attention &amp; School Prob.</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.62***</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. College GPA (Fall)</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.30***</td>
<td>-.30***</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. College GPA (Winter)</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
<td>-.34***</td>
<td>.75***</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stand. Dev.</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* H-S Conflict = Home-school cultural value conflict; Attention & School Prob. = Attention and school problems; \( p < .001***, p < .01**, p < .05^*; one-tailed; entire sample was included
Table 4.

**Typical Resolution and Mean Psychological Distress, Attention and School Problems and College GPA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Psychological Distress</th>
<th>Attention &amp; School Prob.</th>
<th>College GPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academics</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each Some of the Time</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: College GPA = Fall quarter/Winter quarter; sample size decreased because only participants who provided a typical resolution were included*
Figure 1. Hypothesized model for predictors of home-school value conflict: Model 1. Latino = Latino ethnicity (coded as 1) vs. not (coded as 0); First-Gen = First-generation college student (students’ parents did not attend college; coded as 1) vs. not (coded as 0). A dashed line indicates a non-significant relation was expected. Note that Model 2 was identical to Model 1; the only difference was that Latino ethnicity was removed.

Figure 2. Hypothesized model for consequences of home-school value conflict. A dashed line indicates a non-significant relation was expected.
Figure 3. Final Model 1: Predictors of home-school value conflict. Latino = Latino ethnicity (coded as 1) vs. not (coded as 0); First-Gen = First-generation college student (students’ parents did not attend college; coded as 1) vs. not (coded as 0). Included are unstandardized (and standardized) estimates; $p < .001^{***}$, $p < .01^{**}$, $p < .05^{*}$; one-tailed

Figure 4. Final Model 2: Predictors of home-school value conflict. First-Gen = First-generation college student (students’ parents did not attend college; coded as 1) vs. not (coded as 0). A dashed line indicates a non-significant relation. Included are unstandardized (and standardized) estimates; $p < .001^{***}$, $p < .01^{**}$, $p < .05^{*}$; one-tailed
Figure 5. Consequences of home-school value conflict final model. A dashed line indicates a non-significant relation. Included are unstandardized estimates (with standard errors); $p < .001^{***}$, $p < .01^{**}$, $p < .05^{*}$; one-tailed
Appendix

Home-School Cultural Value Conflict Measure Organized by Conflict Type

**Attending family events vs. doing academic work**
Since you started UCLA, how often have you had to choose between your academic work and the following things…
1.) Attending family events
2.) Attending cultural or religious family gatherings
3.) Spending holidays with family

**Spending time with family vs. doing academic work**
Since you started UCLA, how often have you had to choose between your academic work and the following things…
1.) Spending time with your parents or siblings on weekends
2.) Spending time at home with your family
3.) Spending time with your grandparents, cousins, aunts, or uncles

**Assisting your family vs. doing academic work**
Since you started UCLA, how often have you had to choose between your academic work and the following things…
1.) Doing tasks your family needs done
2.) Helping out around your family’s house
3.) Helping take care of family members (e.g., grandparents, parents, siblings)
4.) Helping your brothers or sisters with their homework

**Living further from home vs. remaining close to home**
How often did it happen that you wanted to go further away from home, but your family wanted the following things…
1.) For you to attend a college closer to home
2.) For you to continue living at home

**Using money to help family vs. for college expenses**
Since you started UCLA, how often have you had to choose between using your money for your college expenses (e.g., tuition, living costs) and the following things…
1.) Purchasing something for your family
2.) Giving your family money for something they need

**Using money for transportation costs to travel home vs. for college expenses**
Since you started UCLA, how often have you had to choose between using your money for your college expenses (e.g., tuition, living costs) and the following things…
1.) Transportation costs to travel home (*to visit family)
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The Impact of Home-School Cultural Value Conflicts and President Trump on Latina/o First-Generation College Students’ Attentional Control

Abstract

Home-school cultural conflicts – conflict between family and academic obligations – are associated with unfavorable academic (i.e., attention, grades,) and well-being outcomes for Latina/o first-generation college students (Vasquez-Salgado, et al., 2015; Study 2 of dissertation). The current study followed up prior research with a Distance (close, far) X Gender (male, female) X Condition (home-school value conflict, family obligations, academic obligations, control) design that combined experimental and quasi-experimental elements. An additional quasi-experimental variable emerged as a result of Trump being elected and inaugurated as president half-way through our data collection. 161 Latina/o first-generation college students ($M_{age} = 18.29$) were randomly assigned to one of four experimental primes. Thereafter, they engaged in an attentional control task. As hypothesized, there was a significant interaction between distance and condition. Among students living close to home, the home-school conflict condition produced significantly more attentional disruption than the academic and control conditions. This disruption was concentrated among female students living close to home. The lack of significant difference between the conflict and family obligations condition was largely due to the fact that, as predicted, attentional performance significantly worsened in response to the family obligations prime after Trump was elected and inaugurated. Our results reaffirm the need to create interventions that aid Latina/o first-generation college students in harmonizing their home and school cultures. They also point to a need to create interventions that aid Latina/o college students in negotiating their fears about family, now that Trump is President.
Introduction

Latinas/os now surpass European Americans in college enrollment rates but continue to lag behind all groups in earning a bachelor's degree (Pew Hispanic Center, 2013). One reason why this may occur is because the majority of Latinas/os enrolled in college identify as first-generation college students (i.e., neither parent attended college), which means they have less access to the resources that predict college adjustment. However, an understudied barrier to college success is home-school cultural value conflict, conflict between family obligation and academic obligation. Conflict between family obligation, espoused by Latino immigrant parents, and academic obligation, endorsed by their children's teachers, begins in elementary school (Greenfield & Quiroz, 2013). This value conflict becomes internalized in high school where Latino youth feel torn between working to help their families or going to school (C. Suárez-Orozco & M. Suárez-Orozco, 1995). Family obligations (e.g., attending family events, assisting family) are a collectivistic value that increases further during emerging adulthood (Fuligni, Tseng & Lam, 1999; Fuligni & Pedersen, 2002), a period in development that typically overlaps with the transition to college. The increase in family obligations at this time, combined with an increase in school demands as one enters college, points to a need to examine the consequences of this value conflict at this developmental period.

Our goal was to provide causal evidence that home-school cultural value conflicts disrupt the necessary cognitive resources that Latina/o first-generation college students rely on to succeed in college. This work builds on previous qualitative and survey research showing that home-school cultural value conflicts are both common in the lives Latina/o first-generation college students and can disrupt college adjustment and performance, in part, by reducing
students ability to concentrate on assignments (Vasquez-Salgado, Greenfield & Burgos-Cienfuegos, 2015; Study 2 of dissertation).

We used a laboratory paradigm to prime some of the home and school conflicts that Latina/o first-generation students experience and to measure whether home-school conflicts create a disruption in attentional control using the Stroop task. Importantly, we thought it was important to demonstrate that it is the conflict between the two values, not either value alone, that causes attentional disruption. This conceptualization led to the experimental hypothesis: 

_Hypothesis 1:_ Latina/o first-generation college students experiencing a home-school conflict prime would perform significantly worse (i.e., exhibit more errors) on an attentional control task, compared with participants carrying out tasks priming family obligation alone, school obligation alone, or an irrelevant control activity.

Role of Distance in the Experience of Home-School Cultural Value Conflict

Not all Latina/o first-generation college students experience home-school value conflicts in the same manner. In previous work (Vasquez-Salgado et al., 2015; Study 2 of dissertation), we have found that distance from home plays an important moderating role. Our qualitative and survey studies showed that Latina/o first-generation college students who lived closer to home experienced direct conflicts with their family more frequently (Vasquez-Salgado et al. 2015; Study 2 of dissertation). This experience occurs because their close proximity to home means, for instance, that they must often juggle between attending a family event and completing academic work. Indeed, students who live in closer proximity to their parents' homes also hold stronger family obligation values (Fuligni & Pedersen, 2002) and fulfill these obligations at a higher level (Tseng, 2004), a situation that makes them more susceptible to experiencing
conflicts between family and academic obligations. These findings led to our second and main hypothesis, which is quasi-experimental:

*Hypothesis 2:* The effect of home-school value conflict on attentional control will be greater among Latina/o students living in closer proximity to their parents’ homes, implying a two-way interaction between distance and condition. Because the majority of first-generation college students tend to live within 50 miles from their parents’ home (Saenz et al., 2007), we operationalized “close” as 50 miles or less and far as 51 miles or more.

**Role of Gender in the Experience of Home-School Cultural Value Conflict**

Lastly, we have also found that female students experience higher levels of home-school value conflicts than males (Study 2 of dissertation). This finding aligns with prior research suggesting that females are more heavily burdened by family obligations than males (Stein et al., 2014). This also aligns with the notion that traditionally ascribed gender roles require females to fulfill productive tasks at home and males to fulfill tasks further from home (Manago, Greenfield, Kim & Ward, 2014); direct family obligations (i.e., spending time with family, attending family events, assisting family) typically occur in the home. Our third hypothesis followed:

*Hypothesis 3:* Female students living close to home will be the main drivers of the Condition X Distance effect (Hypothesis 2), such that they will exhibit significantly more attentional disruption in the conflict condition than male students living close to home.

**The Election and Inauguration of President Trump**

Though not intentional, our study was conducted in the midst of a historic political event. About half the participants took part in our study prior to the election and inauguration of President Trump and the remaining took part subsequent to these historical events. This situation
is significant as Donald Trump was a dominant media figure during the 2016 U.S. Presidential election often campaigning on the promise to deport undocumented Latino immigrants. In fact, soon after his inauguration, Donald Trump signed executive orders that would make more undocumented immigrants eligible for immediate deportation (CNN, January 25, 2017); several news outlets reported daily deportations of Latinos, many of whom had families that they had to leave behind. This situation created a natural experiment that tests whether the election and inauguration of Donald Trump may have caused the family obligation condition to trigger worry about the deportation of undocumented family members, thereby causing attentional disruption. We made the election and presidential inauguration the cutoff point for investigating what we term pre- and post-Trump. However, because there were no participants in the family obligation condition between the election and the inauguration, our data cannot specify whether the pre- and post-Trump difference discussed in the results began to show up at the time of the election or at the time of the inauguration.

Although we did not know the documentation status of our participations, all identified as Latina/o and the majority had immigrant parents. Many Latino families in California contain a mix of undocumented members, permanent residents, and citizens. Thus, many of participants’ families may have been at risk of being affected by Trump’s executive actions targeting undocumented immigrants. Taken together, this situation led to the final hypothesis, adding an additional quasi-experimental element to our study:

Hypothesis 4: Priming family obligation alone would increase attentional disruption for students participating in the experiment after the election and inauguration, compared with before the election and inauguration. We did not expect any differences pre- and post-Trump for
the other conditions because we reasoned that priming family obligations alone would make family situations more salient, such as concern about the possibility of family deportations.

Method

Participants

Latina/o first-generation college students who were in their first year at UCLA took part in this study. Participants were recruited through various avenues (e.g., psychology subject pool, classroom announcements, flyers posted throughout campus, and social media). Though 181 participants were run, 20 were removed because they either performed extremely poorly on the practice trials, scored 100% incorrect on the attention task, reported a learning disability, or failed to complete all measures of interest. Thus, the final sample consisted of 161 participants.

Based on the demographic survey carried out after the experiment, all participants identified as Latina/o. Eighty-three percent of the sample was born in the United States and the remaining 17% were born in Latin American countries. However, almost all our participants came from immigrant families: 93% of participants’ mothers were born in Latin American countries and only 7% (n = 12) were born in the United States; 92% of participants’ fathers were born in Latin American countries, 6% were born in the United States, and 2% did not provide a birthplace location.

All participants were first-generation college students, which we defined as having parents who did not receive a college degree. In fact, only seven of the 161 students in the sample had parents with some college experience. The average parental education was junior high school and the average parental income reported was $30-39,999 a year.

The average age of the sample was 18.29 (SD = .51). All participants were right handed and none was colorblind. Sixty percent were female and 40% were male; these values are similar
to that of the larger university campus where about 67% and 33% of Latino entering students are female and male, respectively (average percentages based on the years for when data collection took place).

**Design**

The experimental independent variable was a set of four different primes: 1) family obligations; 2) academic obligations; 3) home-school conflict; 4) favorite restaurants (which served as the control condition). In addition, there were three quasi-experimental independent variables: distance from home (close, far), gender (male, female) and the Trump variable (before or after the election and inauguration). The first two were planned before the experiment began. The third emerged as a result of Trump being elected and inaugurated as president. The dependent variable, attentional control, was defined as the percentage of errors that participants made on a Stroop task, to be elaborated below.

Table 1 shows the number of participants in each of the 16 cells generated by the three planned variables (experimental prime, distance from home, and gender). Fewer male participants reflects the fact that there are twice as many Latino females than males in the university.

Relevant to Hypothesis 4, 18 students in the family obligation prime condition participated before the election and inauguration and 23 participated afterwards; the participant breakdown of the home-school conflict (pre-Trump: n = 20; post-Trump: n = 21), academic obligations (pre-Trump: n = 16; post-Trump: n = 23) and control (pre-Trump: n = 20; post-Trump, n = 20) primes was somewhat similar.
Measures

**Distance.** Distance was assessed through participants’ self-reports of the city, state and zip code for where their parents currently live. This information was then entered onto Google maps in order to determine the number of miles that their parents lived from their current residence (i.e., UCLA). The shortest route was utilized; the number of miles for students that lived with their parents was coded as “0”. Students who lived 50 miles away or less were categorized as living “close” to their family and students who lived 51 miles away or more were categorized as living “far”. Ninety-five percent of the sample lived in the dormitories; only 5% indicated that they lived with their parents. The latter were categorized as "close." The average number of miles from home was 20.02 miles for "close" ($SD = 9.91$; range = 0 to 49.9) and 243.30 miles for "far" ($SD = 432.64$; range = 51.5 to 2,795).

However, in order to create a larger break between the two distance groups, a subject in the “close” group that lived 49.9 miles away was moved to the “far” group. This resulted in a seven-mile gap between the close ($M = 19.66$; $SD = 9.40$; range = 0 to 42.4) versus far ($M = 240.82$; $SD = 430.38$; range = 49.9 to 2,795) group. It is noteworthy to mention that statistical distance results noted in the Results section remained the same regardless of whether the participant was placed in the close or far distance group.

**Gender.** Gender was assessed via participants’ self-reports of their gender. This was an open-ended question: “What is your gender?”

**Priming conditions.** Students were randomly assigned to receive one of the following four prompts to which they responded in writing:
**Family obligations prompt.** In 3-5 sentences, list and describe all of the things that your family would like you to do with or for them (e.g., spending time with family on weekends, attending family events, helping them with tasks):

**Academic obligations prompt.** In 3-5 sentences, list and describe all of the academic work that you need to complete for your current courses (e.g., reading assignments, writing assignments, studying for exams):

**Home-school value conflict prompt.** In 3-5 sentences, list and describe instances, since you started UCLA, when you had to choose between doing your academic work (e.g., reading assignments, writing assignments, studying for exams) and doing things with or for your family (e.g., spending time with family on weekends, attending family events, helping them with tasks):

**Control prompt.** In 3-5 sentences, list and describe your favorite restaurants in Los Angeles (e.g., a pizza parlor, a Chinese restaurant, a fast food restaurant):

**Attentional control.** A Stroop task was used to assess attentional control. This is a popular task of attention and was used in order to capture the lack of concentration and attention associated with home-school conflicts experienced by participants in our prior qualitative (Vasquez-Salgado et al., 2015) and survey studies (Study 2 of dissertation). Students were asked to indicate the ink color presented on two sets of lists. In the first list, the words were congruent with the printed color of the words; e.g., the word "BLUE" was printed in blue ink. However, in the second list, the words and colors were incongruent; e.g., the word "BLUE" was printed in red ink. Both lists were randomly organized to form one list, with congruent and incongruent items comprising 25% (8-items) and 75% (24-items) of the list, respectively. Participants tend to do worse (make more errors) on the incongruent list because we are automatized to read words and there is a semantic interference between the written word and the ink color in which it is printed.
(MacLeod & Dunbar, 1998; MacLeod, 1991; Stroop, 1935). Students’ attentional control on the
task was calculated by subtracting the percentage correct on the incongruent list from that of the
congruent list (baseline). A larger value would indicate a higher percentage incorrect on the
incongruent list than that of the congruent list. The task was programmed on E-prime and took,
on average, between 2 and 3 minutes to complete (Please see Appendix for further details about
the task).

Pre- and Post-President Trump. The election and inauguration of President Trump
served as a natural manipulation. Students in the family obligation condition were considered
Pre-Trump if they participated in the study before the election and inauguration. They were
considered Post-Trump if they participated in the study after the election and inauguration. None
in that condition participated between the election and the inauguration.

In fact, only two students (i.e., one in the home-school conflict condition and another in
the academic obligations condition) participated in the experiment between the election and the
inauguration. Whether they were considered pre- or post-Trump did not affect the results to be
presented.

Procedure

The study was described to potential participants as seeking first year students in order to
test the effectiveness of writing and problem solving activities that might be utilized for a new
course at the University. They were told that the study would involve an online prescreening,
short survey, and an in-person activity that lasted about 1 hour; at the end of the session, they
would receive $25 cash. Interested students completed an online prescreening on
Surveymonkey.com. Participants who met criteria were invited to take part in the study and were
presented with an online consent form. After completing the consent form, participants took a
short survey that asked them to indicate their gender and the city, state and zip code where their parents currently live. Thereafter, students listed their availability for an in-person session.

The in-person session began with one of the four primes, followed by the attentional control task. Thereafter, students completed a post-experiment survey that asked a range of demographic questions. At the end of the session, students received payment for their participation and were told that they would be debriefed once data collection for the study had been finalized. The entire study took, on average, 30 minutes to complete. Thus, the study was much shorter than what it was marketed as. All in-person sessions were conducted by one of several Latina/o experimenters; a sheet with a general introduction to the study being conducted (described in the previous paragraph) was placed over the prime in an effort effort to make the experimenter blind to the condition that was being conducted.

**Piloting.** This study was initially piloted using different priming conditions. The final priming conditions were determined once participants’ written responses to the priming task matched the intended goals of the study. That is, when participants listed and described what we intended to measure (e.g., academic obligations only, conflicts between family and academic obligations). Examples of participants’ responses to each prime will be presented in the Results section. In addition, the paradigm was initially piloted using three dependent outcomes: state anxiety, attentional control and an anagram task. The dependent variable in the final paradigm was selected once a visual trend of Hypothesis 1 with two subjects per condition was present. State anxiety was removed because it did not yield a visual trend across the conditions. Though the attentional control and anagram tasks both yielded preliminary trends that fit with Hypothesis 1, only one dependent variable could be integrated into the final paradigm because the effect was immediate and would dissipate over time.
**Block randomization and power analysis.** Data was collected across two years. During the first year, participants were randomly assigned to conditions using a preset block randomization procedure. Each block included four conditions (family, school, home-school conflict, control) and there were a total of 20 blocks. For each block, the condition order was randomly assigned without replacement using four pieces of paper that named each of the conditions.

However, by the end of the first year of data collection, we had analyzed data from the survey study (Study 2 of the dissertation) and found that distance and gender both related to the experience of home-school value conflict. We therefore added these two new quasi-experimental independent variables to the design. At that point, using the means and standard deviations of data collected from the first half of the study, we conducted a power analysis for our 2X2X4 factorial design; and it was revealed that 12 participants per cell were needed. The participant count for each of the 16 cells was assessed and a plan to fill in the cells to their appropriate number using block randomization was created. Block randomization continued to be utilized (as described above), but the blocks were now separated by the type of participant that was taking part in the in-person session (e.g., close-female, close-male). Thus, rather than one set of randomized condition packets being created for the entire sample (as was done earlier), there was a set of randomized condition packets for each type of participant in our design: close-female, close-male, far-female and far-male. If a subject was removed from the sample as noted earlier, they were replaced by a new subject and, thereafter, the block randomization process was resumed.
Analysis

We used mixed methods, integrating quantitative and qualitative analyses. On the quantitative level, a three-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to test the effect of prime (family obligations, school obligations, home-school conflict, control), distance (close, far), and gender (female, male) on the attentional control measure. If an effect was significant, planned comparisons were conducted. However, in order to test Hypothesis 3, only a planned comparison was conducted. In addition, we used planned comparisons to test the pre- and post-Trump differences across the four conditions. Lastly, because all the hypotheses were directional, one-tailed tests were used (Howell, 2008). On the qualitative level, we have selected extracts from the written responses to the prompts in order to relate the quantitative findings to participants' descriptions of their lived experience.

Results

Hypotheses 1-3

Experimental analysis. Descriptive statistics for the attentional control variable – percentage correct on the incongruent list subtracted from the percentage correct on the congruent list – as a function of the levels of the three preplanned factors is shown in Table 2. As mentioned in earlier paragraphs, the distance variable that had a seven-mile gap between the close versus far group was the one that was used for our analyses. Contrary to Hypothesis 1, the main effect of condition was not significant, $F(2, 145) = 1.46, p > .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .03$, suggesting that the condition alone did not significantly affect attentional control.

However, as predicted in Hypothesis 2, there was a significant interaction between distance and condition, $F(3, 145) = 2.93, p = .036$, partial $\eta^2 = .06$, suggesting that the effect of condition depended on whether a student lived close or far from home. Two separate one-way
ANOVAs revealed that the effect of condition was significant for students living close to home, $F(3, 79) = 3.20, p = .028, \eta^2 = .12$, but not those living far, $F(3, 74) = 1.23, p > .05, \eta^2 = .05$, further confirming our hypothesis that the effect of condition would be concentrated among students living close to home. Planned contrasts among students living close to home revealed that the home-school conflict prime produced significantly more attentional disruption than the academic-obligations prime and or the control condition, $t(21.86) = 2.40, p = .013$, Cohen’s $d = .72$, and $t(23.72) = 2.13, p = .022$, Cohen’s $d = .66$. Though the disruption in attentional control was almost 10 points larger in response to the conflict prime than to the family obligation prime, there was no significant difference between the two groups, $t(32.99) = 1.18, p > .05$, Cohen’s $d = .35$. As will be discussed later, the lack of significant difference could have been due to the pre- and post-Trump difference in the family condition. There were no significant differences between the other conditions (e.g., family obligation vs. academic obligation, $p > .05$).

As predicted in Hypothesis 3, females who lived close to home exhibited significantly more errors in the conflict condition than males who lived close to home, $t(12.53) = 1.87, p = .043$, Cohen’s $d = .72$, suggesting that females living close to home experienced the most attentional disruption during reflection on these conflicts and that gender played a role in the findings noted for Hypothesis 2. Indeed, close visual examination of the means across the cells illustrates a pattern whereby the effect of the condition was more concentrated among females living close to home because they exhibited the highest level of attentional disruption in the conflict condition (Table 2, Figure 1). Please see Table 3 for a complete portrait of the main effects and interactions tested in our three-way ANOVA. Included in Table 3 are tests that were not part of our main hypotheses and therefore, not described in the Results section; please note
that none of those tests were significant (e.g., main effect of gender; interaction between gender and condition).

**Qualitative examples.** Table 4 includes examples of participants’ responses to the experimental primes. The examples exemplify the experience of participants in the different conditions and served as a manipulation check (i.e., showing that the experimental manipulation was successful in priming what we intended to prime). The examples that were selected are typical responses to each prime.

The following examples provide insight into the underlying cognitive and social processes that contribute to the effect of distance and gender on response to the conflict between family obligation and academic obligation:

**Close-female** (17% more errors for incongruent compared with congruent Stroop items). “I have many instances when choosing between doing my academic work or doing thing[s] with my family, for example family gatherings or someone’s birthday. I have tried my very best to plan out when to do work because I know when I go to these activities I might not finish my work. Sometimes, I want to do assignment back home but there is always something my family members need from me…but I have a lot of work to complete that it sometimes gets overwhelming.”

**Close-male** (8% more errors for incongruent compared with congruent Stroop items). “In some instances I have chosen my family over my academic work. When my grandfather passed away during winter quarter, I helped my family recover with support. Not only that but I often choose to help my around the house during the weekends which puts me behind on homework due Monday.”
Far-female (0% errors). “Since starting school at UCLA, I have not had many occasions where I have had to spend time with my family since they live a couple hours away from here. Most of the time, I have enough time to do my academic work instead. One time, I did go home for a weekend to see my family but I made sure to finish or complete the majority of my coursework before going.”

Far-male (0% errors). “Since I am from Norcal, I am significantly far from home. Because of this, I am not able to go home to visit every weekend as that will end up costing a ton of money. However, when there is a holiday I do go visit and during the days that I am home I do little to no academic work as I want to enjoy the little time I am able to spend with my family.”

These qualitative examples illuminate the stark contrast between students living close versus far from home. Those living far may be somewhat unaffected by these conflicts because they experience very few of them. They also seemed to prepare or organize themselves ahead of time around the idea that they will not do any schoolwork while visiting home. In contrast, students living close to home listed different types of conflicts and the negative role they play in their academic studies. They also stated that they wanted to complete their schoolwork during weekends when they were with family, but for the most part were unable to. Thus, the cognitive processes underlying the differences between students living close to home versus far from home is frequency of home-school conflicts and schoolwork organization.

Though the close male and female both listed conflicts and the negative role in their academic studies, their attentional reactions to conflict differed. This may be due to the greater cultural expectations of familial obligations for females versus males (Vasquez-Salgado & Greenfield, under review). This will be elaborated in the Discussion section.
Hypothesis 4: Before and After President Trump

We hypothesized that students would exhibit more attentional disruption in response to the family obligation prime after President Trump’s election and inauguration, compared with prior to these events. As reminder, we predicted that this effect should happen in general for both male and female students as well as students living both close and far from home since the election and inauguration of President Trump served as events triggering concerns for all students who were primed to think about their family. As predicted, there was a significant pre- and post-Trump difference whereby students in the family obligation condition exhibited significantly more attentional disruption if they participated in our study after the presidential election and inauguration (Family $M = .10, SD = .17$) than before (Family $M = .02, SD = .06$), $t(39) = 1.82, p = .038$, Cohen’s $d = .63$.

This finding helps explain why one student who participated in the family obligation condition post-Trump had watery eyes at the end of the session and told the experimenter that she felt the prime prompt was “sort of personal”. This behavior on the part of participants in the family obligation condition did not occur prior to Trump’s election and inauguration.

Furthermore, as predicted in Hypothesis 4, there were no pre- and post-Trump differences in the other conditions (i.e., conflict, academic, and control primes; $p > .05$). The absence of pre- post-Trump difference remained whether the two students in other conditions who participated between the election and the inauguration were considered pre- or post-Trump.

In order to rule out a seasonal explanation for the pre- and post-Trump difference, I compared cognitive disruption pre-Trump with cognitive disruption post-Trump, holding season constant: Participants in the family obligation condition during Winter Quarter 2016 (pre-Trump) were compared with participants in the family obligation condition during Winter Quarter 2017
(post-Trump). The mean difference (more disruption post-Trump) remained \((M = .02, SD = .05,\) pre-Trump; \(M = .10, SD = .17,\) post-Trump). Because the sample size became too small for inferential statistics, I am simply reporting the pattern rather than carrying out a significance test.

Together, these results suggest that in the Trump era, reflection about family is cognitively disruptive for children of Latina/o immigrants. The pre- and post-Trump finding may be the reason why attentional control in the home-school conflict condition did not significantly differ from attentional response to the family obligations prompt.

**Discussion**

The results of our behavioral experiment were, for the most part, in line with our hypotheses. Our results demonstrate that living close to home makes it more likely that one's attentional control will be disrupted by cultural value conflicts between family obligation and academic obligation. We also found that females living close to home may be the main drivers of this effect. Finally, the fear engendered by Trump's deportation rhetoric in his campaign and his actions right after his inauguration prompted us to consider the possibility that attentional control would be more disrupted after the inauguration than before when family was primed in the family obligation condition. We found that Latina/o first-generation college students showed significantly worse attentional control in the family obligation condition after the Trump’s election and inauguration than before.

In line with our expectations, students who lived less than 50 miles from their parents’ homes were affected by the direct conflicts between family obligations and academic obligations while students living 50 miles or more were unaffected. This fits with prior research suggesting that students living close to home experience more of direct home-school value conflicts (Vasquez-Salgado et al., 2015; Study 2 of the dissertation). The qualitative examples of students’
response to the prompts further illustrated that students living close to home experienced more conflicts than students who lived far from home; students living close to home wrote about the disruption these conflicts caused for their college academics but students living far from home seemed to be unaffected, as they organized themselves around the idea that they would enjoy the less frequent and more planned time spent with their families.

Among the sub-group of those living close to home, the home-school conflict condition caused significantly more disruption of attentional control than the academic obligation and control conditions. Contrary to expectations, the conflict condition did not differ significantly from the family obligation condition, although the difference was in the predicted direction. Our explanation lies in the post-Trump state of mind for Latino immigrant families, discussed below.

Nonetheless, as hypothesized, we found that female students living close to home were the main drivers of the attentional disruption caused by conflicts among the sub-group of students living close to home. This is because they exhibited significantly more attentional disruption in response to the home-school conflict prime than male students living close to home. This gender difference aligns with prior research suggesting that females are more burdened by family obligations (Stein et al., 2014). This may be especially true in the Latino culture because of the adoption of beliefs such as, marianismo, which “emphasizes the self-sacrificing role of females and highlights the females’ role as family caretaker” (Sy, 2006; pg. 369).

We believe that the lack of significant difference between the home-school conflict and family obligation condition was largely due to increased disruption and variability in the attentional task in the post-election and inauguration period. The increased disruption and variability (noted in the standard deviation) is a result of Latina/o participants in our study being differentially affected depending on whether or not their families included undocumented
members and the relationship of those members to them. We thought that the family obligation condition might have possibly triggered fears of deportation of undocumented loved ones during the post-Trump period.

Though Trump’s election and inauguration partially disrupted our original hypotheses, we believe this information is very useful for both academic and public awareness. University administrators, faculty, and policy makers need to know that Latina/o college students, a population that continuously struggles in the education pipeline (Sólorzano, Villalpando & Osegura, 2005), is being cognitively affected by the immigration policies and attitudes of our current President.

Limitations & future directions

Our study had four main limitations. First, we did not have a comparison group that was non-Latina/o. However, our prior survey research clearly suggests that Latina/o first-generation college students are more susceptible to these conflicts than Asian or European Americans (Study 2 of dissertation); therefore they were the relevant population.

Our second limitation was that we did not achieve our goal of having 12 subjects across all of our 16 cells. In particular, we did not have enough males, especially males living far from home. Thus, our design was underpowered. Future research in psychology should talk more broadly about the lack of males participating in studies and the scientific implications of this gender imbalance.

Another limitation involved the nature of our conditions. While the conflict condition required students to think about conflict between two different aspects of their lives (family and academics), the other conditions required students to think about one aspect of their lives (family, academics or restaurants). Thus, an additional condition is needed to rule out the notion that
thinking about two pieces of information produces more disruption than home-school value conflict. Nevertheless, the fact that home-school cultural value conflicts involve navigating two aspects of one’s lives is exactly what we were trying to test against only navigating one aspect. Therefore, we believe that our conditions were appropriate and ecologically valid.

Finally, a limitation of our original design was that historic political events occurred in the middle of our data collection. These events probably caused the attentional effect of the family prompt to more closely resemble that of the home-school conflict prompt, contrary to our hypothesis. At the same time, the timing was lucky, in that it produced evidence important to the broader community: President Trump’s immigration policies have caused a disruption in Latina/o college students’ attentional control.
Table 1.

*Participants per cell in a 2 (Distance) X 2 (Gender) X 4 (Condition) Experimental Design*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Close</th>
<th></th>
<th>Far</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$N$</td>
<td>$N$</td>
<td>$N$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home-School Conflict</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Obligations</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Obligations</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.

*Mean Disruption on Attentional Control Task as a Function of Distance, Gender and Condition*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Close</th>
<th>Far</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Females (M)</td>
<td>Males (M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Females (SD)</td>
<td>Males (SD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home-School Conflict</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Obligations</td>
<td>.27 (.38)</td>
<td>.06 (.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.07 (.13)</td>
<td>.11 (.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.07 (.07)</td>
<td>.04 (.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Obligations</td>
<td>.00 (.07)</td>
<td>.04 (.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.00 (.07)</td>
<td>.04 (.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>.07 (.05)</td>
<td>-.02 (.11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.10 (.13)</td>
<td>.13 (.31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.10 (.23)</td>
<td>.05 (.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.06 (.11)</td>
<td>.06 (.16)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.

*Three-Way Analysis of Variance for the effect of Condition, Distance and Gender on Attentional Control*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>η²</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Condition (C)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance (D)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (G)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C X D</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.93*</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C X G</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D X G</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C X D X G</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S within-group</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>(.03)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Values enclosed in parentheses represent mean square errors.

*p < .05
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priming Condition</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family Obligations</td>
<td>“My family enjoys my company all the time, so spending plenty of time with them is a must. When I get a chance to go home on the weekends, they like for me to have dinner with them, just so that I have a moment to talk about things going on in school and in my life. They also like for me to hear them talk about any upcoming plans they have or goals. My family expects me to complete my chores when I go over. Attending church is a must when I go home to my family on the weekends.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Obligations</td>
<td>“For my current courses, Phy Sci 5, Poli Sci 10, and Ethnomusicology 50B, I have many assignments to complete. For Phy Sci 5 I have to complete 5 quizzes, a workbook with 10 chapters worth of questions, a project, midterm, and final. For Poli Sci 10 I have 5 quizzes, 2 essays, and a Final worth 30 percent. Finally, for Ethnomusicology 50B I have two essays, a midterm, a final, and the opportunity for an extra credit essay.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home-School Cultural Value Conflict</td>
<td>“Since I started at UCLA I have gone home almost every weekend to spend time with my family. Anytime it is a family member’s birthday I head back home, for example last week I went for my mom and grandma’s birthday when I should have been reviewing for my midterm. I also go to work to help with things and that takes away from my time for assignments and reading. I also go home whenever they [need] help with anything, like when my grandma needs to go to the doctor and no one else is available to take her.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>“My two favorite restaurants in Los Angeles would be La Fonda and Jonny Rocket. La Fonda’s a Mexican restaurant that always includes live mariachi music. It is owned by Mariachi Los Camperos, one of my favorite mariachi groups, and they perform on the weekends whereas during the week they have other groups perform. Jonny Rocket, specifically the one on Universal City Walk, is my favorite fast food restaurant due to their classic 50’s American theme. In my opinion their burgers and fries are the best and it’s a good place to sit and enjoy a meal after walking around or coming from Universal Studios.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1. Mean disruption on attentional control task across experimental conditions, distance and gender of the participant.
Appendix

Students completed the task on a laptop computer and provided their color-label responses using four keys that were labeled with a blue, yellow, green and red sticker. To ensure that participants understood the task, they were instructed to notice the color-keys on the keyboard (i.e., blue, red, yellow, green) and engaged in 12 color-key practice trials (3 for each color). For the color-key trials, participants were told that they would see an array of X’s on the screen and were to press the color-labeled key corresponding to the color that the X’s were printed in (e.g., press the blue key when they see “XXXXXXXX” printed in blue). The color-key trials were completed in a random order. Next, participants engaged in 16 congruent practice trials (4 for each color) described above. The congruent practice trials were presented in a random order. Participants received feedback on their performance after each trial in the color-key and congruent practice (i.e., “Correct”, “Incorrect”). Subsequently, participants were told that they would now begin the real trials and would no longer be receiving feedback on their performance. They were allowed to ask questions prior to beginning the real trials and were told to be as fast and accurate as possible.
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Overall Conclusions

My dissertation moved from qualitative study to survey to experiment to document the phenomenon and harmful effects of home-school cultural value conflict – conflict between collectivistic family obligations and individualistic academic obligations – experienced by Latina/o first-generation college students during the transition to college. Study 1 elucidated the lived experience of these conflicts and their effects; it also provided a typology of the types of conflicts that were then utilized in the design of a survey study (Study 2) and a laboratory experiment (Study 3).

The survey study showed that these conflicts are experienced at higher levels among Latina/o students than Asian or European American students. It also showed that the conflicts were particularly acute for students who live close to their parents’ home as well as those that identify as female students. These conflicts, explained by both sociodemographic variables (low income, education) and Latina/o ethnic background, were negatively related to psychological well-being and indicators of academic adjustment (attention, grades).

In Study 3, experimental evidence confirmed that these conflicts cause a disruption in attention among Latina/o first-generation college students who live close to their parents’ homes. There was also evidence that this causal effect was driven by female students living close to home. The home-school value conflict condition produced significantly more attentional disruption than the academic obligation and control conditions, but not the family obligation condition. This was largely due to the pre-/post-Trump finding, whereby performance on attention significantly worsened and became more variable in response to the family obligation prime after the election and inauguration of President Trump.
Together, the results of my dissertation studies solidify the need to create interventions that aid Latino first-generation college students in harmonizing their home and school cultures. My results also imply that interventions pertaining to cultural conflict between direct family obligations and school obligations could be focused on students living close to home, especially females living close to home. There is also a need to create interventions that aid Latino college students in negotiating their fears about family, now that Trump is President.