UC Riverside

UC Riverside Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Title

Acculturation Gaps in Latino Families: Prospective Family Mediators Associated with Child Outcomes

Permalink

https://escholarship.org/uc/item/76q1g2wq

Author

Toro, Rosa Irene

Publication Date

2010

Peer reviewed|Thesis/dissertation

eScholarship.org Powered by the California Digital Library
University of California

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
RIVERSIDE

Acculturation Gaps in Latino Families: Prospective Family Mediators Associated With Child Outcomes

A Dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction
of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in

Psychology

by

Rosa I. Toro

March 2011

Dissertation Committee:
Dr. Nancy G. Guerra, Chairperson
Dr. Ruth Chao
Dr. Tanya Nieri

Copyright by
Rosa I. Toro
2011

The Dissertation of Rosa I. Toro is approved:

_____

_____

_____
Committee Chairperson

University of California, Riverside

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my advisor, Dr. Nancy Guerra, for her never ending support, and encouragement. I am also deeply grateful to my other committee members, Dr. Tanya Nieri and Dr. Ruth Chao, for their much appreciated advisement and guidance through the entire dissertation process. I feel fortunate to have been guided by such a wonderful, strong and dynamic group of women.

I would also like to thank the great people I met at UCR. First, I want to acknowledge *Faye Harmer*. Your support during these past five years was a blessing in disguise, and something I did not expect but happy to have received. Next, I would like to thank *Roxie Alcaraz*. Your genuine care and concern during my time at ACE-UCR is truly appreciated. Faye and Roxie were never ending sources of support, help and comforting words. Thank you for always knowing what to say.

I was also fortunate to be surrounded by a wonderful group of friends during this process. *Lilia, mi hermana del alma,* what can I possible tell you? From the very fist day I met you, I knew you were gong to be someone important in my life. I thank you for the many times that you were that listening ear. I hope I have been as good a friend to you as you have been to me. Having someone, like you go, go through this process with me made it a fun and memorable ride. ¡Hechale ganas! *Jackie*, we have been friends for well over 10 years, thank you for your encouragement and for being my friend. We've grown together, and now are watching our children grow together. I look forward to sharing more years of friendship with you. Finally, *Lourdes*, I am so happy and fortunate to have been blessed with such a wonderful friend. Your strength, encouragement and

positivity were a God send to me, and never ending sources of motivation for me. Thank you so much for always being a supportive friend.

People like these are a dime a dozen, and make me feel like I've hit the jackpot.

Dedication

There are so many people that I would like to dedicate this dissertation to. If it were not for every single one of them, my graduate career would not have been possible or the same. *Mom and Dad*, there are no right words to try and express everything that you both mean to me. I feel truly blessed to have been given such wonderful and loving parents that sacrificed so much for their children. *Dad*, although you are no longer here with me, I always carry you in my heart. You were my silent cheerleader, and for that I will forever be indebted and eternally grateful to you. *Mom*, you are my measure of what it means to be the greatest wife, mother and friend a person can have. I only hope that one day I will be half the person you are. Although you may not have always understood what I was doing, your encouragement and comforting words always healed me. *Anabel, Lupe, and Chenchin* throughout the years we have become closer siblings, but better friends. Your continual support throughout this entire graduate school process is something that cannot be easily repaid, and for that I cannot thank you three enough. *Oscar, Zarizha, Lucie and Dahmineek* you four were the first to introduce me to know what it is to truly love and care for someone. I have watched you four grow and become these beautiful people that I am proud of, I love you four very much. *Aaron* you are truly my proudest accomplishment and biggest blessing. You have taught me what it truly means to unconditionally love someone. Even on the most difficult days, your smile and innocence was enough for me to go forward. I don't know what I did to have been given such a wonderful blessing, but my personal promise to you is that I will try to be the best mother to you.

ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION

Acculturation Gaps in Latino Families: Prospective Family Mediators Associated with Child Outcomes

by

Rosa I. Toro

Doctor of Philosophy, Graduate Program in Psychology
University of California, Riverside March 2011
Dr. Nancy G. Guerra, Chairperson

Acculturation presents several unique challenges that can influence the well-being of immigrant children and families. Previous research indicates that members of the same family tend to acculturate at different rates, with children acculturating faster than their parents, creating a parent-child acculturation gap (Phinney, Ong, & Madden, 2000; Szapocznik & Truss, 1978). There are many inconsistencies in regarding the potentially negative impact of the acculturation gap; in part, this may be due to variations in how acculturation is operationalized; on the other hand, it may also speak to the need to include and assess proposed mechanisms by which the acculturation gap may have a negative impact on children. This investigation examined the effect of overall acculturation and specific values gaps on child outcomes and family functioning. Additionally, the mediating effect of family functioning was examined in order to identify potential mechanisms by which gaps influence child social, emotional, and behavioral competencies. The sample included 89 immigrant Latino parent and adolescent dyads from the Southern California area. Along with examining overall

acculturation, participants reported on their adherence to core Latino values such as: familism, respect and traditional gender roles. The family functioning constructs measured included: passive/inconsistent parenting, parental monitoring, accepting parenting, nurturing parenting practices, parental monitoring and parentification. Finally, child outcomes included: self-control, social decision making, moral system of belief, positive sense of self, prosocial connectedness, depression and aggression. Overall, the results were consistent with the current state of the acculturation gap literature. Findings indicated that overall acculturation gaps were not significantly associated to any of the child outcomes or family functioning. On the other hand, gaps on Latino values demonstrated to have negative effects on some child outcomes and family functioning. For example, familism-support was associated with low positive sense of self, low prosocial connectedness, depression, aggression, low parental monitoring, low accepting parenting, and low nurturing parenting. Finally, family functioning demonstrated to be a significant mediator for some gaps and outcomes. Specifically, familism-support was found to indirectly affect adolescent moral system of belief via accepting parenting. In light of the results, limitations, implications and suggestions for future directions are discussed.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements……iv

Dedication…….....vi

Abstract…….....vii

List of Tables…….....x

Chapter 1 – Introduction and Literature Review……1

Chapter 2 – Methods……..26

Chapter 3 – Results……33

Chapter 4 – Discussion……..50

References……..74

Tables…….89

Appendix A……..115

Appendix B……..131

Appendix C……..147

Appendix D……..171

List of Tables

Table 1. Matches and Mismatches Between Parent and Adolescent Acculturation Orientation

Table 2. Matches and Mismatches Between Parent and Adolescent Levels of Mexican Values

Table 3. Correlations Among Parent and Adolescent Gaps

Table 4. Correlations Between the Predictor Gaps and Mediators, Outcomes and Control Variables

Table 5. Correlations Among the Mediator, Outcome and Control Variables

Table 6. Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis of a Gap on Familism—Support on Observed Outcomes

Table 7. Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis of a Gap on Familism-Obligations on Observed Outcomes

Table 8. Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis of a Gap on Familism-Referent on Observed Outcomes

Table 9. Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis of a Gap on Respect on Observed Outcomes

Table 10. Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis of a Gap on Traditional Gender Roles on Observed Outcomes

Table 11. Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis of a Gap on Mexican Values on Observed Outcomes

Table 12. Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis of a Gap on Overall Acculturation on Observed Outcomes

Table 13. Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis of a Gap on Familism—Support on Observed Mediators

Table 14. Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis of a Gap on Familism—Obligations on Observed Mediators

Table 15. Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis of a Gap on Familism—Referent on Observed Mediators

Table 16. Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis of a Gap on Respect on Observed Mediators

Table 17. Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis of a Gap on Traditional Gender Roles on Observed Mediators

Table 18. Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis of a Gap on Mexican Values on Observed Mediators

Table 19. Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis of a Gap on Overall Acculturation on Observed Mediators

Table 20. Summary of Mediation Analyses for Observed Outcomes and Mediators on Gaps on Familism—Support

Table 21. Summary of Mediation Analyses for Observed Outcomes and Mediators on Gaps on Familism-Obligations

Table 22. Summary of Mediation Analyses for Observed Outcomes and Mediators on Gaps on Familism-Referent

Table 23. Summary of Mediation Analyses for Observed Outcomes and Mediators on Gaps on Respect

Table 24. Summary of Mediation Analyses for Observed Outcomes and Mediators on Gaps on Traditional Gender Roles

Table 25. Summary of Mediation Analyses for Observed Outcomes and Mediators on Gaps on Mexican Values

Table 26. Summary of Mediation Analyses for Observed Outcomes and Mediators on Gaps on Overall Acculturation

CHAPTER 1 – INTRODUCTION AND LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

The current study investigates the effects of the parent-child acculturation and values gaps on family functioning and children's social, emotional, and behavioral competencies in immigrant Latino families. According to the Center for Immigration Studies, in 2007 the nation's immigrant population reached 37.9 million (Camarota, 2007). Considering the sheer number of immigrants in the U.S., it is critical to understand the unique experiences these families encounter and how they impact children's adjustment. Although a number of studies have examined the effects of acculturation and parent-child acculturation gaps on child adjustment, to date, findings are inconclusive. Four potential reasons are suggested for this lack of consistent findings are addressed in the present study: (1) the theoretical perspective that is used to conceptualize the acculturation process; (2) there are many inconsistencies in the measurement and conceptualization of acculturation and the acculturation gap; (3) given the complexity of cultural norms and practices, the effects of the acculturation gap may hinge on the specific aspects of culture considered; and (4) the processes by which acculturation gaps influence child outcomes through the mediating effects of family functioning have not been studied.

Considering potential reasons that may be contributing to the inconsistencies within the acculturation gap literature, I will be examining the effect of not only acculturation gaps, but also gaps on Latino values. Additionally, I will also examine the

effects of these gaps on child outcomes, and family functioning. Finally, I will also examine the mediating effect of family functioning between gaps and child competency outcomes. By addressing these concerns, via the proposed aims, this investigation will provide more insight to the acculturation and values gap literature.

Literature Review

Approaches to the Conceptualization of Acculturation

A first factor that may be contributing to the inconsistencies in the acculturation gap literature is the lack of consensus with respect to how best to measure acculturation, and what factors are appropriate indicators of an individual's acculturation orientation. At the heart of this disagreement is whether acculturation should be considered a unidimensional or bidimensional construct. The position of the unidimensional model considers the individual to be either high or low on a single continuum of acculturation to the mainstream cultural group that he/she is living with (Unger, Ritt-Olson, Wagner, Soto, Baezconde-Garbanati, 2007). In this particular perspective, as an individual adopts more values of the host culture, he/she will minimize the degree of adherence to values of the home culture.

On the other hand, the bidimensional model views acculturation as being influenced by two separate dimensions that are based on cultural and psychological contact between the individual and two distinct cultural groups. This bidimensional model of acculturation (Berry, 1980; Berry, 2003), posits that retention of the original culture exists independently of orientation towards the larger society. The bidimensional model is broader than the unidimensional perspective, in that positive, negative, and

nonsignificant relations between cultural orientations are all theoretically possible (Chia & Costigan, 2006). From the application of this model, four distinct acculturation orientations have been formed: assimilation, integration, separation and marginalization.

The first orientation, assimilation is defined as having an individual that no relations with his/her home culture and solely adopting the mainstream (or host) society's values and beliefs. The integration orientation pictures the individual as having retained the values and relations of the home culture while adopting the mainstream culture as well. The third orientation, separated, views the individual as solely adhering to the home culture and not adopting or accepting the host culture. Finally marginalization is present when individuals lose cultural and psychological contact with both their traditional culture and the larger society (either by exclusion or withdrawal) (Berry, 2003). For purposes of this investigation, the bidimensional model of acculturation will be the foundation of how this construct is conceptualized and used as the basis for the measurement of the parent adolescent acculturation gap.

Acculturation Gaps

An acculturation gap is considered to be a situation in which there is a differing level of adherence to a set of cultural values between immigrant parents and their children (Birman, 2006). There are several reasons why there is a growing interest in the study of acculturation gaps. First, there continues to be a steady increase in the foreign born population in the United States. According to the U.S. Census Bureau, the current count of foreign born individuals in the United States approximates 31 million individuals, which also constitutes 12.1 million households (U.S. Census Bureau, 2005).

The considerable number of households with foreign born individuals necessitates examination of the experiences of these families. Considering that these families may come from different cultural perspectives than those of the host country, it is important to investigate how these families cope with living in a different environment. Secondly, research has demonstrated that members of the same family tend acculturate at different rates. (Birman, 2006; Phinney, Ong & Madden, 2000; Szapocznik & Truss, 1978). Generally speaking, children acculturate faster because they learn the language of the new culture faster and participate behaviorally in the new culture relatively quickly (Birman & Trickett, 2001; Szapocznik & Kurtines, 1980). Parents, on the other hand, retain particular aspects of the home culture, and therefore, acculturate at a slower rate (Liebkind, 1996). In cases in which both cultural groups may be different with respect to the values each holds as being important, problematic relations between parents and their children may ensue. These problematic relations are thought to be indicative of what has been termed an acculturation gap/discrepancy.

How is an Acculturation Gap Measured?

Beyond the issues of the effects that an acculturation gap can have on immigrant families, there is also a concern of how to calculate the gap between parents and children. Various methods are utilized to calculate the acculturation gap between parent-child dyads. Previous investigations have utilized: difference scores, interaction analyses, and match/mismatch. Considering the variety of approaches in order to measure an acculturation gap, this may also be another reason why there are inconsistencies in this area of research.

In a discussion of methodological issues pertaining to the calculation of acculturation gaps, Birman (2006) offers several limitations and benefits for each procedure. A common method for investigations to calculate an acculturation gap is to utilize difference scores, subtracting one informant's score from the other. This method fails to acknowledge a situation in which the parent may be more acculturated than the child. Therefore, a difference score calculation would show the level of acculturative dissonance between the parent and child, but fail to note the direction of the dissonance.

Birman (2006) suggests that the best method for calculating an acculturation gap is to utilize an interaction approach. In this approach there are a total of four different possible groups that parent-child dyads can fall into: 1) parent is high on acculturation while child is low, 2) both child and parent are high, 3) both parent and child are low and 4) parent is low on acculturation while child is high. The advantages of this procedure is that it can test differences between groups, in order to see whether particular matching combinations have associations to negative outcomes or whether negative effects are associated with a mismatch between parents and children. But, a limitation of this method is that it restricts the sample to four different groups and does not allow all possible combinations to be examined.

Finally, when utilizing a match/mismatch method, investigators divide their samples into two groups: 1) parent and child are matched on acculturation level or 2) parent and child are not matched on acculturation level (Farver et al., 2002). Although, this method has been noted to have its limitations, such limitations include: failure to acknowledge the other combinations of groups that may be occurring and minimization

of the bidirectional nature of acculturation (Berry, 2002), it may also have its benefits. It may be a useful way to look at whether parent-child gaps, in general, have any significant relations. Therefore, I will be utilizing this particular method to conceptualize the acculturation gap.

Surface and Deep Culture Constructs in Acculturation Measures

An additional reason for the inconsistencies within the acculturation gap literature may be the manner in which acculturation is being measured. Specifically, it may be that the constructs being examined and utilized as indicators of an individual's level of acculturation are not as complex as needed. Specifically, various acculturation measures are based on different structural components of culture: surface structure or deep structure.

Surface Structure. Along with investigating the effect of overall acculturation gaps between parent and adolescent dyads, this investigation is also interested in the effect of gaps on specific values that are salient within the Latino culture. The addition of these salient cultural values is guided by the differences between the surface and deep structure constructs of culture. Although, the discussion of these two dimensions of culture has been primarily done within the context of cultural sensitivity in prevention research (Resincow, Soler, Braithwaite, Ahluwalia, and Burler, 2000; Guerra & Knox, 2008), its basic tenets are applicable within the discussion of acculturation measurement. Surface structure is depicted as involving factors that are characteristic of a particular cultural group. Specifically, it refers to factors such as: people, places, food, language,

music, brand names, locations and clothing (Resincow, Soler, Braithwaite, Ahluwalia, and Burler, 2000).

A number of acculturation measures generally focus on the surface structure constructs of participant's home culture. Examples of these types of measures include: Short Acculturation Scale for Hispanics (Marin, Otero-Sabogal, & Perez-stable, 1987), Acculturation Rating Scale for Mexican Americans II (ARSMA-II; Cuellar, Arnold, & Maldonado, 1995), Acculturation Scale for Hispanics (Bauman, 2005), and the Bidimensional Acculturation Scale for Hispanics (Marin & Gamba, 1996). Although a number of the aforementioned scales are bidimensional in nature, again the primary focus of these measures is on surface structure constructs of one or both of the cultural groups examined. The surface structure constructs of the host culture may be more readily adopted by the adolescent and even by the parent. Language, for instance, is often used as an indicator of an individual's level of acculturation. It has accounted for a significant amount of the variance in many acculturation measures, and is therefore considered to be an appropriate measure (Epstein et al., 1998; Epstein et al., 1996, Serrano & Anderson, 2003). But, acculturation is constructed of more than just language usage and preference. And both may be more dictated by the norms of the environment in which the individual finds him/herself in. An adolescent may prefer to speak and use English more than Spanish, but that may be primarily due to the demands of the school environment to speak in English (Unget et al., 2007). But, the question remains whether these components are appropriate indicators of acculturation and not just individual preferences. Therefore, acculturation measures that solely focus on surface structure

constructs of culture may not be entirely capturing the other important components of culture (i.e. values).

Deep Structure. The other dimension of culture is deep structure, it reflects how cultural, social, psychologic, environmental and historical factors influence behaviors in various populations (Airhihenbuwa, DiClemente, Wingood & Lowe, 1992; Marin et al., 1995; Morris, 1993; Pasick, D'Onofrio & Otero-Sabogal, 1996). Resincow and colleagues (2000) add that deep structure involves the appreciation for how religion, family, society, economics and the government, both in perception and in fact, influence behavior. In contrast to surface structure, deep structure is seen as "…to the salience of or effect of multiple elements on behavior in the selected population (p.224, Wright & Zimmerman, 2006)." Therefore, it is considered to exert a greater influence on an individual's behavior than the surface structure constructs a the same cultural group. With respect to acculturation, measures that encompass the deep structure constructs of a particular cultural group, may be tapping into a greater degree of complexity to match the complex process that is acculturation. Therefore, an additional focus of this investigation is to examine the effects of gaps on salient values in the Latino culture: familism, respect and traditional gender roles on family functioning and adolescent outcomes (Cauce, A. M & Domenech-Rodriguez, 2002). The added focus on only Latino values is due to the position of the bidimensional model of acculturation, which stipulates that change in values for an individual is more likely to happen with the home culture's values due to the exposure into the host culture (Berry, 2003). Additionally, by examining these

specific values it may point to reasons why there have been discrepant findings in the literature.

Salient Values within the Latino Culture

Familism. An important value within the Latino culture is familism. Familism refers to the importance of family closeness and getting along with and contributing to the well-being of the family, which in many cases goes beyond the nuclear family and includes extended family members as well (Cauce & Domenech-Rodriguez, 2000). Additionally, familism is considered to place emphasis on family solidarity, obligation and parental authority (Ramirez, 1990). According to Baca-Zinn (1994), there are four primary components to familism: demographic, normative, structural and behavioral. Briefly, demographic familism entails demographic characteristics (i.e. family size), normative familism looks at the value people place on family unity and solidarity, structural familism considers multigenerational households or extended family systems and behavioral familism refers to the degree of interaction between families and kin networks (Baca-Zinn, 1994). In general though, there have been three facets of familism that have been identified. According to Sabogal, Otero-Sabogal, Marin and Perez-Stable (1987), three basic dimension of familism include: familial obligations, familial support and family as referents. Familial obligation is conceptualized as an individual's perceived obligation to provide material and emotional support to extended family members. Familial support entails with an individual's perception of family members being reliable providers of support and help in order to solve problems. Finally, family as referents refers to having relatives that may be examples behavioral and attitudinal

referents. Research has suggested that perceived support from the family may be the strongest component of the three, due to its stability as individuals acculturate to the host culture (Sabogal et al., 1987). Therefore, for purposes of this research project, the construct of familism will be measured with these three components.

Investigations that have examined familism have found that deterioration of familistic values and behaviors have been associated with negative behaviors. Specifically, it has been found that decreased levels of familism in adolescent males is associated with increased alcohol consumption, and this relationship was more prevalent in participants that were born in the United States in comparison to those that had immigrated to the United States (Gil, Wagner, & Vega, 2000). Retainment of familism has been associated with positive psychological functioning. For example, a high degree of adolescent familism was associated with increased levels of self-esteem (Smokowski & Bacallao, 2006). Other investigations have also reported similar findings (Contreras, Lopez, Rivera, Raymond-Smith, & Rothstein, 1999; Fuligni, Tseng, & Lam, 1999; Suarez-Orozco Suarez-Orozco, 1995). But, it has also been noted that the positive associations between familism and child outcomes were affected by other family factors such as adolescent-parent conflict (Smokowski & Bacallao, 2006). Therefore, in keeping in line with the general direction of the findings with respect to the relations found with familism and its deterioration on child outcomes and immigrant families, it is feasible to conceive that discrepant levels of these values can lead to poorer adolescent psychological functioning and also affect poorer family functioning. But, it is expected that the support facet of familism will be the construct that will show the least amount of

gaps. Additionally, gaps in this particular construct will be associated with far more negative adolescent outcomes and poorer family functioning than familism-referent and familism-obligations.

Respect. The cultural value of respect or "respeto" emphasizes obedience and children's consideration of adults (Delgado-Gaitan, 1994; Gonzales-Ramos et al., 1998). It also relates to "knowing the level of courtesy and decorum required in a given situation in relation to other people of a particular age, sex and social status" (Harwood, Miller, & Irizarry, 1995, p. 98). Although the literature has suggested that the construct of respect remains intact across generations, it also indicates that maintenance of this value is affected by acculturation (Delgado-Gaitan, 1993; Phinney, Ong & Madden, 2000). Specifically, research has demonstrated that first generation immigrant parents tended to favor having children that were obedient and respectful (Arcia & Johnson, 1998). Similarly, Fuligni (1998) found that Latino adolescents, in comparison to European American adolescents, held beliefs that expressed greater respect for parental authority. But, these results were influenced more so by generational status than ethnic group membership. The less time the family had been in the United States, the more likely the adolescents and the parents were to endorse respect to authority figures. Additionally, it was found that the majority of the adolescents tended to find acceptable instances in which they would be able to voice their opinion if it differed from that of their parents. Therefore, it is of interest to examine the effect that discrepant levels of a value, such as respect, have on family functioning and adolescent outcomes. Taking into account the current findings in the literature, it is expected that parent and adolescent gaps in respect

will be associated with poor adolescent outcomes and have negative repercussions on family functioning.

Traditional Gender Values. An additional core value within the Latino culture is the maintenance of traditional gender roles. At the heart of traditional gender values within the Latino culture are the constructs of machismo and marianismo. Machismo refers to the importance of the man not just as a father within the family, but most importantly as the head of the household (Cauce & Domenech-Ramirez, 2000). Alternatively, marianismo refers to the woman's role as a mother and venerates her self-sacrifice and suffering for her children (Cauce & Domenech-Ramirez, 2000). The roles specifically ascribed to both genders have been noted in the literature to be affected by acculturation, but for the most part this relationship has been studied within the context of marital stress. Specifically, in married couples when there is a discrepancy in acculturation, there tends to be a heightened level in marital stress (Vega, Kolody & Valle, 1988). Additionally, in couples where both were individuals are highly acculturated, higher levels of marital conflict were reported in comparison to couples in which both individuals identified strongly as Mexicans and were most likely immigrants (Flores, Tschann, Marin & Pantoja, 2004). The reasoning behind these findings is that in couples with higher levels of acculturation reflected more direct expressions of power issues between husbands and wives, resulting in greater conflict and increased likelihood of marital dissolution (Flores et al., 2004).

With respect to the effect of traditional gender roles and parent and adolescent relationships Céspedes and Huey (2008) examined gender roles discrepancies between

adolescents and their parents. They found that it was associated with higher youth depression; additionally, this relationship mediated by increases in family dysfunction. Generally, investigators found that this specific association was more pronounced with Latina adolescents. Taking into account the findings from this study, it was decided that gaps in traditional gender roles would be examined in order to see of such results could be replicated in the sample under investigation.

Acculturation Gaps and Child Outcomes

Although I have discussed various factors that may be contributing to the inconsistencies within the literature, there are current findings that merit their discussion. Acculturation gaps can have various effects on immigrant families and children. Some studies have reported negative associations between parent-child acculturation gaps and child outcomes. In a study conducted by Unger, Ritt-Olson, Soto and Baezconde-Garbanati (2007), gaps in parent-child acculturation level were associated with youth's lifetime risk and past-month use of tobacco and alcohol. With respect to behavioral outcomes, discrepancies in acculturation levels between parents and children have been associated with heightened depressive symptoms (Weaver & Kim, 2007). Additional investigations have also found negative associations with acculturation gaps and child outcomes such as: youth behavioral problems (Vega, Khoury, Zimmerman, Gil & Warheit, 1995), low self-esteem (Gil, Vega & Dimas, 1994) and child conduct disorder (Szapocznik, Santisteban, Kurtines, Ferez-Vidal & Hervis, 1984). Although these investigations indicate that acculturation gaps have a negative impact for immigrant children, other studies have not replicated such findings.

On the other hand, when Lau, McCabe, Yeh, Garland, Wood and Hough (2005), examined differences in acculturation levels of parent-child dyads they did not find associations in the predicted direction. They found that in dyads where the parent was more acculturated than the child, significant associations were found with youth conduct problems. It has also been hypothesized that acculturation gaps would be related to adolescent adjustment problems and poor child mental health, but these assumptions have not always been confirmed (Pasch, Deardorff, Tschann, Flores, Penilla & Pantoja, 2006; Sam & Virta, 2003). Although gaps in acculturation between parents and children can lead to acculturation-related conflicts, these conflicts may not necessarily affect a child's emotional development (Gil, Vega & Dimas, 1994). The inability of some investigations to find a negative relationship between acculturation gaps and child outcomes could be because both parties involved are well aware of the discrepancies, but still choose to acknowledge the views of other in order to maintain positive functioning. Immigrant and minority youth may be able to balance both sets of values, thereby minimizing any degree of distress (Fuligni & Pedersen, 2002; Fuligni, Yip & Tseng, 2002). These inconsistencies have lead some investigators to re-evaluate this relationship. In doing so, other factors such as family functioning have been considered along with acculturation gaps as potential influencing mechanisms on child outcomes.

Acculturation Gaps and its Potential Association with Family Functioning

A consideration of family functioning and how it is affected by acculturation gaps may be a viable construct to examine in order to explain the inconsistencies in the literature. The family functioning constructs that were examined were: parenting style

passive/inconsistent parenting and nurturing/supportive parenting), parental monitoring and parentification. The selection of these specific family functioning constructs was guided by two primary theoretical frameworks.

The first theoretical framework guiding the selection of particular family functioning constructs is intercultural conflict/distancing theory. This theory posits that prior to the development of acculturation gaps, development of intergenerational/intercultural distancing is likely to occur (Sluzki, 1979). According to Ying (1999), this particular distancing may become a significant source of conflict between immigrant parents and their children. If both parties involved hold different ideas, with respect to what each believed to be important, then it may cause friction. For example, immigrant parents may believe that exhibiting cooperation and interdependence is a desired quality in a child. While the child may believe that being independent and competitive is a desired quality (Drachman et al., 1996; Harrison, Wilson, Pine, Chan, & Buriel, 1990). This friction is believed to cause heightened levels of mental health problems for both parents and children (Ying, 1999). According to Ying and Chao (1996), the parents desire to provide a better future for their children may become a source of contention between both individuals. As children continue to ascribe to the norms of the host culture and presumably distance themselves from the home culture, parents may feel a sense of dismay and even betrayal (Drachman et al., 1996). Parents may attempt to impose the norms of the host culture on the child, in doing so the child may rebel and be susceptible to negative outcomes such as: gang membership (Adler, Ovando, & Hocevar, 1984), depression and anxiety (Aldwin & Greenberger, 1987;

Hernandez-Guzman & Sanchez-Sosa, 1996), and learning and behavioral problems at school (Yao, 1985). In this respect an intergenerational/intercultural distancing may affect parents and their parenting behaviors. These parents may then decide to minimize their nurturing practices and not being consistent with how they decide to discipline their children.

The second guiding theoretical framework is family systems theory. According to this perspective, the family is an open system with internal and external aspects of functioning. According to Rueschenberg and colleagues (1995):

> Internal aspects include family members' patterns of relationships and interactions and also the structure of the family system. External aspects include the family's interactions with outside social systems including social institutions and the larger context of U.S. society (p. 16).

When investigating issues of acculturation it is essential to acknowledge that with immigrant families, distal factors will undoubtedly affect the proximal processes of the family unit. The focus on the family is important if one considers that children and parents will be differentially influenced due to differing levels of exposure to the host culture and the degree to which the host culture's values are adopted. Additionally, by utilizing a family system's perspective, the unit of analyses moves away from an individual focus to a family focus. Within the context of investigating acculturation level discrepancies this theoretical perspective is the most appropriate. Also, Minuchin's (1974) discussion of the family subsystems within family systems theory is guiding this research. By differentiating between the various subsystems and discussing the negative

implications of what can occur if the hierarchy in the household is disrupted, Minuchin provides a sound theoretical basis to examine the constructs of parentification and parental monitoring.

Parenting Style. Acculturation gaps have been reported to affect family functioning by contributing to ineffective parenting practices and increased parent-child conflict. Martinez (2006), found that increases in discrepancies in acculturation levels between Latino parents and children were associated with family stress and ineffective parenting practices. Similar findings have also been found with Vietnamese immigrant families when compared to U.S. born families (Dinh, Sarason, & Saranson, 1994). This particular investigation found that in the presence of a parent-child acculturation gap, greater levels of parent-child conflict and less positive relationships were reported. Other investigations have also found similar findings with Asian American (Lee et al., 2000) and Soviet Jewish refugee samples (Birman, 2006).

But, other investigations have not replicated such findings. In a sample of Indian adolescents, a match in acculturation styles was associated with lower levels of parent-child conflict (Farver, Narang, & Bhadha, 2002). In this particular though, children did self-identified more often as Indian-American than their parents. This differing self-identification indicates that adolescents still held a higher degree of adherence to the American culture than their parents. In light of these differences in self identification, they were successful in their relations with their parents perhaps due to their adherence to the Indian culture. In this particular case, the children's partial self-identification as Indian, may have limited the number of opportunities for conflict to ensue. By being able

to employ and demonstrate normative behaviors, that are considered appropriate for Indian youth, these adolescents may have been able to minimize instances of parent-child conflict. Therefore, even in the presence of a gap, negative parenting practices were not found.

Parental Monitoring. To the extent that children acculturate more rapidly than their parents (with the resultant parent-child acculturation gap) they are better able to navigate the host culture without parental knowledge. Indeed, when parents learn the U.S. culture at a slower pace than their children, they may become dependent on their children to help them navigate and interpret the new culture rather than vice versa (Weisskirch & Alva, 2002). In other words, children can provide details to parents regarding their whereabouts that may even be blatantly false; yet parents who do not know how to navigate the U.S. system or speak English simply may be unaware of the accuracy of their child's explanations. In addition, parents may be reluctant to become involved in their children's schools, particularly if teachers do not speak English and few translators are available (Leidy, Guerra, & Toro, 2009). In essence, parents may rely on their children to translate important documents such as report cards, notes from school, etc. All of these constraints can severely compromise their ability to effectively monitor their children's whereabouts and activities and undermine parental authority (Portes & Rumbaut, 2001; Samaniego & Gonzales, 1999). Ultimately, decreased parental authority and ability to monitor their children's whereabouts may lead to higher levels of children's acting out and antisocial behavior (Szapocznik et al., 1986; Wills & Filer, 1996; Ying et al., 1999). Therefore, an examination of the effect of compromised power dynamic

between immigrant parents and children, due to an acculturation gap, may have on parental monitoring may be a plausible family indicator that can account for the negative associations between parent and child acculturation gaps.

Parentification. The premature exposure of children to adult roles and responsibilities within the family network, known as parentification, is a construct that has been limited to the clinical psychology literature (Jurkovic, 1997; Minuchin, Colapinto, & Minuchin, 1998). It is viewed as a phenomenon that causes generational boundaries to be dissolved or become diffused between the parentified child and parents. There are different ides with respect to the effect that parentification can have on a child and family. According to Minuchin (1974), a situation in which the child crosses into the parental subsystem can be natural and helpful in large families, single-parent families or in families in which both parents work. While Jurkovic (1997) states that having a child take on adult like responsibilities for a prolonged period of time can restrict childhood, limit the development of other abilities and be harmful. Presently, the majority of the literature has focused on the negative factors contributing to parentification. It has been associated with parental alcoholism (Burnett, Jones, Bliwise & Ross, 2006; Kelley, French, Bountress, Keefe, Schroeder, Steer, Fals-Stewart & Gumienny, 2007), caring for an ill parent (Thastum, Johansen, Gubba, Olesen & Romer, 2008) and child negligence (Fitzgerald, Scneider, Salstrom, Zinzow, Jackson & Fossel, 2008). Although, the bulk of the literature indicates that parentification can be detrimental for a child, some investigations have found other results. Parentified children exposed to some form of family risk (witnessing domestic violence, mother and father impairment), still

demonstrated lower levels of psychological maladjustment (Fitzgerald et al., 2008). On the other hand, parentification was also found to be associated with posttraumatic growth, which enabled the development of resiliency in children (Hooper, 2008). Therefore, there may be some positive effects of children being parentified. But, I believe that this difference may have to do with how parentification is perceived by both parents and children.

In the case of Latino immigrant families, a child may be more likely to become parentified because of their ability to navigate through the new culture. They may not be adversely affected by it because of specific values that are instilled within the Latino culture, one of which being familism. Familism is described as having a strong identification and attachment to one's family and strong feelings of loyalty, reciprocity and solidarity among members of the same family (Triandis, Marin, Betancourt, Lisanky & Chang, 1982; Sabogal, Marin & Otero-Sabogal, 1987). Research has demonstrated that familism remains one of the core values that Latino individuals continue to embrace regardless of their acculturation level. Fuligni and colleagues (1999) found that among a sample of Latino youth, attitudes emphasizing family obligation and duty remained high even into the second and third generation. Therefore, a child in an immigrant Latino family may see their role in home as one of an active contributing member of the household. If so, then Latino children may be less likely to exhibit the negative behaviors associated with parentification.

Adolescent Core Competencies.

In addition to investigating the relations that gaps in core Latino values may have with immigrant Latino families, adolescent core competencies will also be examined along with adolescent behavioral outcomes. Recent developments within the area of youth development have been the identification of core competencies that are considered to promote positive youth development. Guerra and Bradshaw (2008), have identified five different core competencies: positive sense of self, self-control, decision making skills, moral system of belief and prosocial connectedness. By including the examination of these adolescent core competencies in this investigation, it will provide a clearer view of how gaps can potentially affect positive youth development within these specified competencies.

First, positive sense of self primarily highlights the importance of considering the self when examining or attempting to explain healthy adolescent development and behavior. The authors conclude that adolescent positive sense of self is comprised of three primary components self-awareness, agency and self-esteem (Guerra & Bradshaw, 2008). These three factors together are thought to influence an individual's transition from adolescence into adulthood. Specifically, it can exert an effect on an individual's life course by aiding in the construction of the future self (Cross & Markus, 1991), aid in the development of self-confidence by setting goals that are later attained by the adolescent (Bandura, 1994), and by active niche picking that will foster that heightened levels of self-esteem (Guerra & Bradshaw, 2008).

Second, self-control deals with the individual's behavior to regulate and manage affect and behavior in a control fashion in any given situation (Guerra & Bradshaw,

2008). Although there is evidence that suggests that children are able to exert some degree of control as they progress through development, the changes that occur during adolescence are most notable. During adolescence, there is a heightened level of frontal lobe activity, which is considered to be the region associated with behavioral inhibition (Steinberg, 2008). In essence, the most notable changes and advances in formal decision making are occurring during adolescence. This is in turn, is seen as enhancing adjustment and well being, and minimizing the degree of risk for the adolescent (Gestsdottir & Lerner, 2007).

Third, decision making skills posit that as an individual ages, he/she is able to make decisions and exert some degree of autonomy. In general it is considered that better decision makers tend to rely on "gist based" thinking in which risks are avoided (Reyna & Farley, 2006). Additionally, it is believed that responsibility, perspective, and temperance are important components of effective decision making. Its importance to positive youth development is that as the adolescent ages, his/her judgment becomes mature and more responsible decisions tend to be made (Steinberg & Cauffman, 1996).

Fourth, a moral system of belief is considered to be an important core competency that is developed during adolescence because of the effects it may have on adolescent behaviors. It encompasses beliefs about how individuals should be treated, integrity, fairness, and harm (Guerra, Nucci and Huesmann, 1994). Guerra and Bradshaw (2008), propose that further development of this core competency is contingent upon the socializing experiences that the individual experiences as a child and adolescents. Moreover, the end result is a moral system of belief that is believed to embody the

family, community and cultural values. Additionally, researchers believe that the presence of moral cognition engages the adolescent in perspective taking and empathy (Guerra, Nucci and Huesmann, 1994). Therefore, it is believed that if adolescents commit to a particular moral course of actions that is an integral component of their identity, then they will be more likely to behave accordingly (Nisan, 1996).

Finally, prosocial connectedness refers to the different sources of affiliations available to adolescents. According to Guerra & Bradshaw (2008), connectedness involves both feeling cared for and caring about the social environment. Undoubtedly, having a sense of connectedness is not only associated with adjustment (Commission on Children at Risk, 2003), but it is also linked to risky behaviors (Kirby, 2001). Therefore, the nature of the grouping is important. If the group is prosocial in nature, then it is considered to be more often linked to low levels of risk behaviors (Guerra & Bradshaw, 2008).

Although these core competencies have not been studied directly with acculturation gaps, various components of each of these core competencies such as self-esteem and substance use have been specifically examined. Yet, this indicates to investigators the need venture into incorporating the measurement of youth core competencies in order to determine their relationship with an acculturation and values gap, and also how these relations are influenced by family functioning.

The Current Study

The current study will expand on the present literature that focuses on acculturation gaps and its effects on child outcomes. Some investigations within this

particular area of research have begun to examine the effects family functioning between acculturation gaps and child outcomes. Therefore, this study will also contribute to this emerging area of research. Additionally, this study is also contributing to this particular area of research by examining the relations associated with gaps on specific Latino values and whether discrepancies with these specific values are implicated on family functioning and adolescent outcomes more so than a gap on overall acculturation. Finally, this investigation also contributes to the area of research by focusing on adolescent core competencies as the outcomes to be measured. In doing so, it will provide a clearer understanding of the effects of these gaps on the more widely agreed upon core competencies deemed essential for positive youth development.

Specific Aim 1: To examine the effects of the parent-child acculturation gap (measured by match or mismatch) on youth core competencies and behavioral outcomes.

This aim focuses on the potential effects that a gap on overall acculturation, specific prominent Mexican values (familism—support, familism—obligations, familism—referent, respect, and traditional gender roles) and overall Mexican value adherence levels will each have on: self-control, social decision making, moral system of belief, positive sense of self, prosocial connectedness, depression and aggression. It is hypothesized that gaps will be associated with higher levels of depression and aggression. Also, gaps will be associated with lower levels of self-control, social decision making, moral system of belief, positive sense of self, and prosocial connectedness.

Specific Aim 2: To examine the effects of the parent-child acculturation gap (measured by match or mismatch) on family functioning constructs.

This aim focuses on the potential effects that a gap on overall acculturation, specific prominent Mexican values (familism—support, familism—obligations, familism—referent, respect, and traditional gender roles) and overall Mexican value adherence levels will each have on: passive/inconsistent parenting, accepting parenting, nurturing parenting practices, parental monitoring, and parentification. It is hypothesized that a gap between parent and adolescent dyads will be associated increased levels of parentification and passive/inconsistent parenting. Additionally, a gap between parent and adolescent will be associated with lower levels of parental monitoring, accepting parenting and nurturing parenting.

Specific Aim 3: To examine whether observed relations between the parent-adolescent acculturation gap, youth core competencies and behavioral outcomes are mediated by family functioning constructs.

This aim seeks to explore whether the effects of the parent-adolescent acculturation gap on child outcomes are mediated by family factors. It is hypothesized that specific paths will emerge between the parent-child gaps and outcomes. For example, it is predicted that a gap will predict lower levels of parental monitoring and higher levels of child aggression (mediated model).

CHAPTER 2 – METHODS

Method

Participants and Procedures

The sample was comprised of 89 Latino immigrant parent-adolescent dyads. With respect to the adolescents, 55 were females and ranged in ages from 14 -19 years of age (M = 15.58, SD = 1.34). Fourteen of the adolescents had been born outside of the United States (11 in Mexico, 2 in El Salvador, and 1 in Guatemala), and arrived to the United States at approximately 5 years of age (M = 5.04, SD = 3.44).

With respect to the parents there were a total of: 71 biological mothers, 17 biological fathers and 1 female legal guardian that participated, and ranged from 32 - 65 years in age (M = 43.43, SD = 6.43). Seventy three of the parents were born in Mexico, 6 in El Salvador, 3 in Guatemala and 4 were born in the United States. The length of time that the parents had been in the United States ranged from 5 – 40 years (M = 21.57, SD = 7.24).

Participants were recruited using various methods. I attended school informational sessions that were held in the evening. During these sessions, parents were informed of the study, what was asked of the parents and adolescents, and the time needed to complete the surveys. Along with attending these sessions, I also spoke to different classrooms during the homeroom period, explained the study to the students and had them take the consent forms to the parents.

Upon receipt of the signed consent forms, the investigator called each parent to reiterate the details of the study, thereby ensuring that participants understood the study.

Additionally, an agreement was reached with the investigator and school officials to grant the participants volunteer hours for participating. Parents are required to complete a total of 10 volunteer hours annually, while adolescents are required to complete 20 community service hours. For completing the surveys, parents earned 5 hours, while adolescents earned 2 hours for their participation.

There were two primary ways in which data was collected from the parents and adolescents. Some parents preferred to make an appointment to complete the survey, while other parents preferred to take the survey home. Those parents that took the survey home were also made aware of my contact information in case questions arose. Some parents (N = 17) called needing some clarification while completing the survey. Students were either asked to stay after school to complete their survey during which time they were provided with a snack and refreshments. If for any reason the adolescent was unable to stay after school, they were allowed to take the survey home and return it the following day. For both groups of participants informed consent (from the parents) and assent (from the adolescents) was obtained prior to completing the survey.

Measures

Demographics

A 19-item questionnaire was used to collect family demographic information that will include: parent and child age, country of origin, years of residence in the United States, household income, gender and marital status. Previous research has found that socio economic status and length of residence influence acculturation preferences

(Barakin, Kostantareas & deBosset, 1989) therefore, this investigation also controlled for these variables (see Table 5).

Predictors

Overall Acculturation. Parents' and adolescents' acculturation levels were assessed with the Mexican American Cultural Values Scale (MACVS: Knight, Gonzales, Saenz, Bonds, Germán, Deardoff, Roosa & Updegraff, 2007). The measure is comprised of two super scales measuring Mexican American values ($\alpha = .85$ and $\alpha = .79$, respectively) and Mainstream values ($\alpha = .67$.and $\alpha = .71$, respectively). Reponses are set on a 5-item scale and asks respondents to rate what they think or believe about various statements. By taking the averages of the totals of both subscales, participants were then placed in one of the four acculturation orientations based on Berry's (2003) acculturation model.

Specific Values. In order to assess the extent to which parents and adolescents adhered to some of the most salient values within the Latino culture, the subscales of the Mexican American Cultural Values Scale (MACVS: Knight et al., 2007) were used. For familism there were three different subscales: family support and closeness ($\alpha = .79$ and $\alpha = .79$, respectively), family obligations ($\alpha = .79$ and $\alpha = .79$, respectively), and family as referent ($\alpha = .79$ and $\alpha = .79$, respectively). The subscales were kept separate to determine if each contributed to different outcomes and mediators. The other salient values subscales were respect ($\alpha = .79$ and $\alpha = .79$, respectively), and traditional gender roles ($\alpha = .79$ and $\alpha = .79$, respectively). Reponses are set on a 5-item scale and asks respondents to rate what they think or believe about various statements. The measure

includes items such as “It is always important to be united as a family,” “Children should never question their parents’ decisions,” and “Children should always do things to make their parents happy.” Higher scores indicate stronger levels of the scale characteristic.

Parentification. The Parentification Scale (Mika, Bergner & Baum, 1987), will be used to measure parentification. The scale is a 30-item measure scale in which adolescents responded on a 5-point response scale (ranging from very often to never or does not apply) the frequency of particular behaviors. Sample items include “My parents would argue, and I would wind up on the side of one of them,” “I made dinner for member of my family,” and “I would decide what time my sibling(s) went to bed for the evening, even when my parent(s) were home.” The measure also demonstrated to have appropriate reliability ($\alpha = .81$)

Passive/Inconsistent Parenting. Passive/Inconsistent parenting practices was assessed with a superscale of the Parental Behavior Inventory (PBI: Knight, Tein, Shell & Roosa, 1992). The passive/inconsistent parenting superscale ($\alpha = .68$) is comprised of 28 items that ask about the inconsistent discipline, nonenforcement, and extreme autonomy parenting practices. Parents respond to how much each statement is like him/her on a 3-point scale (1 = not like me, 2 = somewhat like me, and 3 = like me). Sample statements include, “I soon forget a rule I have made,” “I am less friendly with my child when she/he displeases me,” and “I allow my child to go out as often as he/she wants.”

Parental Monitoring. The Parental Monitoring Scale (Stattin & Kerr, 2000) will be used to assess parents’ monitoring activities. This measure is a 6-item scale that had

parents report on their monitoring behaviors. Responses were on a 5-point scale (1= never, 5= almost never) and ask how often parents were aware of child's whereabouts and friends. The measure had a reliability coefficient of .70.

Accepting Parenting. In order to asses the degree of accepting parenting practices, the acceptance subscale (α = .78) of the Parental Behavior Inventory (PBI: Knight, Tein, Shell & Roosa, 1992) was used. Parents respond to how much each statement is like him/her on a 3-point scale (1 = not like me, 2 = somewhat like me, and 3 = like me). Sample items include "I make my child feel better after talking over his/her worries with him/her," "I almost always speak to my child in a warm and friendly voice," and "I am not interested in changing my child, I like my child as she/he is."

Nurturing Parenting. The nurturance subscale of the Child Rearing Practices Report (Block, 1965) was used. This subscale is comprised of 19-itmes and assess the degree to which parents are nurturing toward their child, responses are on a 4-point scale (1 = strongly disagree, 4=strongly agree). The reported alpha coefficient for this particular subscale was .74. Sample items included "I find some of my greatest satisfactions with my child," "I make sure my child knows that I appreciate what she/he tries or accomplishes," and "I find it interesting and educational to be with my child for long periods of time."

Outcomes

Self-Control. Child self-control measured emotion regulation/anger management and impulse control. Items for emotion regulation/anger management will be adapted from and were the *State-Trait Anger Expression Inventory* (Spielberger, 1991). Sample

questions include “I can do things to calm down” and “I can stop myself from losing my temper.” Items tapping impulse control will be adapted from Bosworth and Espelage (1995). Sample questions included “I do things without thinking” and “I have a hard time finishing what I start.” Responses were set on 4-point scale (1 = strongly disagree, 4 = strongly agree), reliability analyses demonstrated that this measure was appropriate (α = .85).

Social Decision Making. A7-item scale adapted from Causey and Dubow (1992). Using a 4-point response scale (1 = strongly disagree, 4 = strongly agree), adolescents respond to items such as “When I have an argument or fight with my friends I try to think of different ways to solve it” and “When I have an argument or fight with my friends I make a plan to solve the problem and then I follow the problem.” (coefficient alpha= .85).

Positive Sense of Self. Items assessing adolescent positive sense of self were a total of 18 items and were adapted from the Rosenberg self Esteem Inventory (Rosenberg, 1965) and Cognitive Autonomy and Self Evaluation Inventory (CASE: Beckert, 2007). Responses were set on a 4-point scale (1 = strongly disagree, 4 = strongly agree), and asked adolescents the extent to which they agreed with particular statements. Sample items included “When I disagree with other I share my views,” “I am able to do things as well as most other people, and “I am good at identifying my own strengths.” The measure demonstrated to have acceptable reliability (α = .89).

Prosocial Connectedness. Twenty one items were used to measure adolescent levels of prosocial connectedness. These items were adapted from the Individual

Protective Factors Index (Phillips and Springer, 1992) and Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support (Zimet, Dahlem, Zimet, & Farley, 1987). Responses were set on a 4-point scale (1 = strongly disagree, 4 = strongly agree) and had adolescents respond the extent to which they agreed with specific statements. Sample items included "there are people I can depend on to help me if I really need it," "My family really tried to help me," and "There are people I can count on in an emergency." This measure also demonstrated to have an acceptable level of reliability ($\alpha = .95$).

Depression. The child's level of depression will be assessed using the Child Depression Inventory (CDI: Kovacs, 1985). This measure asks the child the magnitude of particular feelings such as: being bad, hating oneself, feeling tired, and being good like other children responses are a 3-point scale and depend on the particular question being asked. The alpha coefficient for this measure was also deemed acceptable ($\alpha = .82$).

Physical Aggression. Aggression was assessed by administering the Metropolitan Area Child Study aggression measure (Metropolitan Area Child Study Research Group, 2002). The measure consists of 7-items and asks the child how often they have hit another child, made fun of another child, and punched or beat up another child. Responses are on a 3-point scale (1= never to 3= a lot). The measure demonstrated an acceptable reliability level ($\alpha = .85$).

CHAPTER 3 – RESULTS

Preliminary Analyses

Matches and Mismatches. Prior to conducting analyses to answer the research questions, frequency counts were done of matches and mismatches between parents and adolescents on overall acculturation style and the different cultural values. Acculturation style was determined by using a scoring procedure previously completed by another investigation (Farver et al., 2000). First, two sub scores were calculated, for both the adolescents and parents, from the Mexican American and Mainstream values subscales of the MACVS (Knight et al., 2009). On the basis of median splits, parents and adolescents were classified into 'low' and 'high' levels of Mexican American and Mainstream values. Using these two scores, parents and adolescents were categorized into one of four acculturation styles. High scores on both the Mexican American and Mainstream values scales denoted an integrated or bicultural individual who adheres equally to the values both cultures. A high score on the Mexican American values scale and a low score on Mainstream values scale indicated an assimilated individual who adheres to the values of the Mainstream culture, and has relinquished the values of the Mexican culture. Low scores on both scales reflected a marginal individual who may have lost touch with the values of the culture of origin and has little or no involvement adherence to the values of American society. Finally, a high score on the Mexican American values scale and a low score on the Mainstream values scale reflected a separated individual who focuses primarily on the Mexican culture, and has little or no value adherence with the American mainstream culture.

Therefore, for overall acculturation orientation there were 39 matching dyads (23 integrated, 15 separated and 1 marginalized). Additionally, there were 50 mismatched dyads in the following combinations: 7 adolescents were integrated and the parents were separated, 1 adolescent was integrated and the parent was marginalized, 32 adolescents were separated and the parents were integrated, 3 adolescents were assimilated and the parents were integrated, 1 the adolescent was assimilated and the parent was separated, 1 adolescent was assimilated and the parent was marginalized, 2 adolescents were marginalized and the parents were integrated, and 3 adolescents were marginalized and the parents were separated (see Table 1).

Following the examination of matches and mismatches in overall acculturation orientation, frequency counts were done for the individual measured values. Determination of high and low group membership for each of the values was done using the median split as well (see Table 2). Results of these counts are as follow: for familism-support 83 parent and adolescent dyads matched (both parents and adolescents were high), while the remaining 6 mismatched. Specifically, in one dyad the parent was low on familism-support while the adolescent was high and the remaining 5 were dyads in which the parents were high and the adolescents were low. For familism-obligations, 77 dyads matched (both parents and adolescents were high), while 12 were mismatched. Specifically, there were 6 dyads where parents were high and the adolescents were low. Additionally, in 6 other dyads parents were low while the adolescents were high on familism-obligations. For familism-referent, there were 78 matches (77 both high and 1 both low), and 11 mismatches. Specifically, there were 3 dyads in which the parents

were low and the adolescents were high, and the remaining 8 parents were high and the adolescents were low on familism-referent. For respect, there were 83 matches (82 both high and 1 both low), and 6 mismatches. For the mismatched dyads, there were 2 that had the parents low and the adolescents were high, while the remaining 4 dyads had parents high and the adolescents low on respect. For traditional gender roles, there were 43 matches (35 both low and 8 both high) and 46 mismatches. Specifically, there were 35 dyads in which the parents were high and the adolescents were low, while the remaining 11 dyads the parents were low and the adolescents were high. Finally, Mexican values had 79 matches (77 both high and 2 both low) while 1 dyad had the parent low and the adolescent high and the remaining 9 dyads had parents high and adolescents were low on Mexican values.

Correlations. Following the examination of matches and mismatch frequencies, correlations among the various acculturation gaps, family functioning variables and adolescent outcomes were conducted. First correlations were conducted between the predictor variables. In order to assess the strength of these relationships the parent-adolescent gap was dichotomized for each variable, a "1" on any of these gap variables indicated that there was an adolescent and parent mismatch in this particular value or overall acculturation orientation, while a "0" indicated that there was no gap between the adolescent and the parent. Considering that both of the variables involved in the individual correlations were dichotomous, the normal product moment correlation *r* was not appropriate. Therefore, in instances where both variables are dichotomous, a phi coefficient (φ) was computed (Rosenthal & Rosnow, 1991).

Results of these correlations demonstrated some significant association between the gaps (see Table 3). First, an overall acculturation gap was positively associated with a familism-support gap ($\varphi = .23$, $p < .05$), familism-obligations gap ($\varphi = .20$, $p < .05$), respect gap ($\varphi = .23$, $p < .05$), and with a Mexican American values gap ($\varphi = .31$, $p < .01$) (see Table 3). Relations between the different components of familism also demonstrated to be strongly associated with one another. A familism-support gap was positively associated with a familism-obligations gap ($\varphi = .68$, $p < .01$) and a familism-referent gap ($\varphi = .72$, $p < .01$). Similarly, a familism-obligations gap was also positively associated with a familism-referent gap ($\varphi = .45$, $p < .01$). Additionally, a gap in Mexican American values was also significantly associated with a familism-support gap ($\varphi = .76$, $p < .01$), a familism-obligations gap ($\varphi = .59$, $p < .01$) and a familism-referent gap ($\varphi = .73$, $p < .01$). Finally, associations with a gap in respect demonstrated it to be significantly positively associated with familism-support gap ($\varphi = .82$, $p < .01$), familism-obligations gap ($\varphi = .55$, $p < .01$), familism-referent gap ($\varphi = .72$, $p < .01$) and with a Mexican American values gap ($\varphi = .61$, $p < .01$).

As the correlations indicated, the relations among the three different familism gaps were all significantly associated with one another. It would be logical to combine the three constructs into a single familism measurement, but it was decided that these three variables would be kept separate in order to determine if they each were associated with the different mediators, outcomes and if each had a significant mediating effect between the observed predictor gaps and measured child outcomes.

Following the examination of the relations between the various gaps with each other, correlations of them with the mediators, outcomes and control variables were conducted (see Table 4). The results of these correlations highlighted several important relationships. A gap in familism-support was significantly associated with parental monitoring (r = -.30, p < .01), accepting parenting style (r = -.30, p < .01), nurturing parenting style (r = -.41, p < .01), adolescent positive sense of sel*f* (r = -.38, p < .01), adolescent self-control (r = -.26, p < .05), and adolescent depression (r = .33, p < .01), adolescent aggression (r = .30, p < .01). A gap in familism-obligations was significantly associated with parentification (r = -.24, p < .01), passive/inconsistent parenting (r = -.28, p < .01), nurturing parenting style (r = -.25, p < .01), self-control (r = -.26, p < .05), social decision making (r = -.23, p < .01), positive sense of self (r = -.27, p < .05), depression (r = .33, p < .01), and aggression (r = .21, p < .05). Next, a gap in familism-referent was found to be significantly associated with parental monitoring (r = -.22, p < .05), adolescent social decision making (r = -.21, p < .05), positive sense of sel*f* (r = -.40, p < .05), depression (r = -.37, p < .01) and aggression (r = -.21, p < .05). Correlations examining with a gap in respect found it to be significantly associated with parental monitoring (r = -.26, p < .05), accepting parenting style (r = -.32, p < .01), nurturing parenting (r = -.34, p < .01), positive sense of sel*f* (r = -.33, p < .01), depression (r = .24, p < .05) and aggression (r = .29, p < .05). While a gap in traditional gender roles, was associated with passive/inconsistent parenting (r = .32, p < .01) and parental monitoring (r = -.22, p < .05). Finally, a gap in Mexican American values was significantly associated with parental monitoring (r = -.22, p < .01), nurturing parenting style (r = -

.27, $p < .05$), self- control ($r = -.25$, $p < .05$), social decision making ($r = -.22$, $p < .05$), positive sense of self ($r = -.34$, $p < .01$) depression ($r = .32$, $p < .01$), and aggression ($r = .23$, $p < .05$).

The final set of correlation analyses examined the relationships between the mediators, observed outcomes and control variables. Analyses with parentification demonstrated that it was significantly associated with parental monitoring ($r = .30$, $p < .05$), social decision making ($r = .33$, $p < .01$), moral system of belief ($r = .32$, $p < .05$) and positive sense of self ($r = .27$, $p < .05$). Next, passive/inconsistent parenting was significantly associated with nurturing parenting ($r = .30$, $p < .05$). Parental monitoring had several significant relations, it was significantly associated with self-control ($r = .32$, $p < .05$), social decision making ($r = .26$, $p < .05$), moral system of belief ($r = .26$, $p < .05$), positive sense of self ($r = .46$, $p < .01$), depression ($r = .30$, $p < .01$), and aggression ($r = -.31$, $p < .01$). The last mediator to have significant associations with other variables was accepting parenting, it was significantly correlated with nurturing parenting ($r = .42$, $p < .01$), self-control ($r = .25$, $p < .05$), social decision making ($r = .32$, $p < .05$), and moral system of belief ($r = 32$, $p < .05$). Finally, there were a number of significant associations between the measured outcomes (see Table 5).

Hierarchical Multiple Regression Predicting the Outcome Variables (Aim 1)

Following the correlation analyses, hierarchical multiple regression analyses were conducted in order to examine whether the various computed gaps: familism-support, familism-obligation, familism-referent, respect, traditional gender roles, Mexican American values, and overall acculturation predicted adolescent outcomes. Again, the

measured outcomes were: self-control, social decision making, moral system of belief, positive sense of self, prosocial connectedness, depression and aggression. Regression analyses revealed several significant associations between the various gaps and outcomes. It should be noted that income and number of years that the parent has been in the United States were controlled for.

Familism Gaps. Hierarchical regression analyses examining the relations of a gap on familism-support rendered several significant associations. First, a gap on familism-support was found to predict lower levels of adolescent reported positive sense of sel*f* (β = -.387, t = -3.918, $p < .01$). This particular relationship contributed 2.9% of the variance to the overall significant model F (3, 85) = 6.002, $p < .01$. Next, analyses revealed that a gap on familism-support significantly predicted lower levels of prosocial connectedness (β = -.339, t = -3.333, $p < .01$). A gap in familism-support contributed 10.6% of the total variance to the overall significant model F (3, 85) = 4.079, $p < .01$. Then, analyses revealed that a gap in familism-support significantly predicted increased levels of adolescent depression (β = 6.823, t = 3.408, $p < .01$). This finding also contributed 10.5% of the total variance to the overall significant model F (3, 85) = 6.264, $p < .01$. Finally, analyses revealed that a gap in familism-support predicted increased levels of adolescent physical aggression (β = .298, t = 2.930, $p < .01$). A gap in familism-support contributed 8.0% of the total variance to the overall significant model F (3, 85) = 4.006, $p < .01$ (see Table 15).

Following the previous analyses, relations between a gap on familism-obligations and child outcomes were then examined. First, analyses revealed that a gap in familism-

obligations significantly predicted lower levels of adolescent positive sense of self (β = -.282, t = -2.746, p < .01). It also contributed 7.1% of the total variance to the overall significant model F (3, 85) = 3.330, p < *.05.* Next, analyses examining the relations with prosocial connectedness also revealed significant findings. Results indicated that a gap in familism-obligations predicted lower adolescent prosocial connectedness (β = -.291, t = -2.724, p < .01). Additionally, it contributed 7.0% of the total variance to the overall significant model F (3, 85) = 2.835, p < .05. Finally, a gap in familism-obligations also revealed itself to significantly predict increased levels of depression (β = .334, t = 3.392, p = .01). It also contributed 10.4% of the total variance to the overall significant model F (3, 85) = 6.225, p < .01 (see Table 16).

The last of the familism analyses examined relations between a gap on familism-referent and the measured outcomes rendered two significant relationships. First, analyses revealed that a gap on familism-referent significantly predicted lower levels of adolescent positive sense of self (β = -.384, t = -3.795, p < .01). It contributed 13.5% of the total variance for the overall significant model F (3, 85) = 5.677, p < .01. Secondly, analyses revealed that a gap on familism-referent significantly predicted increased levels of depression (β = .318, t = 3.147, p < .01). It also contributed 9.0% of total variance to the overall significant model F (3, 85) = 5.650, p < .01 (see Table 17). Again, taken as a whole, analyses with the different components of familism revealed that the three constructs elucidated different significant relationships that would not have been detectable if they had been combined together into a single familism indicator.

Other Values. Following the analyses on the familism gaps, hierarchical regressions were done with the other values: respect, religion and traditional gender roles. Analyses revealed that a gap on respect was the only value that significantly predicted the measured outcomes. First, a gap on respect predicted lower levels of adolescent positive sense of self (β = -.341, t = -3.380, p < .01). It contributed a total of 10.8% of the variance for the overall significant model F (3, 85) = 4.657, p < .01. Second, a gap on respect demonstrated to significantly predict decreased levels of prosocial connectedness (β = -.285, t = -2.742, p < .01). It contributed 7.1% of the variance for the overall significant model F (3, 85) = 2.867, p < .05. Third, a gap on respect significantly predicted increased levels of adolescent depression (β = .247, t = 2.424, p < .01). It contributed 6.9% of the variance in the overall significant model F (3, 85) = 4.207, p < .01. Interestingly, it should be mentioned that number of years that the parent was in the United States was also a significant predictor for increased levels of adolescent depression at both steps of the hierarchical regression. Finally, a gap on respect predicted higher levels of aggression (β = .281, t = 2.734, p < .01). It accounted for 6.9% of the variance in the overall model F (3, 85) = 3.621, p < .01 (see Table 18).

Analyses for gaps on traditional gender roles did not reveal any significant relations with the measured outcomes (see Tables 19 & 20).

Overall Gaps. After conducting analyses on the specific values, regression analyses were done on gaps of overall Mexican values and general acculturation orientation. Analyses revealed several significant associations with a gap in Mexican values and the measured outcomes. Hierarchical regression analyses demonstrated that a

gap on Mexican values significantly predicted decreased levels of positive sense of self (β = -.354, t = -3.535, p < .01). It contributed 11.8% of the variance for the overall significant model F (3, 85) = 5.025, p < .05. Next, a gap on Mexican values predicted increased levels of depression (β = .320, t = 3.232, p < .01). It contributed 9.5% of the variance for the overall model F (3, 85) = 5.844, p < .01. Additionally, it should be noted that number of years that the parent has been in the United States also significantly predicted increased levels of depression for the adolescents. Finally, analyses also revealed that a gap in Mexican values predicted increased levels of aggression (β = .232, t = 2.232, p < .01). It contributed 4.4% of the variance for the overall model F (3, 85) = 2.760, p < .05. With respect to analyses of a gap on overall acculturation, it did not significantly predict any of the outcomes (see Table 21).

Hierarchical Multiple Regression Predicting the Mediator (*Aim 2)*

Following the examination of relations between the various parent-adolescent gaps and adolescent outcomes, hierarchical multiple regression analyses were conducted in order to examine whether the various computed gaps predicted different domains of family functioning. As with the previous set of analyses, income, number of years of the parent in the United States and child gender (in the case of parental monitoring) were controlled for.

Familism Gaps. First, the relations of a parent and adolescent gap in familism-support were examined. It was found to significantly predict lower levels of parental monitoring (β = -.282, t = -2.823, p < .01), it contributed 7.9% of the total variance. And the overall model was also significant F (3, 75) = 4.279, p < .01. Additionally, it should

be mentioned that gender was also a significant predictor at step 1 (β = .300, t = 2.883, p < .01) and step 2 (β = .309, t = 3.082, p < .01) of the regression analyses. Next, associations with accepting parenting practices were examined. A gap in familism-support predicted lower levels of accepting parenting (β = -.299, t = -2.712, p < .05), it contributed a total of 8.9% of the total variance of the overall significant model F (3, 75) = 2.629, p < .05. Finally, a gap in familism-support also predicted lower levels of nurturing parenting practices (β = -.343, t = -3.364, p < .01). It contributed 10.9% of the total variance in the overall significant model F (3, 85) = 3.897, p < .01 (see Table 7).

Next, regression analyses for a gap on familism-obligations were examined. Results indicated that a parent and adolescent gap in familism-obligations predicted decreased levels of passive/inconsistent parenting practices (β = -.255, t = -2.458, p < .01), it contributed 5.6% of the variance to the overall significant model F (3, 85) = 2.828, p < .05. Finally, a gap in familism-obligations predicted decreased levels of nurturing parenting practices (β = -.282, t = -2.823, p < .05). It contributed 7.2% of the variance, to the overall significant model (F (4, 84) = 4.279, p < .01) (see Table 8).

Finally, the last familism gap examined was familism-referent. Results indicated that a gap on familism-referent was associated with decreased levels of parental monitoring (β = -.246, t = -2.388, p < .05) and it contributed a total of 5.0% of the total variance in the overall significant model (F (4, 84) = 3.656, p < .01). Again, it should be noted that gender was a significant predictor at step 1 (β = -.300, t = 2.883, p < .01) and at step 2 (β = .316, t = 3.106, p < .01) of the hierarchical regression analyses (see Table 9).

Other Values. When examining the relations between gaps on respect and the measured outcomes, two significant relations were found. Regression analyses determined that a gap in respect was associated with decreased levels of parental monitoring (β = -.256, t = -2.729, p < .01) and it contributed 6.7% of the variance. Additionally, the overall model was also significant F (4, 84) = 4.135. Next, analyses revealed that a gap in respect was associated with decreased levels of nurturing parenting practices (β = -.283, t = -2.715, p < .01) with an overall contribution of 7.0% to the total variance of the overall significant model F (3, 85) = 2.577, p < .05 (see Table 10).

Next, relations with traditional gender roles were examined and found two significant associations. Hierarchical regression results indicated that a gap in traditional gender roles was associated with increased levels of passive/inconsistent parenting practices (β = .266, t = 2.541, p < .01). It also contributed as total of 6.0% of the total variance and the overall model was also significant F (3, 85) = 2.969, p < .01. Additionally, a gap in traditional gender roles was found to significantly predict decreased levels of parental monitoring (β = -.220, t = -2.888, p < .05). It contributed a total of 4.8% of the total variance to the overall significant model F (4, 84) = 3.527, p < .01. As with the other analyses that include parental monitoring, gender was also observed to be a significant predictor at both stages of the hierarchical regression (see Table 12).

Overall Gaps. After examining the relations of gaps of specific values, analyses were conducted with gaps on overall Mexican values and general acculturation orientation. Analyses with a gap on overall Mexican values demonstrated it was

associated with decreased parental monitoring (β = -.216, t = -2.098, $p < .05$), it also contributed 3.7% of the total variance. Additionally, the overall model was also significant F (4, 84) = 3.299, $p < .01$. On the other hand, results for a gap on overall acculturation demonstrated that it was not significantly associated with any of the measured family functioning mediators.

Mediation Analyses for Observed Outcomes and Mediators on Gaps (*Aim 3)*

The Preacher and Hayes (2008) bootstrapping procedure was used to examine whether there was an indirect effect of the predictor variables on the observed outcomes via the proposed mediators. Specifically, a simple mediation model was proposed in order to determine if the family functioning constructs (parentification, passive/inconsistent parenting, parental monitoring, accepting parenting, and nurturing parenting) mediated the relations between the various gaps computed (familism-support, familism-obligations, familism-referent, respect, traditional gender roles, Mexican values and overall acculturation orientation) and adolescents' core competencies and behavioral outcomes. The bootstrapping method for assessing the indirect effect of the predictor variable on the outcome variable via the mediator is considered an alternative to other conventional mediation analyses (MacKinnon, Lockwood, Hoffman, West & Sheets, 2002).

In a simple mediation model the effect of a single mediator is examined. When conducting these types of analyses, the obtained sample is treated as a representation of the population in miniature. Thus, the sample is then resampled during analyses, thereby mimicking the original sampling process (Hayes, 2009). It is generally advised that

iterations of resampling be set to 5000. Therefore, for purposes of this investigation, this was also the number of times that resampling was set for. Bootstrapping analyses render the total effect (c) of X on Y, direct effect (c') of X on Y, and the indirect effect (c-c') of X via the mediator (M) on the outcome variable X. The direct effect is defined as the part of the effect of X on Y that is independent of the pathway through M (Hayes, 2009). The indirect effect is interpreted as the amount by which two cases who differ by one unit on X are expected to differ on Y through X's effect on M (Hayes, 2009). In order to assess whether there is a significant direct effect bootstrapping analyses generate a confidence interval. With the confidence interval, if zero is not between the lower and upper bound, then it can be deduced that the indirect is not zero with *ci*% confidence interval (Hayes, 2009). For purposes of this investigation, a 95% confidence interval was selected and the bias corrected and accelerated confidence interval was reported.

The advantage of utilizing a bootstrapping procedure to measure the indirect effect of the predictor on the outcome is that it does not impose the assumption of normality of the sampling distribution (Preacher & Hayes, 2008). Additionally, use of bootstrapping procedures alleviates some of the concerns over inadequate sample size. It has been reported that for the most common form of examining mediation effect, Baron and Kenny (1986), it is among the lowest in power and it also considered to be the least likely to detect partial indirect effects of the mediator (Hayes, 2009). With bootstrapping simulation research, it has demonstrated to have the highest power and the best Type I error control (Preacher & Hayes, 2008). Specifically, for these analyses, household income and number of years that the parent had been in the United States were controlled

for and when relations including parental monitoring as a mediator were conducted, child gender was also controlled for.

Familism Gaps. An examination of the mediating effect of the family functioning constructs between familism-support and the various child outcomes rendered one significant indirect effect. Specifically, when examining the relation between a gap on familism-support and moral system of belief, accepting parenting was a significant mediator. Exposure to a gap on familism-support related to lower levels of accepting parenting practices, which in turn contributed to lower levels of adolescent moral system of belief. A gap on familism-support had a total indirect effect of -2.801 (95% CI between -10.114 and -.262). This relation was solely transmitted through the mediator since there was no significant total effect (c = -2.427, t (72) = -.632, *n.s.*) nor indirect effect (c' = .374, t (72) = .096, *n.s.*) of the predictor variable (see Table 23).

Next, the mediating effects of the different family factors between a gap in familism-obligations and child outcomes were examined, and revealed three significant mediating effects. First, parentification was a significant mediator between a gap on familism and social decision making. Specifically, being exposed to a gap on familism-obligations contributed to lower levels of parentification and it in turn predicted lower levels of social decision making adolescents. A gap in familism-obligations had a total indirect effect of -1.804 (95% CI between -6.876 to -.011) on social decision making. This relation was partially transmitted by the mediator because the direct effect (c' = -9.304, t (62) = -2.019, $p < .05$) of a gap on familism-obligations was significant. The total effect was also significant (c = -11.107, t (62) = -2.400, $p < .05$). Second, analyses

revealed once again that parentification was a significant mediator between a gap on familism-obligations and moral system of belief. Specifically, having a gap on familism-obligations contributed to lower levels of parentification, and it in turn also predicted lower levels of adolescent moral system of belief. This particular gap had a total indirect effect of -1.377 (95% CI between -4.636 to -.030). This relation was largely transmitted through the mediator since no direct effect of a gap on familism-obligations was found (c' = -4.366, t (64) = -1.520, *n.s.*). Additionally, the total effect (c = -5.742, t (64) = -1.966, $p < .05$) was also significant. Finally, analyses demonstrated that again parentification was a significant mediator in the relationship between a gap in familism-obligations and prosocial connectedness. Specifically, experiencing a gap in familism-obligations contributed to lower levels of parentification, which in turn contributed to lower levels of adolescent prosocial connectedness. A gap on familism-obligations had a significant indirect effect -3.626 (95% CI between -4.366 to .030). This relation was largely transmitted through the mediator since the direct effect between familism-obligations and prosocial connectedness was not significant (c' = -4.366, t (64) = -1.520, *n.s.*). Also, the total effect was significant (c = -5.742, t (64) = -1.966, $p < .05$) (see Table 24).

Finally, mediation analyses were examined with a gap on familism-referent and results rendered one significant finding. It was found that a gap on familism-referent was associated with lower levels of parental monitoring which in turn contributed to increased levels of adolescent depression. This particular gap had a significant indirect effect .696 (95% CI .007 to 2.454). Analyses revealed that this relation was solely transmitted

through parental monitoring since the direct effect was not significant (*c'* = 2.728, t (71) = 1.421, *n.s.*) and neither was the total effect (*c* = 3.424, *t* (71) = 1.792, *n.s.*) (see Table 25).

Other values. When examining the indirect effects of gaps in other values two significant results were observed. First, mediation analyses revealed that accepting parenting mediated the relationship between a gap on respect and adolescent moral system of belief. Results demonstrated that a gap on respect was associated with lower levels of accepting parenting, which in turn contributed to lower levels of moral system of belief. The indirect effect of a gap of respect was -2.566 (95% CI -10.127 to -.288). Analyses revealed that this relation was solely transmitted through accepting parenting since the direct and total effects were not significant (*c'* = -3.507, *t* (72) = -.898, *n.s.*; *c* = -6.073, *t* (72) = -1.605, *n.s.*, respectively) (see Table 26).

CHAPTER 4 – DISCUSSION

Discussion

The present investigation examined the relations among adolescent and parent gaps on acculturation and pertinent Latino values, adolescent outcomes, and family functioning constructs. Additionally, this investigation also examined the potentially mediating effect of these family functioning constructs between the various gaps and adolescent outcomes. The discussion will be organized around the questions that guided the project, the links between the findings and past work, and the implications for application. Finally, the limitations and suggestions for future directions will be mentioned.

Research Aim 1: To examine the effects of the parent-child acculturation gap (measured by match or mismatch) on youth core competencies and emotional outcomes.

The goal of this first aim was to examine whether adolescent and parent mismatches on overall acculturation and specific Latino values (familism-support, familism-obligations, familism-referent, respect, traditional gender roles and Mexican American values) had an effect on youth core competencies (self-control, social decision making, moral system of belief, positive sense of self, and prosocial connectedness) and behavioral outcomes (depression and aggression). In order words, is a gap between adolescents and parents implicated with lower levels of youth core competencies and behavioral outcomes? It was hypothesized that discrepancies between parents and adolescents on values and overall acculturation would be associated with poor positive

youth development, behavioral and emotional outcomes. Overall, the results obtained partially supported the proposed hypothesis.

Familism Gaps. Results indicated that a gap between adolescents and parents on levels of familism-support were associated with decreased levels of adolescent positive sense of self and prosocial connectedness and increased levels of depression and aggression. Next, gaps in familism-obligations were found to be associated with lower levels of positive sense of self, prosocial connectedness and increased levels of depression. Finally, gaps in familism-referent were also associated with lower levels of positive sense of self and prosocial connectedness, and increased levels of depression.

A gap in this particular value demonstrated to have detrimental effects for adolescents on positive youth development, behavioral and emotional outcomes. This is indicative of the instrumental role and importance that the value of familism has within Latino families. Considering that familism appears to be the value that continues to persist across generations in Latino families (Sabogal, Marin and Otero, 1987); it is not surprising that a discrepancy in this value is associated with a number of negative adolescent outcomes. These results are similar to those found by other investigations. German, Gonzales, and Dumka (2008), found that when parents and their adolescents reported high levels of familism, the interaction of the three was associated with decreased behavioral problems. Although parent and adolescent gaps in familism have not been specifically examined, current findings in the literature that report the potentially deleterious effects of minimized levels of familism in adolescents, are resonated in the findings of this particular investigation.

Specifically, with respect to prosocial connectedness, the discrepancy may lead adolescents to feel differently than their parents with respect to the importance of the family. Therefore, the adolescent may be less inclined to feel obligated to act in a manner that would benefit the entire family and not defer to family members for advice. This would then place adolescents at a disadvantage when it comes to having the opportunity to have access to a high quality primary social support network. In this respect, not having a supportive proximal network of family members would severely compromise an adolescent's perceived prosocial connectedness. These considerations fall in line with the conclusions drawn by Bradshaw and Guerra (2008), in which they state that prosocial connectedness entails caring and feeling cared for by the social environment. Therefore by not having the rudimentary foundations to develop a supportive network, that familism enables, then an adolescent's perceived prosocial connectedness is severely compromised. In the absence of such relations, an adolescent may then foster connections with individuals that may not endorse socially acceptable ways of behaving and thinking. This situation may also explain why the adolescents in our particular sample reported increased levels of aggression. If the relationships that the adolescent has formed are not positive, then the group may endorse aggressive behaviors and actions.

Additionally, as indicated by the results, these situations have adolescents experiencing depression and lower levels of positive sense of self. This assumption falls in line with the results obtained by Smokowski and Bacallao (2006), where they found that when adolescents held a high degree of familism, they usually reported increased

levels in self-esteem in comparison to those that reported low levels of familism. In the case of gaps in familism, when an adolescent is not as high on familism as a parent, it may indicate that the parent may have been unable to effectively transmit the importance of the family to the adolescent. This may lead to an adolescent not holding the family important, which may make the adolescent perceive a lack and lead him/her to experience low positive sense of self and increased depression. On the other hand, when the adolescent reports higher levels of familism than the parent, this may also lead to negative outcomes. In this particular case, a lower recognition of the importance of the family, on the parent's part, may lead to a parent not being as involved with the adolescent. These effects can unfortunately then transition into the emerging adulthood period of development. Considering that an adolescent's positive sense of self is seen as an influencing mechanism for developing the future self (Cross & Marcus, 1991), these adolescents may not have the opportunity to develop the necessary tools to successfully navigate later in life. Therefore, these negative relations may continue to affect them as they proceed through the later stages of adulthood.

Other values. Interestingly, when examining the relations of discrepancies between adolescents and parents on respect and traditional gender roles, only one of the two demonstrated to have significant associations. Those parent and adolescent dyads that reported discrepancies in the value of respect had adolescents reporting lower levels of positive sense of self and prosocial connectedness; and increased levels of depression and aggression. There were no significant findings with respect to a gap on traditional gender roles and child outcomes.

The results examining relations of other salient Latino values and child outcomes demonstrated the importance that the value of *respeto* or respect has within the context of Latino families. As our results indicate the majority of the discrepancies were found with parent and child dyads in which the parent held a high degree of the respect value while the adolescent child did not. Respect is the cultural value that is valued by parents because it delineates appropriate behaviors that are indicative of a well raised child (Garza & Watts, 2000). Much like familism, respect tends to be a value that persists past the first generation (Phinney et al., 2000). But, respect has also been found to be a value that is endorsed less by successive generations of immigrant adolescents (Fuligni, 1998); such that adolescents report more often instances in which dissenting from their parent was appropriate. Therefore, a reasonable explanation for the association of parent and adolescent gaps in respect and lower levels of positive sense of self and prosocial connectedness may be due to the adolescent's lack of acknowledging the hierarchical system that is in place in most Latino families. If the adolescent does not endorse respect as much as the parent, then are less likely to demonstrate that degree of decorum that is expected of them. In doing so, parents may decide to be more harsh and punitive in their treatment or minimize their level of engagement with the adolescent, which would then compromise his/her level of prosocial connectedness. Finding him/her in a situation where they lack the substantive high quality social connections that could then lead to low positive sense of self and other negative behavioral (aggression) and emotional (depression) outcomes.

It was expected that there would have been some significant relations between gaps in traditional gender roles and child outcomes, but this was not the case. This expectation was partially supported by the previous findings of Huey and Cespedes (2008). This particular investigation found that a gap in traditional gender roles was associated with increased levels of youth depression (Huey & Cespedes, 2008). Although one would be quick to call into question the validity of a gender roles, this indicates something different. It indicates that the investigation of the effects of gaps in traditional gender roles between adolescents and parents is still in its infancy, and more investigations need to examine this particular gap. Therefore, future investigations that focus on this particular relationship may provide more insight into the effects associated with discrepancies in this particular value.

Overall gaps. Upon examination of associations with gaps on Mexican-American values and overall acculturation, several significant relations were found. Parent and adolescent gaps on Mexican-American values were associated with lower levels of adolescent positive sense of self and increased levels of aggression and depression. These results are similar to those found in this investigation as far as familism and respect are concerned. On the other hand, when examining the relations of overall acculturation gaps on child outcomes, no significant relations were found.

Findings that examined the relations of gaps on Mexican American values and overall acculturation orientation rendered several surprising findings. Although some significant findings were obtained when examining the relations between gaps in Mexican American values and child outcomes, there is also some degree of caution that

needs to be taken into consideration when interpreting these results. These could primarily be due to the specific Latino values (familism, respect and traditional gender roles) partially comprising the entire measurement of Mexican-American values. Nevertheless, this particular subscale did include other pertinent Latino values. Therefore, taken as a whole, discrepancies on Mexican-American values in general do appear to have negative repercussion for Latino youth. These results are similar to those found with respect and familism in this investigation, and therefore indicate the importance of retaining some level of adherence to overall cultural values.

On the other hand, it was somewhat surprising that no significant relations were found with gaps on overall acculturation and any of the measured child outcomes. Although it had been proposed that some associations would be found, it also was not completely surprising that no significant relations were found. The results with respect to overall acculturation are similar to those found in previous investigations. For example, Lau et al., (2005), failed to find associations in the predicted direction that would support the general assumption of the acculturation gap phenomenon. Instead their particular investigation found the opposite, negative outcomes were found in dyads in which the parent was more acculturated than the child. This trend has also been found by other investigations (Pasch et al., 2006; Sam & Virta, 2003). This indicates that this particular area of the literature needs further examination in order to determine if the acculturation gap phenomenon is in fact an occurrence that is affecting immigrant families .

Summary/Implications. The results from this first research aim demonstrate the importance of examining discrepancies between parents and adolescents not only on

overall acculturation, but on specific values as well. As the results indicated, it was only discrepancies in specific values and overall Mexican American values that rendered significant associations with child outcomes. Therefore, this indicates that maintenance of such values can be considered to be an asset for the adolescent that will promote normative development. But, considering that the hypothesis for this first aim was only partially supported, it also directs to investigating other constructs that may affect the relationship between gaps and outcomes. Therefore, the next step that may potentially elucidate relations associated with parent and adolescent gaps is to examine various family functioning constructs.

Research Aim 2: To examine the effect of parent-child acculturation and values gap (measured by match or mismatch), on family functioning constructs.

The focus of the second research aim was to examine whether adolescent and parent mismatches on overall acculturation and specific Latino values (familism-support, familism-obligations, familism-referent, respect, and Mexican-American values) had an effect on family functioning constructs. In other words, do gaps in overall acculturation and specific values have an effect on Latino immigrant family functioning? Therefore, it was hypothesized that gaps in specific values and overall acculturation would be associated with lower levels of parental monitoring, accepting and nurturing parenting. Additionally, gaps were expected to also be associated with increased levels parentification and passive/inconsistent parenting. Overall, the findings partially supported the proposed hypotheses.

Familism. Several noteworthy results were obtained when examining effects of gaps in familism and family functioning. First, gaps in familism-support were associated with lower levels of parental monitoring, accepting parenting, and nurturing parenting. Next, gaps in familism-obligations were found to be associated with lower levels of passive/inconsistent parenting and nurturing parenting. Finally, gaps in familism-referent were associated with decreased levels of parental monitoring.

These results demonstrate the formative role that familism plays on family functioning in Latino families. The three facets of familism had effects on similar family functioning constructs. The familism facet that demonstrated the most significant associations was familism-support. Although it was hypothesized that familism-support would be the part of familism with the least number of significant associations with poor family functioning; it was also hypothesized that if associations were found, that they would be more than the other two constructs of familism. In this respect, the hypothesis was supported. Since the support aspect of familism has been demonstrated to show the most persistence in successive generations in immigrant families (Sabogal et al., 1987); it was of no surprise that deterioration in equal perception of the importance of this value was associated with more negative family functioning than the other two. If the adolescents do not view the family unit as the primary source of support, they may not seek the help of their parents when needed. Additionally, parents may then take an uninvolved role with their parenting with the adolescent. In this respect, the lack of interactions occurring between the two may bring forth dysfunctional family processes such as neglecting to monitor the adolescent properly, perpetuating a parent and child

relationship that is characterized by low levels of accepting and nurturing parenting behaviors. Additionally, it could very well be that a lack of parental involvement with the adolescent may lead to the absence of parenting practices, even negative parenting practices. This would then explain the findings with respect to discrepancies in familism-referent and its association with passive/inconsistent parenting. These findings were counter to what was proposed. In this particular case a lack of involvement, due to a discrepancy between the adolescent and the parent, could also very well be associated to the absence of some negative parenting practices. Although these results would be beneficial for the adolescent, more is jeopardized considering that discrepancies in this value were associated with far more negative family functioning constructs.

Other values. Examining the effect of other salient Latino values on family functioning demonstrated that respect and traditional gender roles significantly predicted some family functioning constructs. Results indicated that gaps in respect were associated with decreased levels of parental monitoring and nurturing parenting. Additionally, parent and adolescent gaps on traditional gender roles, were associated with increased levels of passive/inconsistent parenting and lower levels of parental monitoring.

The findings associated with a discrepancy in respect also speak to the relative importance of this particular value. If adolescents are not behaving in the specifically prescribed manner that is considered culturally appropriate, then it may bring forth specific reactions from their parents. As proposed by Calzada, Fernandez and Cortes (2010), not only does respect delineate the norms for appropriate child behavior, but it is

also considered an important determinant in parenting practices. Respect's effect on parenting is considered to influence the approach a parent takes when attempting to discipline a child. Harwood (1992), found that parents that held high levels of adherence to the cultural construct of respect, utilized parenting techniques that asserted parental authority (e.g. physical restraint); instead of other practices such as modeling and praise that may be more common with European American parents. Additionally, these parents also did not endorse high levels of child autonomy. Therefore, for purposes of this investigation, if an adolescent has ascribed to the perspective that respect is not an important value to uphold, then this may lead him/her to seek more autonomy from family and not be concerned with what his/her parents wishes may be. Consequently, this situation may lead to lower levels of parental monitoring and a disengagement by the parent—in the form of lower levels of nurturing parenting—when dealing with the adolescent.

With respect to traditional gender roles, there are several explanations for the findings that suggest that discrepancies in this value are associated with increased levels of passive/inconsistent parenting and lower levels of parental monitoring. The literature that examined the effect of traditional gender roles within Latino families have often found that as women come to the United States, they tend to endorse the American ideals with respect to gender (Flores et al., 2004). The American culture is accepting of heightened expressions of power by women, this is the opposite in the Latino culture which endorses the submissiveness and docility of the woman within the marriage with the value of marianismo (Cauce & Domenech-Ramirez, 2000). In light of this change in

the perception of acceptable female behavior, a gap in this particular value may have mothers lower their vigilance of their children, especially their daughters, in order to demonstrate that both genders should be treated equally. Therefore, decreased levels of parental monitoring may lead to mothers being more passive/inconsistent in their parenting with their adolescent children. The less the parent is monitoring the adolescent the more likely that parenting practices may not be consistent.

Overall gaps. Again, there were some surprising results with respect to gaps in Mexican-American values and overall acculturation. Results indicated that gaps in Mexican-American values were associated with lower levels of parental monitoring. Again, results indicated that gaps in overall acculturation gaps did not predict any of the observed family functioning constructs.

Similar to the results from the other discrepancies examined, familism, respect and traditional gender roles, discrepancies in Mexican American values were also associated with lower levels of parental monitoring. This relationship may reflect a long standing situation within the families in this particular sample. Situations in which the children no longer endorse the general values of their home culture, denotes a process that may have been occurring over a prolonged period of time. This process would then contribute to the widening discrepancy between parents and adolescents. Perhaps after a prolonged period of time, parents may have felt that they were unable to influence their child and thus began to minimize their involvement in their child's lives by not monitoring them so intently.

On the other hand, the results obtained with respect to discrepancies on overall acculturation were similar to those found with child outcomes. The inability to find significant findings calls into question the validity of the overall acculturation gap. These results obtained support the findings of other investigations that found the same lack of significant findings (Lau et al., 2005).

Summary/Implications. In general, these results demonstrate the utility and necessity of incorporating family functioning constructs when examining the effects of parent and adolescent gaps on child outcomes. By examining family functioning constructs, it may elucidate potential mechanisms that are influenced and thereby vulnerable within normative Latino family functioning. Also, these results demonstrate that if overall acculturation gaps were only examined that investigators would potentially be overlooking a number of significant associations. This may also explain the inconsistency that the acculturation gap literature finds itself in at the present moment. Now the next step, given the results obtained from the first and second research aim, is to examine whether these family functioning play a mediating role between the various gaps and child outcomes.

Research Aim 3: To examine whether observed relations between the parent-adolescent acculturation gap, youth core competencies and behavioral outcomes are mediated by family functioning constructs.

The purpose of the final aim was to explore whether the effects of the parent-adolescent acculturation and values gap on child outcomes were mediated by family functioning factors. Specifically, is the effect of acculturation and values gaps on

adolescent outcomes primarily directed by its effect on family functioning? Generally speaking, it was hypothesized that the presence of any type of gap would be associated with poorer family functioning thereby affecting adolescent outcomes. Again, the results of this investigation partially supported this hypothesis.

Familism. Examining the mediating effect of various family functioning constructs between the different components of familism and adolescent outcomes, rendered a number of significant findings. First, gaps on familism-support were found to indirectly affect adolescent moral system of belief via accepting parenting. Those parent and adolescent dyads that had mismatches in familism-support had adolescent that reported lower levels of accepting parenting practices from their parent which in turn was associated with adolescent reports of lower moral system of belief. Next, gaps on familism-obligations were examined. Parentification resulted being a significant mediator when examining relations between a gap in familism-obligations and adolescent outcomes. Results demonstrated that a gap in familism-obligations was indirectly associated to adolescent social decision making, moral system of belief and prosocial connectedness. Specifically, a gap on familism-obligations was associated with lower levels of adolescent reported parentification, which in turn was associated with lower levels of adolescent social decision making, moral system of belief, and prosocial connectedness. Additionally, it should be mentioned in the case of social decision making, parentification partially mediated this relationship. A gap in familism-obligations was found to have a direct effect on this adolescent outcome. Finally, gaps on familism-referent rendered one significant indirect association. Specifically, results

indicated that a gap on familism-referent was associated with lower levels of parent reported monitoring practices which in turn predicted increased levels of adolescent depression.

The examination of the mediating effects provided more details about the dynamic relationship among the various gaps, family functioning and child outcomes. Specifically, for familism-support, the mediating role that accepting parenting played in its relationship with moral system of belief is of great interest. In this particular case, the lack of an adolescent's perception of the support available by the family, in comparison to that of the parent, severely compromised parent and child relations. By not seeking or not expecting support from family members, adolescents placed themselves in a situation in which a parent would not be as accepting as he/she could be. As a result of this particular situation, an adolescent's moral system of belief was severely compromised. As Guerra and Bradshaw (2008), noted youth moral system of belief is largely influenced and embodies the moral standards of the family, environment and cultural values. If the opportunity to transmit the importance of family and cultural values is absent, as would be the case with the presence of a values gap, then an adolescent will be unable to successfully maintain a socially acceptable moral system of belief.

There were a number of interesting significant associations found with the mediating effect that parentification had between familism-obligations and social decision making, moral system of belief and prosocial connectedness. For this particular case, a gap in family-obligations led to lower levels of parentification. In essence, if adolescents did not have the same level of belief, as their parents, in the importance of

one's obligations to help the family unit; then adoelscents may have been less likely to take on parent like responsibilities. Although some research has noted the negative effect of child parentification (Jurkovic, 1997), other investigations regard parentification as mechanism in which children can positively contribute to large, single parent or two working parent families (Minuchin, 1974). The positive aspect of parentification may apply more so to immigrant Latino due to the numerous demands that they have. Therefore, in the case of Latino families, if the adolescents do not feel that they need to engage in family maintenance tasks, then they will be passive participants in the family. In doing so, adolescents are at a disadvantage at gaining the experience of being able to make less risky decisions. As Reyna and Farley (2007) posited, better decision makers are those that utilize "gist based" thinking in order to avoid risk. In this respect, the inability to make "gist based" decisions may be due to adolescents not taking part in opportunities, afforded by increased levels of parentification, which may allow them to gain a wealth of experiences to rely on later. In addition this absence of experience of taking on adult like responsibilities, and duties in order to help the family would also affect an adolescent's moral system of belief. By not fully engaging in activities that promote the family unit, adolescents may have a limited number of instances to adopt the fundamental values of the family and cultural group; thus compromising the development of their moral system of belief. Finally, if adolescents are incapable of carrying on more mature responsibilities, brought upon by parentification, then it would also place them in a situation in which they could socialize with individuals that may not endorse socially acceptable behaviors. Thus, these adolescents would also be at risk for compromising the

quality of the connections and relationships that they are able to foster within their family network. In essence, not perceiving one's role and expectations within the family will disable adolescents to engage in activities that will allow them to hone abilities that will influence: what they believe is morally right or wrong, the types of decisions they make, and the type of individuals they will chose to comprise their proximal social network.

Finally, parental monitoring mediated the relationship between gap in familism-referent and depression. Specifically, a gap in familism-referent was associated with decreased monitoring which then was associated with adolescent reports of depression. An explanation for this relationship could be that as adolescents disregard the support and advice giving that other family members are able to give, then they in turn may view their parents as being uninvolved and not seek their advice. In doing so, disengagement between both parties may occur and thereby minimizing parental monitoring. Then, the lack of parental involvement, via monitoring, can compromise adolescent emotional outcomes. The mediating effect of less involved/supportive parenting has been investigated and demonstrates that it does have an effect on the relationship between intergenerational discrepancies and adolescent emotional outcomes. Specifically, Kim, Chen, Li, Huang and Moon (2009), found that intergenerational discrepancies was associated with less supportive parenting, and led to increased depressive symptoms in adolescents. Therefore, in light of previous findings, the assumption proposed in order to explain our findings is a plausible explanation.

Other values. Upon examination of the mediating effect of family functioning between gaps on other salient Latino values and adolescent outcomes only one significant

association was found. Specifically, a gap on respect was indirectly associated with adolescent moral system of belief via accepting parenting. Specifically, in parent and adolescent dyads in which there was a gap on the value of respect, parents reported lower levels of nurturing parenting towards the adolescents. This in turn predicted lower levels of adolescent reported moral system of belief.

The mediating effect that accepting parenting had in the relationship in respect and moral system of belief was of great interest. An explanation of this relationship may be similar to that with the finding from the familism gaps. The importance that is placed, within the Latino culture, with respect to the appropriate level of decorum that a child needs to demonstrate is a cornerstone in Latino parenting. If a parent has raised the child the "right way," then the child will demonstrate appropriate levels of respect parents and extended family members. But, if the adolescent does not regard demonstrations of respect as being important, then parent and adolescent gaps may occur. As previously stated, alterations in parenting practice may occur when there is a lack of demonstrations of respect on the child's part (Harwood, 1992). Therefore, it is feasible to assume that in situation of discrepancies in respect, which may have developed over a prolonged period of time, parents may alter their parenting and be less accepting of the adolescent. In this case, minimized levels of accepting parenting may hinder the opportunities that a parent has to communicate to the adolescent additional familial and cultural values that comprise and adolescent's moral system of belief. Which according to Guerra and Bradshaw (2008), transmission of familial, environmental and cultural values are the founding components of an adolescent's moral system of belief. In this respect

minimized opportunities to engage in meaningful interactions, via nurturing parenting, brought on by discrepancies in values can have severe repercussion for positive youth development.

Overall gaps. Interestingly, the observed family functioning constructs were not found to have a significant mediating effect on gaps in Mexican-American values and overall acculturation and adolescent outcomes.

The lack of significant results when examining the mediating effect of various family functioning constructs between overall acculturation and Mexican American values gaps highlights the current trend in the acculturation gap literature. Considering that both of these constructs, overall acculturation and Mexican American values, are composed of various subscales; it may very well be that negative effects on parenting are brought upon by discrepancies on specific values and not overall discrepancies.

Summary/Implications. The findings obtained from the final aim in this research study highlight the formative role that family functioning has between parent and adolescent gaps and adolescent outcomes. As many investigations have found (Dinh et al., 1994; Kim, Chen, Li, Huang & Moon, 2009; Martinez, 2006), the effects of such gaps are associated with family dysfunction which then leads to negative adolescent outcomes. This indicates that future research endeavors should consider the inclusion of family functioning constructs as mechanism that may carry the effect of gaps on child outcomes.

Of great interest and surprise were the findings that none of the measured mediators were significantly associated to overall acculturation and Mexican American values gaps and child outcomes. This finding further illustrates the inconsistencies that

are continually found within the acculturation gap literature. But, it does lead investigators to further consider the examination of salient values as more appropriate indicators of a gap that can affect family functioning and ultimately adolescent outcomes.

Limitations and Future Research Directions

Although this research project has contributed to the acculturation gap literature with immigrant Latino families, this investigation is not without limitations. A primary limitation to this investigation was the relatively small sample size. There was a great deal of difficulty in recruiting a sizeable sample size for various reasons. The current social climate that these families find themselves in may have played a role in the low recruitment number. The concern over deportation and risk of jeopardizing any governmental services that they may be receiving is a constant concern for these families when they are considering disclosing any personal information. Although the parents were assured that no indentifying information would be disclosed, this may not have been enough to appease their concerns.

Another notable limitation of this particular research project is the cross sectional research design of the study. It would have been advantageous to have been able to conduct this kind of investigation in a longitudinal manner. The benefit of including more than one data collection period is that acculturation is generally considered a dynamic process that changes as an individual's exposure and contact with the mainstream culture changes. As these adolescents age, their acculturation levels may have differed in different directions. In addition, the parent's acculturation level may have also changed as their contact with the mainstream culture also changed. But, the

insight and knowledge gained from this cross sectional study is not without merit. It indicates that future research projects should attempt to be longitudinal and include examinations prior to adolescence, during adolescence and at the onset of emerging adulthood. In this manner participants may be tracked during important transitions in development.

The ethnic homogeneity of the sample utilized in this investigation is also a limitation. This particular investigation's sample primarily consisted of Mexican immigrant parents and adolescents. Due to the heterogeneity of the general immigrant Latino population, these results cannot be assumed to apply to other immigrant Latino groups. Therefore, the conclusions drawn from this investigation are limited to only being discussed within the context of Latino Mexican families. Future investigations should include immigrant families from other Latin American countries. In doing so, it will enable investigators to see if the same values are important in different Latino immigrant groups. If so, then gaps in acculturation and values may be examined to determine if the acculturation gap phenomenon applies to certain Latino groups and not others.

Implications

The current study provides valuable information that will be useful for researchers, interventionists, and therapists in gaining an understanding of the effect of having a values and acculturation level discrepancy between parents and children. For researchers, this investigation directs future investigations to further examine discrepancies on acculturation level along with discrepancies values as potential

mechanisms of explaining the effect of gaps. Acculturation gap investigations have only examined gaps on overall acculturation and not on specific core values for a particular cultural group. Perhaps the differences lie in discrepancies in values and not on overall acculturation. Therefore, future investigations would benefit from approaching the gap phenomenon in this manner. Researchers also need to consider utilizing more inclusive measures of acculturation. Specifically, measures that include both deep and surface structure constructs of culture would be better indicators on an individual's acculturation. Since this particular investigation only utilized deep culture constructs to measure acculturation, the lack of finding an effect of an overall gap may have been due to the exclusion of surface structure culture constructs. Finally, as with the general current trend in the acculturation gap literature, further examination of the effect of family functioning constructs need to be included in future acculturation gap investigations. As this investigation has indicated, family functioning characteristics have shown to be important mediators to include when looking at the effect of parent and adolescent gaps. By considering and including the aforementioned suggestions, researchers will undoubtedly advance further understanding of this particular area of research.

The results of this investigation also provide valuable directions for prevention program developers and therapists to consider when working with immigrant Latino samples. Some prevention programs are said to be tailored to Latino families to help improve parenting skills and family functioning. But, in reality these programs rarely consider the unique needs of immigrant families and how they can be adequately addressed (Leidy, Guerra, & Toro, 2010). In order to be effective prevention programs,

they must incorporate attention to the unique needs and issues for distinct subgroups within the larger culture, such as recent immigrant families and their children. These findings support the further development and dissemination of bicultural family skills training approaches (Bacallao & Smokowski, 2005) in order to decrease the susceptibility of family dysfunction. Some programs have been developed, such as Bicultural Effectiveness Training (BET) (Szapocznik, Santisteban, Kurtines, Perez-Vidal & Hervis, 1984) and filial therapy (Garza & Watts, 2010), and have shown promise and success. But, further progress needs to occur in order to properly serve this fast growing sector of the population.

Conclusions

The current study highlights two primary issues. First, this investigation exemplifies the current state of the acculturation gap literature which is inconsistent with no clear consensus. Since this investigation was unable to successfully find significant relations associated with an overall acculturation gap, it calls into question whether there is an effect that can be attributed to an overall acculturation gap. Again, this area of research is still in its infancy and more investigations need to be conducted in order to really consider if a gap on overall acculturation has an effect or not in immigrant populations. Alternatively, the second issue this investigation highlights is the formidable effect of salient Latino values and how discrepancies of the degree of adherence to these values, between parents and their children, can have negative for adolescents and the family system as well. Therefore, the examination of the acculturation gap may not necessarily lie solely within overall acculturation, but also

within specific core cultural values. In this respect, this investigation provides a feasible direction to further investigate the gap phenomenon by looking at specific salient values within a particular cultural group. The hope is that by including these additional constructs in the study of acculturations gaps, it will enable researchers to gain a better understanding of the issues encountered by immigrant families and provide feasible and effective avenues for prevention efforts.

References

Adler, P., Ovando, C., & Hocevar, D. (1984). Familiar correlates of gang membership: An exploratory study. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 6,* 65–76.

Airhihenbuwa, C. O., DiClemente, R. J., Wingood, G. M., & Lowe, A. (1992). HIV/AIDS education and prevention among African-American: A focus on culture. *AIDS Education and Prevention, 4,* 267-276.

Aldwin, C., & Greenberger, E. (1987). Cultural differences in the predictors of depression. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 15*, 789–813.

Arcia, E., & Johnson, A. (1998). When respect means to obey: Immigrant Mexican mothers' values for their children. *Journal of Child and Family Studies, 7,* 79-95.

Baca-Zinn, M. C. (1994). Adaptation and continuity in Mexican origin families. In R. L. Taylor (Ed.), *Minority families in the United States.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Bandura, A. (1994). Self-efficacy. In V. S. Ramachaudran (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of human behavior* (Vol. 4, pp. 71-81). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

Barakin, T., Konstantareas, M. & Debosset, F. (1989). Adaptation of recent Soviet Jewish immigrants and their children in Toronto. *Canadian Journal of Psychiatry, 34,* 512-518.

Bauman, S. (2005). The reliability and validity of the brief acculturation rating scale for Mexican Americans-II for children and adolescents. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Science, 27,* 426–441.

Berry, J. W. (1980). Acculturation as varieties of adaptation. In A. M. Padilla (Ed.), *Acculturation: Theory, models and some new findings* (pp. 9-25). Boulder, CO: Westview.

Berry, J. (2003). Conceptual approaches to acculturation. In K. Chun, P. Balls Organista, & G. Marin (Eds.), *Acculturation: Advances in theory, measurement and applied research* (pp. 17–37). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Berry, J.W., Phinney, J.S., Sam, D.L., & Vedder, P. (Eds.) (2006). Immigrant youth in cultural transition: Acculturation, identity and adaptation across national contexts. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.Burnett, Jones, Bliwise & Ross, 2006

Birman, D. (2006) Measurement of the "acculturation gap" in immigrant families and implications for parent-child relationships. In M. H. Bornstein & L. R. Cote (Eds.), *Acculturation and parent-child relationships: Measurement and Development* (pp. 113-134). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Block, J., H. (1965). *The child rearing practices report*. Berkeley: Institute of Human Development, University of California.

Bosworth, K., & Espelage, D. (1995). Teen conflict survey. Bloomington, IN: Center for Adolescent Studies, Indiana University. Items were published in Dahlberg, L.L., Toal, S.B., Behrens, C.B., (1998). Measuring Violence-Related Attitudes, Beliefs, and Behaviors Among Youths: A Compendium of Assessment Tools. Atlanta, GA: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Injury Prevention and Control.

Calzada,E. J., Fernandez, Y., & Cortes, D. E. (2010). Incorporating the cultural value of respeto into a framework of Latino parenting. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 16,* 77-86.

Camarota S (2007) 'Immigrants in the United States, 2007: A Profile of America's Foreign-Born Population', *Center for Immigration Studies Backgrounder*

Cauce, A. M., & Domenech-Rodriguez, M. (2002). Latino families: Myths and realities. In J. M. Contreras, K. A. Kerns, & A. M. Neal-Barnett (Eds.). *Latino children and families in the United States: Current research and future directions* (pp. 3–25). Westport, CT: Praeger/ Greenwood Publishing Group.

Causey, D. L., & Dubow, E. F. (1992). Development of a self-report coping measure for elementary school children. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology, 21,* 47-59.

Cespedes, Y.M., & Huey, S.J., Jr. (2008). Depression in Latino Adolescents: A Cultural Discrepancy Perspective. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Mental Health, 14,* 168-172.

Chia, A., & Costigan, C. L. (2006). Understanding the multidimensionality of Acculturation among Chinese Canadians. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science, 38,* 311-324.

Commission on Children at Risk. (2003*). Hardwired to connect: The new scientific case for authoritative communities*. New York: Institute for American Values.

Contreras, Lopez, Rivera, Raymond-Smith, & Rothstein, 1999

Cross, S., & Markus, H. (1991). Possible selves across the life span. *Human Development, 34,* 230-255.

Cuellar, I., Arnold, B. & Maldonado, R. (1995). Acculturation rating scale for Mexican Americans-II: A revision of the original ARMSA scale. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 17,* 275-304.

Delgado-Gaitan, C. (1993). Parenting in two generations of Mexican American families. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 16,* 409-427.

Delgado-Gaitan, C. (1994). Socializing young children in Mexican-American families: An intergenerational perspective. In P. Greenfield & R. Cocking (Eds.), *Cross-cultural roots of minority child development* (pp. 55–86). Hillside, NJ: Erlbaum.

Dinh, K. T., Sarason, B. R., & Sarason, I. G. (1994). Parent–child relationships in Vietnamese immigrant families . *Journal of Family Psychology, 8,* 471–488

Drachman, D., Kwon-Ahn, Y.H., and Paulino, A. (1996). Migration and resettlement experiences of Dominican and Korean families. *Families in Society, 77,* 626–638.

Epstein, J.A., Botvin, G.J., Dusenbury, L., Diaz, T., & Kerner, J. (1996). Validation of an acculturation measure for Hispanic adolescents. *Psychological Reports, 79,* 1075–1079.

Epstein, J.A., Botvin, G.J., & Diaz, T. (1998). Linguistic acculturation and gender effects on smoking among Hispanic youth. *Prevention Medicine, 27*, 583–589.

Farver, J. M., Narang, S., & Bhadha, B. R. (2002). East meets West: Acculturation and conflict in Asian Indian families. *Journal of Family Psychology, 16,* 338–350.

Fitzgerald, M.M., Salstrom, S.A., Zinzow, H.M., Fossel, R. & Jackson, J.L. (2008). Child sexual abuse, early family risk, childhood parentification: Pathways to current psychosocial adjustment. *Journal of Family Psychology, 22,* 320-324.

Flores, E., Tschann, J.M., Marin, B.V., & Pantoja P. (2004). Marital conflict and acculturation among Mexican American husbands and wives. *Cultural Diversity & Ethnic Minority Psychology, 10,* 39-52.

Fuligni, A. J., & Pedersen, A. (2002). Family obligation and transition to young adulthood. *Developmental Psychology, 38,* 856-868.

Fuligni, A. J., Yip, T, & Tseng, V. (2002). The impact of family obligation on the daily behavior and psychological well being of Chinese American adolescents. *Child Development, 73*, 306-318.

Fuligni, A. J., Tseng, V., & Lam, M. (1999). Attitudes toward family obligations among American adolescents with Asian, Latin American, and European backgrounds. *Child Development, 70,*1030-1044.

Garza, Y., & Watts, R. E. (2010). Filial therapy and Hispanic values: Common ground for culturally sensitive helping. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 88,* 108-113.

German, M., Gonzales, N. A., & Dumka, L. (2009). Familism values as a protective factor for Mexican-origin adolescents exposed to deviant peers. *The Journal of Early Adolescence, 29,* 16-42.

Gestsdottir, S., & Lerner, R. M. (2007). Intentional self-regulation and positive youth development in early adolescence: Findings from the 4-H study of positive youth development. *Developmental Psychology, 43,* 508-521.

Gil, A. G., Vega, W. A., & Dimas, J. M. (1994). Acculturation stress and personal adjustment among Latino adolescent boys. *Journal of community psychology, 22,* 43-54.

Gil, A. G., & Vega, W. A. (1996). Two different worlds: Acculturation stress and adaptation among Cuban and Nicaraguan families. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 13,* 435-456.

Gil, A. G., Wagner, E. F., & Vega, W. A. (2000). Acculturation, familism, and alcohol use among Latino adolescent males: Longitudinal relations. *Journal of Community Psychology, 28,* 443-458.

Gonzalez-Ramos, G., Zayas, L. H., & Cohen, E. V. (1998). Child-rearing values of low-income, urban Puerto Rican mothers of preschool children. *Professional Psycholog*y: *Research & Practice, 29,* 377–382.

Guerra, N. G., & Bradshaw, C. P. (2008). Linking the prevention of problem behaviors and positive youth development: Core competencies for positive youth development and risk prevention. *New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development, 122*, 1–17.

Guerra, N. G., & Knox. L. (2008). The role of culture in the dissemination and implementation of innovation. Invited article, special issue, *American Journal of Community Psychology, 41,* 304-313.

Guerra, N. G., Nucci, L., & Huesmann, L. R. (1994). Moral cognition and childhood aggression. In L. R. Huesmann (Ed.), *Current perspectives in aggressive behavior* (pp.13-33). New York: Plenum.

Harrison, A.O., Wilson, M.N., Pine, C.J., Chan, S.Q., and Buriel, R. (1990). Family ecologies of ethnic minority children. *Child Development, 61,* 347–362.

Harwood, R. L. (1992). The influence of culturally derived values on Anglo and Puerto Rican mothers' perceptions of attachment behavior. *Child Development, 63,* 822–839.

Harwood, R. L., Miller, J. G., & Irizarry, N. L. (1995). *Culture and attachment: Perceptions of the child in context.* New York: Guilford Press.

Hernandez-Guzman, L., and Sanchez-Sosa, J.J. (1996). Parent–child interactions predict anxiety in Mexican adolescents. *Adolescence, 31,* 953–963.

Hooper, L. M. (2007). Expanding the discussion regarding parentification and its varied outcomes: Implications for mental health research and practice. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling, 29*, 322–337.

Jurkovic, G. J. (1997). *Lost childhoods*: *The plight of the parentified child*. Philadelphia: Brunner/Mazel.

Kelley, M. L., French, A., Bountress, K., Keefe, H.A., Schroeder, V., Steer, K., Fals-Stewart, W., & Gumienny, L.(2007). Parentification and family responsibility in the family of origin of adult children of alcoholics. *Addictive Behaviors, 32,* 675-685

Kim, S. Y., Chen, Q., Li, J., Huang, X., Moon, U. J**.** (2009). Parent-child acculturation, parenting, and adolescent depressive symptoms in Chinese immigrant families. *Journal of Family Psychology, 23,* 426-437.

Kirby, D. (2001). Understanding what works and what doesn't in reducing adolescent risk-taking. *Family Planning Perspectives, 33,* 276-281.

Knight, G. P., Gonzales, N. A., Saenz, D. S., Bonds, D. D., Germán, M., Deardoff, J., Roosa, M. W., & Updegraff, K. A. (2007). The Mexican American cultural values scale for adolescents and adults. *The Journal of Early Adolescence, 30,* 444-481.

Knight, G.P., Tein, J.-Y., Shell, R., & Roosa, M.W. (1992). The cross-ethnic equivalence of parenting and family interaction measures among Hispanic and Anglo American families. Child Development, 63, 1392-1403.

Kovacs, M. (1985). The children's depression, inventory (CDI). *Pharmacology Bulletin, 21,* 995-998.

Lau, A S., McCabe, K. M., Yeh, M., Garland, A. F., Wood, P. A., & Hough, R. L. (2005). The acculturation gap-distress hypothesis among high-risk Mexican American families. *Journal of Family Psychology, 19,* 367-375.

Lee, R. M., Choe, J., Kim, G., & Ngo, V. (2000). Construction of the Asian American family conflicts scale. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *47,* 211-222.

Leidy, M. S., Guerra, N. G., & Toro, R. I. (in press). A review of family-based programs to prevent youth violence among Latinos. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences.*

Marin, G., Burhansstipanov, L., Connell, C.M., Gielen, A.C., Helitzer-Allen, D., Lorig, K., Morisky, D.E., Tenney, M., & Thomas, S. (1995). A research agenda for

health education among underserved populations. *Health Education Quarterly, 22,* 346–363.

Marin, G. and Gamba, R. (1996) A new measurement of acculturation for Hispanics: The bidimensional acculturation scale for Hispanics (BAS). *Hispanic Journal of Behavior Sciences, 18*, pp. 297-317.

Martinez, C. R. (2006). Effects of differential family acculturation on Latino adolescent substance use. *Family Relations, 55,* 306-317.

McDonald, L. (2000). FAST Program Manual. Madiscon, WI: FAST International.

Metropolitan Area Child Study Research Group and Gorman-Smith, D. (2003). Effects of teacher training and consultation on teacher behavior toward students at high risk for aggression. *Behavior Therapy, 34*, 437-452.

Mika, P., Bergner, R.M., & Baum, M.C. (1987). The development of a scale for the assessment of parentification. *Family Therapy, 1,* 229-235.

Minuchin, S. (1974). *Families & family therapy*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Minuchin, P., Colapinto, J., & Minuchin, S. (1998). *Working with families of the poor*. New York: Guilford.

Morris, M. (1993). *The complex nature of prevention in the African American community: The problem of conceptualization (SMA 93-2015).* Rockville: United States Department of Health and Human Services, SAMHSA.

Pasch, L.A., Deardorff, J.**,** Tschann, J.M., Flores, E., Penilla, C., & Pantoja, P. (2006). Acculturation, parent-adolescent conflict, and adolescent adjustment in Mexican American families. *Family Processes, 45,* 75-86.

Pasick, R., D'Onofrio, C., & Otero-Sabogal, R. (1996). Similarities and differences across cultures: Questions to inform a third generation for health promotion research. *Health Education Quarterly, 23 (Supplement)*, S142–S161.

Phillips, J., Springer, F. (1992). *Extended National Youth Sports Program 1991-1992 Evaluation Highlights, Part Two: Individual Protective Factors Index (IPFI) and Risk Assessment Study.* Report Prepared for the National Collegiate Athletic Association, Sacramento,CA: EMT Associates.

Phinney, J. S., Ong, A., & Madden, T. (2000). Cultural values and intergenerational value discrepancies in immigrant and non-immigrant families. *Child Development, 71,* 528-539.

Portes, A., & Rumbaut, R. G. (2001). *Legacies: The story of the immigrant second generation*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Ramírez, O. (1990). Mexican American children and adolescents. In J.T. Gibbs & L. N. Huang (Eds.), *Children of color* (pp. 224-250). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Resnicow, K., Soler, R., Braithwaite, R. L., Ahluwalia, J. S., & Butler, J. (2000). Cultural sensitivity in substance abuse prevention. *Journal of Community Psychology, 28*, 271-290.

Reyna, V. F., & Farley, F. (2006). Risk and rationality in adolescent decision making: Implications for theory, practice and public policy. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest, 7,* 1-49.

Rosenberg, M. (1965). *Society and the adolescent self-image.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Rosenthal, R., & Rosnow, R. L. (1991). *Essentials of behavioral research: Methods and data analysis (2nd ed.).* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Rueschenberg, E. J., & Buriel, R. (1995). Mexican American family functioning and acculturation. In A. M. Padilla (Ed.), *Hispanic psychology: Critical issues in theory and research* (pp.15-25). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Sabogal, F., Marin, G., Otero-Sabogal, R., Marin, B., & Perez-Stable, E. (1987). Hispanic Familism and acculturation: What changes and what doesn't? *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences. 9,* 397-412.

Sam, D., & Virta, E., (2003). Social group identity and its effect on the self-esteem of adolescents with immigrant background. In: H.W. Marsh, R.G. Craven and D.M. McInerney, (Eds), *International advances in self research* (pp. 347-374). Greenwich, Connecticut: Information Age Publishing.

Samaniego, R. Y., Gonzales, N. A. (1999). Multiple mediators of the effects of acculturation status on delinquency for Mexican American adolescents. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 27,* 189-210.

Serrano, E., & Anderson, J. (2003). Assessment of a refined short acculturation scale for Latino pre-teens in rural Colorado. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 25,* 240-253.

Sluzki, C. (1979). Migration and family conflict. *Family Process, 18,* 379–390.

Spielberger, C. D., & Sydeman, S. J. (1994). State trait anxiety inventory and state-trait anger expression inventory. In M. E. Maruish (Ed.), *The use of psychological test*

*for treatment planning and outcome assessment (*pp.292-321). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Stattin, H. & Kerr, M. (2000). Parental monitoring: A reinterpretation. *Child Development, 75,* 781-786.

Steinberg, L. (2008). A social neuroscience perspective on adolescent risk-taking. *Developmental Review, 28,* 78-106.

Steinberg, L., & Cauffman, E. (1996). Maturity of judgment in adolescence: Psychosocial factors in adolescent decision making. *Law and Human Behavior, 20,* 249–272.

Suárez-Orozco, C., & Suárez-Orozco, M. M. (1995). *Transformations: Immigration, family life, and achievement motivation among Latino adolescents.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Szapocznik, J., Kurtines, W.M., Foote, F., Perez-Vidal, A., & Hervis, O.E. (1986). Conjoint versus one-person family therapy: Further evidence for the effectiveness of conducting family therapy through one person with drug-abusing adolescents. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 54*, 395-397.

Szapocznik, J., Santisteban, D., Kurtines, W., Perez-Vidal, A., & Hervis, O. (1984). Bicultural effectiveness training: A treatment interventions for enhancing intercultural adjustment in Cuban American families. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 6,* 317-344.

Szapocznik, J. and Truss, C., 1978. Intergenerational sources of conflict in Cuban mothers. In C. Monteil (Ed.), *Hispanic families: Critical issues for policy and programs in the human services* (pp. 41-65). Washington, DC: COSSMHO.

Thastum, M., Johansen, M.B., Gubba, L., Olesen, L.B., & Romer, G. (2008). Coping, social relations, and communication: A qualitative exploratory study of children of parents with cancer. *Clinical Child Psychology & Psychiatry, 3,* 123-138.

Triandis, H. C., Martin, G., Betancourt, H., Lisansky, J., & Chang, B. (1982). Dimensions of familism among Hispanics and mainstream Navy recruits. Technical Report No. 14, Department of Psychology, University of Illinois, Champaign.

U.S. Census Bureau. (2000, n.d.). *Profile of Selected Demographic and Social Characteristics for the Foreign-born Population1: 2000, United States*. Retrieved August 01, 2009, from http://www.census.gov/population/cen2000/stp-159/foreignborn.pdf.

Unger, J. B., Gallaher, P., Shakib, S., Ritt-Olson, A., Palmer, P. H., & Johnson, C. A. (2002). The AHIMSA acculturation scale: A new measure of acculturation for adolescents in a multicultural society. *Journal of Early Adolescence, 22*, 225-251.

Unger, J. B., Ritt-Olson, A., Wagner, K., Soto, D., & Baezconde-Garbanati, L. (2007). A comparison of acculturation measures among Hispanic/Latino adolescents. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 36,* 555-565.

Vega, W. A., Khoury, E. L., Zimmerman, R. S., Gil, A. G., & Warheit, G. J. (1995). Cultural conflicts and problem behaviors of Latino adolescents in home and school environments. *Journal of Community Psychology, 23*, 167-179.

Vega, W. A., Kolody, B., & Valle, R. (1988). Marital strain, coping, and depression among Mexican american women. *Jounral of Marriage and the Family, 50,* 391-403.

Weaver, S. R. & Kim, S. Y. (2008). A person-centered approach to studying the linkages among parent-child differences in cultural orientation, supportive parenting, and adolescent depressive symptoms in Chinese American families. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 37,* 36-49.

Weisskirch, R. S., & Alva, S. A. (2002). Language brokering and the acculturation of Latino children. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 24*, 369-378.

Wills, T.A. & Filler, M. (1996). Stress-coping model of adolescent substance use. In: T. H. Ollendick & R. J. Prinz (Eds.) *Advances in Clinical Child Psychology (vol. 18)* (pp. 91-132). New York: Plenum Press.

Wright, J. C., & Zimmerman, M. A. (2006). Culturally sensitive interventions to prevent youth violence. In N. G. Guerra, & E. Phillips-Smith (Eds.), *Preventing youth violence in a multicultural society* (pp. 221–247). Washington, DC: APA Books.

Yao, E.L. (1985). Adjustment needs of Asian immigrant children in the schools. *Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, 19,* 222–227.

Ying, Y. (1999). Strengthening intergenerational/intercultural ties in migrant families: A new intervention for parents. *Journal of Community Psychology, 27,* 89-96.

Ying, Y., Coombs, M., & Lee, P. A. (1999). Family intergenerational relationship of Asian American adolescents. *Cultural Diversity & Ethnic Minority Psychology, 5,* 350-363.

Zimet, G. D., Dahlem, N. W., Zimet, S. G., & Farley, G. K. (1988). The Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 52, 30–41*.

Table 1

Matches and Mismatches Between Parent and Adolescent Acculturation Orientation

		Adolescent Overall Acculturation Orientation			
		Integrated	Separated	Assimilated	Marginalized
Parent Overall Acculturation Orientation	Integrated	23	32	3	2
	Separated	7	15	1	3
	Assimilated	0	0	0	0
	Marginalized	1	0	1	1

Table 2

Matches and Mismatches Between Parent and Adolescent Levels of Mexican Values

			Adolescent Levels											
			FAM-SUP		FAM-OB		FAM-REF		RESP		GEN		MEX	
			LO	HI	LO	HI	LO	HI	LO	HI	LO	HI	LO	HI
Parent Levels	FAM-SUP	LO	0	1										
		HI	5	83										
	FAM-OB	LO			0	6								
		HI			6	77								
	FAM-REF	LO					1	3						
		HI					8	77						
	RESP	LO							1	2				
		HI							4	82				
	GEN	LO									35	11		
		HI									35	8		
	MEX	LO											2	1
		HI											9	77

Note. *FAM-SUP* = Familism-Support. *FAM-OB* = Familism-Obligations. *FAM-REF* = Familism-Referent. *RESP* = Respect. *GEN* = Traditional Gender Roles. *MEX* = Mexican Values

Table 3

Correlations Among Parent and Adolescent Gaps

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Overall Acculturation Gap	1.00						
2. Familism—Support Gap	.23*	1.00					
3. Familism—Obligations Gap	.20*	.68**	1.00				
4. Familism—Referent Gap	.25*	.72**	.45**	1.00			
5. Respect Gap	.23*	.82**	.55**	.72**	1.00		
6. Traditional Gender Roles Gap	-.05	.08	-.01	.03	-.01	1.00	
7. Mexican American Values Gap	.31**	.76**	.59**	.73**	.61**	.06	1.00

Note. * $p \leq .05$. ** $p \leq .01$

Table 4

Correlations Between the Predictor Gaps and Mediators, Outcomes and Control Variables

	Mediators							Outcomes				Controls			
	PAR	PAS	MON	ACC	NUT	SC	SDM	MSB	POS	PRO	DEP	AGG	INC	YRS	TC	PC
Predictors																
1. Overall Acculturation Gap	-.08	.11	-.07	.012	-.05	.03	.00	.00	.10	-.13	.06	-.10	-.02	-.19	.13	-.13
2. Familism Gap	-.20	-.14	-.30**	-.30**	-.41**	-.26*	-.18	-.18	-.19	-.34**	.33**	.30**	.08	-.04	.03	.00
3. Familism—Obligations Gap	-.24*	-.28*	-.17	-.16	-.25*	-.26*	-.23*	-.23*	-.15	-.30**	.33**	.21*	.03	-.05	.11	-.16
4. Familism—Referent Gap	-.14	.14	-.22*	-.10	-.14	-.17	-.21*	-.21*	-.17	-.26**	.37**	.21*	.15	-.18	.08	.07
5. Respect Gap	-.20	-.07	-.26*	-.32**	-.34**	-.18	-.22	-.22	-.26*	-.29*	.24*	.29*	.11	-.04	.03	.00
6. Traditional Gender Roles Gap	.02	.32**	-.22*	.11	.19	.02	.12	.12	-.04	-.12	-.19	.09	-.03	-.16	.03	-.01
7. Mexican American Values Gap	-.18	-.11	-.22*	-.16	-.27*	-.25*	-.22*	-.22*	-.21	-.27*	.32**	.23*	.05	-.05	-.01	.06

Note. PAR = Parentification. *PAS* = Passive/Inconsistent Parenting. *MON* = Parental Monitoring. *ACC* = Accepting Parenting. NUT = Nurturing Parenting. *SC* = Self-Control. *SDM* = Social Decision Making. *MSB* = Moral System of Belief. *POS* = Positive Sense of Self. *PRO* = Prosocial Connectedness *DEP* = Depression. *AGG* = Aggression. *INC* = Income. *YRS* = Years in the United States. *TC* = Target Child Gender. *PC* = Primary Caregiver Gender. * $p \leq .05$. ** $p \leq .01$

Table 5

Correlations Among the Mediator, Outcome and Control Variables

Variable	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.	11.	12.	13.	14.	15.	16.
1. Parentification	1.00															
2. Passive/Inconsistent Parenting	.16	1.00														
3. Parental Monitoring	.30*	-.07	1.00													
4. Accepting Parenting	.08	-.14	-.02	1.00												
5. Nurturing Parenting	.06	.30*	-.04	.42**	1.00											
6. Self-Control	.25	.09	.32*	.25*	.12	1.00										
7. Social Decision Making	.33**	-.02	.26*	.32*	.14	.68*	1.00									
8. Moral System of Belief	.32*	-.02	.26*	.32*	.21	.57**	.45**	1.00								
9. Positive Sense of Self	.27*	.08	.46**	.22	.20	.67**	.62**	.53**	1.00							
10. Prosocial Connectedness	-.50**	.04	.50**	.11	.11	.38*	.30**	.40**	.53**	1.00						
11. Depression	-.15	-.15	.30**	-.10	-.01	-.56**	-.37**	-.26**	-.59**	-.44**	1.00					
12. Aggression	-.13	-.13	-.31**	-.20	.07	-.30**	-.36**	-.29**	-.23**	-.37**	.35**	1.00				
13. Years in the U.S	-.06	-.17	.01	.12	.00	-.01	-.03	-.05	.60	-.11	-.03	.03	1.00			
14. Income	-.13	-.15	.04	-.07	.04	.01	-.01	.10	-.01	-.03	.08	.19	.21	1.00		
15. Parent Gender	-.17	-.04	-.17	.02	.15	-.01	.01	-.05	-.01	-.19	.00	-.04	-.13	-.11	1.00	
16. Child Gender	.09	.01	.30**	.03	.06	-.03	-.14	.13	-.06	.06	-.13	.10	-.11	.06	.15	1.00
Mean	36.13	33.42	12.50	20.16	79.35	38.99	97.04	69.33	56.34	71.60	34.03	8.43	21.57	---	---	---
Standard Deviation	17.75	6.52	2.28	3.12	7.76	6.41	11.91	7.77	7.75	11.56	5.41	3.21	7.24	---	---	---

Note. * $p \leq .05$. ** $p \leq .01$

Table 6

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis of a Gap on Familism—Support on Observed Outcomes

		Step 1			Step 2	
Variable	B	SE (B)	β	B	SE (B)	β
Self-Control						
Income	.120	.463	.028	.192	.450	.046
Years in U.S.	-.005	.005	-.113	-.006	.005	-.127
Familism Gap				-6.432	2.541	-.264**
Adjusted R^2		-.011			.049	
F for model		.529			2.511	
Social Decision Making						
Income	.040	.864	.005	.134	.855	.017
Years in U.S.	-.005	.010	-.061	-.006	.010	-.071
Familism Gap				-8.438	4.833	-.186
Adjusted R^2		-.020			.004	
F for model		.154			1.121	
Moral System Of Beliefs						
Income	.630	.565	.122	.697	.558	.134
Years in U.S.	-.008	.006	-.129	-.008	.006	-.140
Familism Gap				-5.931	3.151	-.198
Adjusted R^2		.002			.031	
F for model		1.095			1.933	
Positive Sense of Self						
Income	.117	.573	.022	.249	.531	.047
Years in U.S.	-.010	.006	-.164	-.011	.006	-.185
Familism Gap				-11.765	3.002	-.387**
Adjusted R^2		.003			.146	
F for model		1.137			6.002**	
Prosocial Connectedness						
Income	-.039	.849	-.005	.108	.805	.134
Years in U.S.	-.171	.176	-.106	-.179	.166	-.111
Familism Gap				15.166	4.550	-.339**
Adjusted R^2		-.011			.095	
F for model		.503			4.079**	
Depression						
Income	.077	.375	.022	.000	.354	.000
Years in U.S.	.010	.004	.257**	.011	.004	.276**
Familism Gap				6.823	2.002	.336**
Adjusted R^2		.047		.152		
F for model		3.193*		6.264**		
Aggression						
Income	.322	.239	.146	.279	.230	.126
Years in U.S.	.002	.003	.092	.003	.003	.109
Familism Gap				3.805	1.298	.298**
Adjusted R^2		.013			.093	
F for model		1.577			4.006**	

Note. * $p \leq .05$. ** $p \leq .01$

Table 7

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis of a Gap on Familism-Obligations on Observed Outcomes

		Step 1			Step 2	
Variable	B	SE (B)	β	B	SE (B)	β
Self-Control						
Income	.120	.463	.028	.162	.452	.038
Years in U.S.	-.005	.005	-.113	-.006	.005	-.126
Familism-Obligations Gap				-4.260	1.876	-.238*
Adjusted R^2		-.011			.036	
F for model		.529			2.087	
Social Decision Making						
Income	.040	.864	.005	.116	.845	.015
Years in U.S.	-.005	.010	-.061	-.007	.010	-.074
Familism-Obligations Gap				-7.882	3.505	-.237*
Adjusted R^2		-.020			.026	
F for model		.154			1.793	
Moral System Of Beliefs						
Income	.630	.565	.122	.665	.561	.128
Years in U.S.	-.008	.006	-.129	-.008	.006	-.139
Familism-Obligations Gap				-3.601	2.326	-.164
Adjusted R^2		.002			.018	
F for model		1.095			1.541	
Positive Sense of Self						
Income	.117	.573	.022	.178	.553	.034
Years in U.S.	-.010	.006	-.164	-.011	.006	-.180
Familism-Obligations Gap				-6.298	2.293	-.282**
Adjusted R^2		.003			.074	
F for model		1.137			3.330*	
Prosocial Connectedness						
Income	-.039	.849	-.005	-.087	.819	-.011
Years in U.S.	-.171	.176	-.106	-.054	.175	-.034
Familism-Obligations Gap				-9.560	3.509	-.291**
Adjusted R^2		-.011			.059	
F for model		.503			2.835*	
Depression						
Income	.077	.375	.022	.028	.354	.008
Years in U.S.	.010	.004	.257**	.011	.004	.277**
Familism-Obligations Gap				4.984	1.469	.334**
Adjusted R^2		.047			.151	
F for model		3.193*			6.225**	
Aggression						
Income	.322	.239	.146	.302	.235	.137
Years in U.S.	.002	.003	.092	.003	.003	.105
Familism-Obligations Gap				2.201	.975	.216
Adjusted R^2		.013			.049	
F for model		1.577			2.524	

Note. * $p \leq .05$. ** $p \leq .01$

Table 8

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis of a Gap on Familism-Referent on Observed Outcomes

		Step 1			Step 2	
Variable	B	SE (B)	β	B	SE (B)	β
Self-Control						
Income	.120	.463	.028	.191	.462	.045
Years in U.S.	-.005	.005	-.113	-.004	.005	-.089
Familism-Referent Gap				-2.926	2.019	-.158
Adjusted R^2		-.011			.002	
F for model		.529			1.057	
Social Decision Making						
Income	.040	.864	.005	.209	.856	.027
Years in U.S.	-.005	.010	-.061	-.003	.010	-.030
Familism-Referent Gap				-7.040	3.739	-.204
Adjusted R^2		-.020			.010	
F for model		.154			1.288	
Moral System Of Beliefs						
Income	.630	.565	.122	.722	.583	.139
Years in U.S.	-.008	.006	-.129	-.006	.006	-.104
Familism-Referent Gap				-3.830	2.460	-.168
Adjusted R^2		.002			.018	
F for model		1.095			1.550	
Positive Sense of Self						
Income	.117	.573	.022	.331	.536	.063
Years in U.S.	-.010	.006	-.164	-.006	.006	-.105
Familism-Referent Gap				-8.882	2.340	-.384**
Adjusted R^2		.003			.138	
F for model		1.137			5.677**	
Prosocial Connectedness						
Income	-.039	.849	-.005	.222	.832	.029
Years in U.S.	-.171	.176	-.106	-.155	.171	-.097
Familism-Referent Gap				-8.801	3.594	-.258*
Adjusted R^2		-.011			.044	
F for model		.503			2.354	
Depression						
Income	.077	.375	.022	-.042	.359	-.012
Years in U.S.	.010	.004	.257**	.008	.004	.209*
Familism-Referent Gap				4.932	1.567	.318**
Adjusted R^2		.047			.137	
F for model		3.193*			5.650**	
Aggression						
Income	.322	.239	.146	.280	.238	.127
Years in U.S.	.002	.003	.092	.002	.003	.065
Familism-Referent Gap				1.721	1.040	.177
Adjusted R^2		.013			.032	
F for model		1.577			1.985	

Note. * $p \leq .05$. ** $p \leq .01$

Table 9

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis of a Gap on Respect on Observed Outcomes

		Step 1			Step 2	
Variable	B	SE (B)	β	B	SE (B)	β
Self-Control						
Income	.120	.463	.028	.195	.459	.046
Years in U.S.	-.005	.005	-.113	-.006	.005	-.123
Respect Gap				-4.486	2.596	-.184
Adjusted R^2		-.011			.012	
F for model		.529			1.357	
Social Decision Making						
Income	.040	.864	.005	.208	.851	.027
Years in U.S.	-.005	.010	-.061	-.007	.010	-.074
Respect Gap				-10.098	4.807	-.223
Adjusted R^2		-.020			.019	
F for model		.154			1.578	
Moral System Of Beliefs						
Income	.630	.565	.122	.770	.547	.149
Years in U.S.	-.008	.006	-.129	-.009	.006	-.146
Respect Gap				-8.405	3.092	-.281**
Adjusted R^2		.002			.071	
F for model		1.095			3.248*	
Positive Sense of Self						
Income	.117	.573	.022	.290	.543	.055
Years in U.S.	-.010	.006	-.164	-.011	.006	-.184
Respect Gap				-10.376	3.030	-.341**
Adjusted R^2		.003			.111	
F for model		1.137			4.657**	
Prosocial Connectedness						
Income	-.039	.849	-.005	.123	.821	.016
Years in U.S.	-.171	.176	-.106	-.147	-.170	-.091
Respect Gap				-12.757	4.653	-.285**
Adjusted R^2		-.011			.060	
F for model		.503			2.867*	
Depression						
Income	.077	.375	.022	-.007	.366	-.002
Years in U.S.	.010	.004	.257**	.011	.004	.272**
Respect Gap				5.015	2.069	.247**
Adjusted R^2		.047			.129	
F for model		3.193*			4.207**	
Aggression						
Income	.322	.239	.146	.262	.232	.119
Years in U.S.	.002	.003	.092	.003	.003	.109
Familism Gap				3.579	1.309	.281**
Adjusted R^2		.013			.082	
F for model		1.577			3.621**	

Note. * $p \leq .05$. ** $p \leq .01$

Table 10

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis of a Gap on Traditional Gender Roles on Observed Outcomes

		Step 1			Step 2	
Variable	B	SE (B)	β	B	SE (B)	β
Self-Control						
Income	.120	.463	.028	.120	.465	.028
Years in U.S.	-.005	.005	-.113	-.005	.005	-.113
Traditional Gender Roles Gap				-.055	1.336	-.004
Adjusted R^2		-.011			-.023	
F for model		.529			.349	
Social Decision Making						
Income	.040	.864	.005	.037	.863	.005
Years in U.S.	-.005	.010	-.061	-.004	.010	-.042
Traditional Gender Roles Gap				2.613	2.478	.115
Adjusted R^2		-.020			-.018	
F for model		.154			.474	
Moral System Of Beliefs						
Income	.630	.565	.122	.631	.567	.122
Years in U.S.	-.008	.006	-.129	-.008	.006	-.138
Traditional Gender Roles Gap				-.848	1.628	-.056
Adjusted R^2		.002			-.006	
F for model		1.095			.814	
Positive Sense of Self						
Income	.117	.573	.022	.118	.575	.022
Years in U.S.	-.010	.006	-.164	-.010	.007	-.174
Traditional Gender Roles Gap				-.965	1.651	-.063
Adjusted R^2		.003			-.005	
F for model		1.137			.866	
Prosocial Connectedness						
Income	-.039	.849	-.005	-.070	.849	-.009
Years in U.S.	-.171	.176	-.106	-.167	.176	-.104
Traditional Gender Roles Gap				-2.527	2.410	-.112
Adjusted R^2		-.011			-.010	
F for model		.503			.702	
Depression						
Income	.077	.375	.022	.078	.373	.022
Years in U.S.	.010	.004	.257**	.009	.004	.236*
Traditional Gender Roles Gap				-1.362	1.072	-.133
Adjusted R^2		.047			.054	
F for model		3.193*			2.682*	
Aggression						
Income	.322	.239	.146	.321	.239	.145
Years in U.S.	.002	.003	.092	.003	.003	.110
Traditional Gender Roles Gap				.698	.686	.109
Adjusted R^2		.013			.013	
F for model		1.577			1.397	

Note. * $p \leq .05$. ** $p \leq .01$

Table 11

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis of a Gap on Mexican Values on Observed Outcomes

		Step 1			Step 2	
Variable	B	SE (B)	β	B	SE (B)	β
Self-Control						
Income	.120	.463	.028	.169	.452	.040
Years in U.S.	-.005	.005	-.113	-.006	.005	-.128
Mexican Values Gap				-4.653	2.029	-.240*
Adjusted R^2		-.011			.037	
F for model		.529			2.122	
Social Decision Making						
Income	.040	.864	.005	.123	.849	.016
Years in U.S.	-.005	.010	-.061	-.007	.010	-.075
Mexican Values Gap				-7.860	3.810	-.219*
Adjusted R^2		-.020			.018	
F for model		.154			1.526	
Moral System Of Beliefs						
Income	.630	.565	.122	.685	.555	.132
Years in U.S.	-.008	.006	-.129	-.008	.006	-.143
Mexican Values Gap				-5.173	2.490	-.218*
Adjusted R^2		.002			.039	
F for model		1.095			2.197	
Positive Sense of Self						
Income	.117	.573	.022	.207	.539	.039
Years in U.S.	-.010	.006	-.164	-.011	.006	-.186
Mexican Values Gap				-8.547	2.418	-.354**
Adjusted R^2		.003			.121	
F for model		1.137			5.025**	
Prosocial Connectedness						
Income	-.039	.849	-.005	.016	.824	.002
Years in U.S.	-.171	.176	-.106	-.153	.171	-.095
Mexican Values Gap				-9.418	3.703	-.265**
Adjusted R^2		-.011			.049	
F for model		.503			2.514	
Depression						
Income	.077	.375	.022	.022	.356	.006
Years in U.S.	.010	.004	.257**	.011	.004	.278**
Mexican Values Gap				5.167	1.599	.320**
Adjusted R^2		.047			.142	
F for model		3.193*			5.844**	
Aggression						
Income	.322	.239	.146	.297	.234	.13
Years in U.S.	.002	.003	.092	.003	.003	.107
Mexican Values Gap				2.345	1.051	.232*
Adjusted R^2		.013			.057	
F for model		1.577			2.760*	

Note. * $p \leq .05$. ** $p \leq .01$

Table 12

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis of a Gap on Overall Acculturation on Observed Outcomes

Variable	Step 1 B	Step 1 SE (B)	Step 1 β	Step 2 B	Step 2 SE (B)	Step 2 β
Self-Control						
Income	.120	.463	.028	.120	.466	.028
Years in U.S.	-.005	.005	-.113	-.005	.005	-.112
Overall Gap				.047	1.361	.004
Adjusted R^2		-.011			-.023	
F for model		.529			.349	
Social Decision Making						
Income	.040	.864	.005	.042	.870	.005
Years in U.S.	-.005	.010	-.061	-.005	.010	-.062
Overall Gap				-.161	2.541	-.007
Adjusted R^2		-.020			-.032	
F for model		.154			.103	
Moral System Of Beliefs						
Income	.630	.565	.122	.614	.567	.118
Years in U.S.	-.008	.006	-.129	-.007	.006	-.115
Overall Gap				1.074	1.657	.071
Adjusted R^2		.002			-.005	
F for model		1.095			.865	
Positive Sense of Self						
Income	.117	.573	.022	.144	.573	.027
Years in U.S.	-.010	.006	-.164	-.011	.007	-.187
Overall Gap				-1.874	1.673	-.121
Adjusted R^2		.003			.006	
F for model		1.137			1.179	
Prosocial Connectedness						
Income	-.039	.849	-.005	-.026	.847	-.003
Years in U.S.	-.171	.176	-.106	-.182	.176	-1.036
Overall Gap				-2.977	2.440	-1.220
Adjusted R^2		-.011			-.006	
F for model		.503			.834	
Depression						
Income	.077	.375	.022	.060	.375	.017
Years in U.S.	.010	.004	.257**	.011	.004	.279**
Overall Gap				1.125	1.096	.109
Adjusted R^2		.047			.048	
F for model		3.193*			2.481	
Aggression						
Income	.322	.239	.146	.324	.241	.147
Years in U.S.	.002	.003	.092	.002	.003	.087
Overall Gap				-.185	.704	-.029
Adjusted R^2		.013			.002	
F for model		1.577			1.063	

Note. * $p \leq .05$. ** $p \leq .01$

Table 13

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis of a Gap on Familism—Support on Observed Mediators

Variable	Step 1 B	Step 1 SE (B)	Step 1 β	Step 2 B	Step 2 SE (B)	Step 2 β
Parentification						
Income	-1.248	1.216	-.112	-1.132	1.209	-.102
Years in U.S.	-.003	.014	-.021	-.004	.014	-.030
Familism-Support Gap				-10.282	6.833	-.160
Adjusted R^2		-.009			.006	
F for model		.615			1.171	
Passive/Inconsistent Parenting						
Income	-.432	.444	-.106	-.403	.444	-.099
Years in U.S.	-.005	.005	-.102	-.005	.005	-.108
Familism-Support Gap				-2.607	2.511	-.111
Adjusted R^2		.003			.004	
F for model		1.153			1.129	
Parental Monitoring						
Income	.047	.165	.031	.075	.159	.048
Years in U.S.	-.001	.002	-.038	-.001	.002	-.055
Child Gender	1.393	.483	.300**	1.432	.465	.309**
Familism-Support Gap				-2.531	.897	-.282**
Adjusted R^2		.058			.130	
F for model		2.818*			4.279**	
Accepting Parenting						
Income	-.160	.244	-.077	-.112	.235	-.056
Years in U.S.	.001	.003	.043	.001	.002	.029
Familism-Support Gap				-3.701	1.365	-.299*
Adjusted R^2		.006			.095	
F for model		.247			2.629*	
Nurturing Parenting						
Income	.140	.553	.028	.251	.523	.050
Years in U.S.	.003	.006	.050	.002	.006	.031
Familism-Support Gap				-9.943	2.956	-.343**
Adjusted R^2		-.019			.090	
F for model		.168			3.897*	

Note. * $p \leq .05$. ** $p \leq .01$

Table 14

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis of a Gap on Familism—Obligations on Observed Mediators

		Step 1			Step 2	
Variable	B	SE (B)	β	B	SE (B)	β
Parentification						
Income	-1.147	1.477	-.124	1.347	1.447	-.114
Years in U.S.	-.005	.027	-.039	.007	.017	-.052
Familism-Obligations Gap				-12.204	6.178	-.236
Adjusted R^2		-.011			.032	
F for model		.638			1.744	
Passive/Inconsistent Parenting						
Income	-.432	.444	-.106	-.389	.432	-.096
Years in U.S.	-.005	.005	-.102	-.005	.005	-.226
Familism-Obligations Gap				-4.402	1.791	-.255**
Adjusted R^2		.003			.059	
F for model		1.153			2.828*	
Parental Monitoring						
Income	.047	.165	.031	.075	.159	.048
Years in U.S.	-.001	.002	-.038	-.001	.002	-.055
Child Gender	1.3939	.483	.300**	1.432	.465	.329**
Familism-Obligations Gap				-2.532	.897	-.282**
Adjusted R^2		.058			.130	
F for model		2.818*			4.279**	
Accepting Parenting						
Income	-.148	.226	-.072	-.136	.225	-.066
Years in U.S.	.001	.003	.043	.001	.003	.034
Familism-Obligations Gap				-1.277	.934	-.147
Adjusted R^2		-.017			-.007	
F for model		.247			.789	
Nurturing Parenting						
Income	.140	.553	.028	.188	.541	.037
Years in U.S.	.003	.006	.050	.002	.006	-.233*
Familism-Obligations Gap				-4.950	2.245	
Adjusted R^2		-.019			.025	
F for model		.168			1.738	

Note. * $p \leq .05$. ** $p \leq .01$

Table 15

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis of a Gap on Familism—Referent on Observed Mediators

		Step 1			Step 2	
Variable	B	SE (B)	β	B	SE (B)	β
Parentification						
Income	-1.248	1.216	-.112	-1.127	1.224	-.102
Years in U.S.	-.003	.014	-.021	.000	.014	-.006
Familism-Referent Gap				-5.028	5.344	-.103
Adjusted R^2		-.009			-.010	
F for model		.615			.704	
Passive/Inconsistent Parenting						
Income	-.432	.44	-.106	-.394	.447	-.097
Years in U.S.	-.005	.005	-.102	-.004	.005	-.088
Familism-Referent Gap				-1.596	1.953	-.089
Adjusted R^2		.003			.000	
F for model		1.153			.998	
Parental Monitoring						
Income	.047	.165	.031	.087	.161	.056
Years in U.S.	-.001	.002	-.038	.000	.002	-.003
Child Gender	1.393	.483	.300**	1.464	.471	.316**
Familism-Referent Gap				-1.685	.706	-.246*
Adjusted R^2		.058			.108	
F for model		2.818*			3.656**	
Accepting Parenting						
Income	-.160	.244	-.077	-.133	.246	-.064
Years in U.S.	.001	.003	.045	.001	.003	.061
Familism-Referent Gap				-1.008	1.104	-.107
Adjusted R^2		-.020			-.022	
F for model		.245			.441	
Nurturing Parenting						
Income	.140	.553	.028	.218	.553	.043
Years in U.S.	.003	.006	.050	.004	.006	.073
Familism-Referent Gap				-3.233	2.416	-.146
Adjusted R^2		-.019			-.010	
F for model		.168			.710	

Note. * $p \leq .05$. ** $p \leq .01$

Table 16

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis of a Gap on Respect on Observed Mediators

		Step 1			Step 2	
Variable	B	SE (B)	β	B	SE (B)	β
Parentification						
Income	-1.248	1.216	-.112	-1.079	1.213	-.097
Years in U.S.	-.003	.014	-.021	-.004	.014	-.031
Respect Gap				-10.098	6.853	-.158
Adjusted R^2		-.009			.005	
F for model		.615			1.139	
Passive/Inconsistent Parenting						
Income	-.432	.444	-.106	-.411	.448	-.101
Years in U.S.	-.005	.005	-.102	-.005	.005	-.105
Respect Gap				-1.267	2.529	-.054
Adjusted R^2		.003			-.005	
F for model		1.153			.846	
Parental Monitoring						
Income	.047	.165	.031	.088	.160	.057
Years in U.S.	-.001	.002	-.038	-.001	.002	-.055
Child Gender	1.393	.483	.300	1.429	.466	.308**
Respect Gap				-2.460	.901	-.274**
Adjusted R^2		.058			.125	
F for model		2.818*			4.135**	
Accepting Parenting						
Income	-.148	.226	-.072	-.152	.229	-.074
Years in U.S.	.001	.003	.043	.001	.003	.045
Respect Gap				-.141	.753	-.020
Adjusted R^2		-.017			-.029	
F for model		.247			.174	
Nurturing Parenting						
Income	.140	.553	.028	.277	.536	.055
Years in U.S.	.003	.006	.050	.002	.006	.034
Respect Gap				-8.214	3.025	-.283**
Adjusted R^2		-.019			.051	
F for model		.168			2.577*	

Note. * $p \leq .05$. ** $p \leq .01$

Table 17

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis of a Gap on Traditional Gender Roles on Observed Mediators

Variable	Step 1 B	Step 1 SE (B)	Step 1 β	Step 2 B	Step 2 SE (B)	Step 2 β
Parentification						
Income	-1.248	1.216	-.112	-1.249	1.223	-.112
Years in U.S.	-.003	.014	-.021	-.002	.014	-.108
Traditional Gender Roles Gap				.631	3.509	.020
Adjusted R^2		-.009			-.020	
F for model		.615			.416	
Passive/Inconsistent Parenting						
Income	-.432	.444	-.106	-.436	.430	-.107
Years in U.S.	-.005	.005	-.102	-.003	.005	.059
Traditional Gender Roles Gap				3.137	1.235	.266**
Adjusted R^2		.003			.063	
F for model		1.153			2.969*	
Parental Monitoring						
Income	.047	.165	.031	.048	.161	.031
Years in U.S.	-.001	.002	-.038	-.001	.002	-.077
Child Gender	1.393	.483	.300**	1.442	.472	.311**
Traditional Gender Roles Gap				-1.057	.462	-.234*
Adjusted R^2		.058			.103	
F for model		2.818*			3.527**	
Accepting Parenting						
Income	-.148	.226	-.072	-.149	.226	-.072
Years in U.S.	.001	.003	.043	.001	.003	.062
Traditional Gender Roles Gap				.698	.649	.117
Adjusted R^2		-.017			-.016	
F for model		.247			.551	
Nurturing Parenting						
Income	.140	.553	.028	.137	.544	.027
Years in U.S.	.003	.006	.050	.005	.006	.083
Traditional Gender Roles Gap				2.977	1.562	.205
Adjusted R^2		-.019			.011	
F for model		.168			1.326	

Note. * $p \leq .05$. ** $p \leq .01$

Table 18

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis of a Gap on Mexican Values on Observed Mediators

Variable	Step 1 B	Step 1 SE (B)	Step 1 β	Step 2 B	Step 2 SE (B)	Step 2 β
Parentification						
Income	-1.248	1.216	-.112	-1.164	1.209	-.105
Years in U.S.	-.003	.014	-.021	-.004	.014	-.031
Mexican Values Gap				-.156	-1.466	.146
Adjusted R^2		-.009			.004	
F for model		.615			1.132	
Passive/Inconsistent Parenting						
Income	-.432	.444	-.106	-.414	.445	-.102
Years in U.S.	-.005	.005	-.102	-.005	.005	-.107
Mexican Values Gap				-1.722	1.997	-.092
Adjusted R^2		.003			.000	
F for model		1.153			1.014	
Parental Monitoring						
Income	.047	.165	.031	.064	.162	.041
Years in U.S.	-.001	.002	-.038	-.001	.002	-.052
Child Gender	1.393	.483	.300**	1.384	.474	.298**
Mexican Values Gap				-1.523	.726	-.213*
Adjusted R^2		.058			.095	
F for model		2.818*			3.299**	
Accepting Parenting						
Income	-.148	.226	-.072	-.134	.225	-.065
Years in U.S.	.001	.003	.043	.001	.003	.034
Mexican Values Gap				-1.344	1.012	-.143
Adjusted R^2		-.017			-.008	
F for model		.247			.754	
Nurturing Parenting						
Income	.140	.553	.028	.200	.539	.040
Years in U.S.	.003	.006	.050	.002	.006	.035
Mexican Values Gap				-5.717	2.419	-.248*
Adjusted R^2		-.019			.032	
F for model		.168			1.980	

Note. * $p \leq .05$. ** $p \leq .01$

Table 19

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis of a Gap on Overall Acculturation on Observed Mediators

		Step 1			Step 2	
Variable	B	SE (B)	β	B	SE (B)	β
Parentification						
Income	-1.248	1.216	-.112	-1.214	1.221	-.109
Years in U.S.	-.003	.014	-.021	-.004	.014	-.035
Overall Gap				-2.285	3.569	-.070
Adjusted R^2		-.009			.004	
F for model		.615			1.132	
Passive/Inconsistent Parenting						
Income	-.432	.444	-.106	-.445	.446	-.109
Years in U.S.	-.005	.005	-.102	-.004	.005	-.087
Overall Gap				.888	1.302	.074
Adjusted R^2		.003			-.003	
F for model		1.153			.916	
Parental Monitoring						
Income	.047	.165	.031	.055	.165	.035
Years in U.S.	-.001	.002	-.038	-.001	.002	-.064
Child Gender	1.393	.483	.300**	1.480	.489	.319**
Overall Gap				-.551	.487	-.121
Adjusted R^2		.058			.061	
F for model		2.818*			1.280	
Accepting Parenting						
Income	-.148	.226	-.072	-.150	.228	-.073
Years in U.S.	.001	.003	.043	.001	.003	.048
Overall Gap				.158	.665	.026
Adjusted R^2		-.017			-.029	
F for model		.247			.181	
Nurturing Parenting						
Income	.140	.553	.028	.147	.556	.029
Years in U.S.	.003	.006	.050	.002	.006	.044
Overall Gap				-.466	1.625	-.032
Adjusted R^2		-.019			-.030	
F for model		.168			.138	

Note. * $p \leq .05$. ** $p \leq .01$

Table 20

Summary of Mediation Analyses for Observed Outcomes and Mediators on Gaps on Familism—Support

	Outcomes						
Mediator	SC	SDM	MSB	POS	PRO	DEP	AGG
Parentification							
Indirect Effect (C-C')	-1.259	-2.390	-1.791	-1.150	-4.419	.449	.002
Direct Effect (C')	-3.741	-20.277**	-10.844*	-7.260	.037	2.926	2.784
Total Effect (C)	-5.000	-22.667**	-12.635*	-8.410	-4.382	3.375	2.786
R^2	.016	.131*	.127*	.092*	.216**	.034	.001
Passive/Inconsistent Parenting							
Indirect Effect (C-C')	-.277	-.015	.161	-.258	-.247	.208	-.206
Direct Effect (C')	-2.964	-6.902	-2.517	-8.639*	-5.138	6.761**	.649
Total Effect (C)	-3.241	-.6917	-2.356	-8.897*	-5.384	6.969**	.443
R^2	-.022	-.035	-.029	.069	.050	.171**	.016
Parental Monitoring							
Indirect Effect (C-C')	-1.526	-2.126	-2.834	-2.551	-4.983	1.016	.606
Direct Effect (C')	-.094	-5.568	-3.253	-1.625	4.421	3.065	.525
Total Effect (C)	-1.621	-7.784	-6.086	-4.204	-.562	4.081	1.131
R^2	.023	.001	.148**	.132**	.152**	.126**	.051
Accepting Parenting							
Indirect Effect (C-C')	-1.727	-4.875	-2.801~	-1.150	-1.155	-.152	.679
Direct Effect (C')	-1.965	-3.137	.374	-7.776*	-3.886	7.291**	-.096
Total Effect (C)	-3.691	-8.012	-2.427	-8.926*	-5.041	7.139**	.583
R^2	.010	.056	.055	.072	-.005	.142**	.029
Nurturing Parenting							
Indirect Effect (C-C')	-.825	-2.094	-2.785	-1.614	-1.643	-1.066	-.560
Direct Effect (C')	-3.182	-6.306	-.248	-7.514	-3.264	8.237**	1.122
Total Effect (C)	-4.006	-8.400	-3.033	-9.128*	-4.907	7.170**	.561
R^2	-.015	-.014	.014	.080*	-.012	.148**	.015

Note. *SC* = Self-Control. *SDM* = Social Decision Making. *MSB* = Moral System of Belief. *POS* = Positive Sense of Self. *PRO* = Prosocial Connectedness. *DEP* = Depression. *AGG* = Aggression. ~ Indicates the confidence interval does not include zero. * $p \leq .05$. ** $p \leq .01$

Table 21

Summary of Mediation Analyses for Observed Outcomes and Mediators on Gaps on Familism-Obligations

				Outcomes			
Mediator	SC	SDM	MSB	POS	PRO	DEP	AGG
Parentification							
Indirect Effect (C-C')	-1.067	-1.804~	-1.377~	-.916	-3.626~	.258	-.011
Direct Effect (C')	-2.480	-9.304*	-4.436	-2.180	.715	3.510	1.427
Total Effect (C)	-3.547	-11.107*	-5.742*	-3.096	-2.911	3.768*	1.416
R^2	.016	-.099*	.094*	.067	.217**	.079	-.005
Passive/Inconsistent Parenting							
Indirect Effect (C-C')		.354	.268	-.296	-2.326	.090	-.314
Direct Effect (C')	-2.111	-6.482	-1.222	-3.499	-2.144	4.515**	.467
Total Effect (C)	-2.466	-6.128	-.955	-3.795	-2.458	4.605**	.153
R^2	-.024	-.016	-.032	.015	.040	.164**	.016
Parental Monitoring							
Indirect Effect (C-C')	-.102	-.576	-.765	-.735	-1.438	.251	.166
Direct Effect (C')	-2.070	-6.616	-1.706	-1.101	-1.656	3.273*	.341
Total Effect (C)	-2.171	-7.192	-2.742	-1.836	-3.094	3.523*	.507
R^2	.033	.027	.146**	.133**	.148**	.163**	.051
Accepting Parenting							
Indirect Effect (C-C')	-.936	-1.656	-.927	-.527	-.618	.086	.222
Direct Effect (C')	-1.991	-5.538	-.129	-3.254	-2.571	4.561**	.064
Total Effect (C)	-2.927	-2.194	-1.056	-3.781	-3.189	4.648**	.284
R^2	.016	.080*	.055	.041	-.005	.139**	.029
Nurturing Parenting							
Indirect Effect (C-C')	-.497	-.856	-1.105	-.979	-.794	-.138	-.173
Direct Effect (C')	-2.767	-6.740	-.612	-3.113	-2.191	4.807**	.452
Total Effect (C)	-3.264	-7.596	-1.717	-4.091	-2.985	4.669**	.279
R^2	-.007	.013	.015	.054	-.012	.134**	.011

Note. *SC* = Self-Control. *SDM* = Social Decision Making. *MSB* = Moral System of Belief. *POS* = Positive Sense of Self. *PRO* = Prosocial Connectedness. *DEP* = Depression. *AGG* = Aggression. ~ Indicates the confidence interval does not include zero. * $p \leq .05$. ** $p \leq .01$

Table 22

Summary of Mediation Analyses for Observed Outcomes and Mediators on Gaps on Familism-Referent

				Outcomes			
Mediator	SC	SDM	MSB	POS	PRO	DEP	AGG
Parentification							
Indirect Effect (C-C')	-.183	-.594	-.523	-.346	-1.009	.093	.010
Direct Effect (C')	.102	-10.267	-4.264	-3.124	.494	2.422	1.788
Total Effect (C)	.090	-10.861	-4.787	-3.469	-.516	2.514	1.788
R^2	.005	.083	.085	.072	.217**	.038	.000
Passive/Inconsistent Parenting							
Indirect Effect (C-C')	-.184	-.0303	.067	-.174	-.242	.130	-.096
Direct Effect (C')	.830	-5.120	-.574	-5.712*	-.965	4.266*	-.924
Total Effect (C)	.647	-5.150	-.507	-5.885*	-1.207	4.396*	-1.020
R^2	-.035	-.040	-.035	.051	.137**	.131**	.022
Parental Monitoring							
Indirect Effect (C-C')	-.774	-1.382	-1.374	-1.189	-2.411	.696~	.307
Direct Effect (C')	1.287	-5.113	-1.308	-3.334	2.225	2.728	-.512
Total Effect (C)	.533	-6.496	-2.682	-4.523	-.186	3.424	-.205
R^2	.027	.006	.143**	.151**	.149**	.137**	.053
Accepting Parenting							
Indirect Effect (C-C')	-.479	-2.053	-.625	-.351	-.446	.110	.158
Direct Effect (C')	.072	-4.580	-.477	-6.186*	-1.823	4.870**	-.533
Total Effect (C)	-.407	-6.632	-1.102	-6.537**	-2.270	4.980**	-.357
R^2	.005	.066	.055	.093*	-.009	.129**	.032
Nurturing Parenting							
Indirect Effect (C-C')	-.346	-.841	-.739	-.635	-.594	-.010	-.089
Direct Effect (C')	-.362	-6.149	-.954	-6.091*	-1.519	5.034**	-.305
Total Effect (C)	-.708	-6.989	-1.693	-6.725*	-2.112	5.024**	-.394
R^2	-.027	-.002	.016	.106*	-.015	.123*	.010

Note. *SC* = Self-Control. *SDM* = Social Decision Making. *MSB* = Moral System of Belief. *POS* = Positive Sense of Self. *PRO* = Prosocial Connectedness. *DEP* = Depression. *AGG* = Aggression. ~ Indicates the confidence interval does not include zero. * $p \leq .05$. ** $p \leq .01$

Table 23

Summary of Mediation Analyses for Observed Outcomes and Mediators on Gaps on Respect

			Outcomes				
Mediator	SC	SDM	MSB	POS	PRO	DEP	AGG
Parentification							
Indirect Effect (C-C')	-1.259	-2.390	-1.791	-1.150	-4.419	.449	.002
Direct Effect (C')	-3.741	-20.277**	-12.635**	-7.260	.037	2.926	2.784
Total Effect (C)	-5.000	-22.667**	-10.844*	-8.410	-4.382	3.375	2.786
R^2	.016	.131*	.127**	.092*	.216**	.034	.001
Passive/Inconsistent Parenting							
Indirect Effect (C-C')	-.140	-.030	.071	-.167	-.119	.136	-.087
Direct Effect (C')	-.038	-9.236	-6.124	-6.563	-1.053	3.993	.144
Total Effect (C)	-.178	-9.266	-5.053	-6.730	-1.172	4.129	.057
R^2	-.038	-.017	.004	.035	.035	.103*	.013
Parental Monitoring							
Indirect Effect (C-C')	-1.100	-1.463	-2.050	-1.756	-3.565	.706	.461
Direct Effect (C')	-.350	-9.604	-4.410	-5.906	1.105	4.464	-.153
Total Effect (C)	-1.450	-11.067	-6.460	-7.662*	-2.460	5.170*	.308
R^2	.023	.026	.158**	.166**	.145**	.155**	.050
Accepting Parenting							
Indirect Effect (C-C')	-2.231	-4.864~	-2.566~	1.421	-1.788	.171	.767
Direct Effect (C')	1.476	-5.515	-3.507	-5.384	.678	4.231	.552
Total Effect (C)	-.756	-10.380	-6.073	6.804	-1.110	4.402	.215
R^2	.008	.063	.066	.043	-.012	.074	.030
Nurturing Parenting							
Indirect Effect (C-C')	-1.153	-1.539	-1.747	-1.421	-1.954	-.239	-.368
Direct Effect (C')	.115	-9.243	-4.941	-5.384	.977	4.681	.549
Total Effect (C)	-1.038	-10.782	-6.688	6.804	-.977	4.441	.181
R^2	-.028	.004	.036	.043	-.016	.070	.010

Note. *SC* = Self-Control. *SDM* = Social Decision Making. *MSB* = Moral System of Belief. *POS* = Positive Sense of Self. *PRO* = Prosocial Connectedness. *DEP* = Depression. *AGG* = Aggression. ~ Indicates the confidence interval does not include zero. * $p \leq .05$. ** $p \leq .01$

Table 24

Summary of Mediation Analyses for Observed Outcomes and Mediators on Gaps on Traditional Gender Roles

	Outcomes						
Mediator	SC	SDM	MSB	POS	PRO	DEP	AGG
Parentification							
Indirect Effect (C-C')	.198	.621	.456	.304	.746	-.070	-.016
Direct Effect (C')	1.430	2.849	.698	.534	-1.202	1.670	.634
Total Effect (C)	1.637	3.470	1.153	.838	-.457	-1.740	.618
R^2	.018	.049	.061	.058	.220**	.055	-.018
Passive/Inconsistent Parenting							
Indirect Effect (C-C')	.289	-.243	-.204	.440	.484	-.155	.230
Direct Effect (C')	.730	5.261	.765	.417	-1.230	-2.356	-.158
Total Effect (C)	1.019	5.018	.560	.857	-.746	-2.510	.073
R^2	-.034	-.007	-.033	-.012	.038	.111*	.014
Parental Monitoring							
Indirect Effect (C-C')	-.759~	-.855	-.1080	-.934	-1.371	.379	.228
Direct Effect (C')	1.958	4.906	1.450	1.782	.810	-2.750**	.063
Total Effect (C)	1.199	4.051	.371	.849	-.561	-2.370*	.291
R^2	.047	.035	.150**	.147*	.146**	.186**	.050
Accepting Parenting							
Indirect Effect (C-C')	.542	1.775	.671	.429	.341	-.095	-.174
Direct Effect (C')	-.180	1.551	-.944	-.904	-1.288	-1.429	.562
Total Effect (C)	.362	3.325	-.273	-.475	-.947	-1.523	.389
R^2	.005	.057	.059	.020	-.008	.060	.037
Nurturing Parenting							
Indirect Effect (C-C')	.326	.647	.783	.897	.836	.003	.079
Direct Effect (C')	.671	3.324	.030	-.888	-2.160	-1.570	.329
Total Effect (C)	.997	3.971	.813	.009	-1.324	-1.566	.407
R^2	-.025	-.007	.014	.036	-.007	.051	.011

Note. *SC* = Self-Control. *SDM* = Social Decision Making. *MSB* = Moral System of Belief. *POS* = Positive Sense of Self. *PRO* = Prosocial Connectedness. *DEP* = Depression. *AGG* = Aggression. ~ Indicates the confidence interval does not include zero. * $p \leq .05$. ** $p \leq .01$

Table 25

Summary of Mediation Analyses for Observed Outcomes and Mediators on Gaps on Mexican Values

				Outcomes			
Mediator	SC	SDM	MSB	POS	PRO	DEP	AGG
Parentification							
Indirect Effect (C-C')	-.455	-1.343	-.975	-.612	-2.238	.228	.014
Direct Effect (C')	-3.075	-13.634**	-5.580	-4.930	.185	-3.352	1.087
Total Effect (C)	-3.529	-14.977**	-6.555*	-5.542*	-2.053	3.579	1.101
R^2	.023	.138	.111*	.103*	.217**	.061	-.019
Passive/Inconsistent Parenting							
Indirect Effect (C-C')	-.282	-.026	.911	-.196	-.167	.133	-.113
Direct Effect (C')	-1.823	-6.819	-2.324	-5.141	-1.357	4.831*	-.160
Total Effect (C)	-2.105	-6.845	-2.233	-5.337	-1.524	4.964*	-.273
R^2	-.029	-.205	-.026	.036	.036	.144**	.013
Parental Monitoring							
Indirect Effect (C-C')	-.630	-1.436	-1.309	-1.198	-2.391	.698	.287
Direct Effect (C')	-1.293	-6.698	-3.227	-2.584	1.490	3.013	.264
Total Effect (C)	-1.924	-8.134	-4.536	-3.781	-1.524	3.711	.550
R^2	.026	.016	.157**	.142**	.036	.140**	.051
Accepting Parenting							
Indirect Effect (C-C')	-.875	-2.351	-.981	-.540	-2.391	.076	.245
Direct Effect (C')	-2.004	-5.778	-1.692	-5.535*	1.490	5.338**	.051
Total Effect (C)	-2.879	-8.129	-2.673	-6.076*	-.902	5.414**	.295
R^2	.015	.074	.060	.074*	.146**	.138**	.029
Nurturing Parenting							
Indirect Effect (C-C')	-.569	-1.081	-1.204	-1.002	-.529	-.246	-.212
Direct Effect (C')	-2.642	-7.435	-2.118	-5.364*	-2.111	5.679**	.497
Total Effect (C)	-3.211	-8.516	-3.322	-6.367*	-2.641	5.433**	.286
R^2	-.0121	.008	.022	.084*	-.008	.135**	.011

Note. *SC* = Self-Control. *SDM* = Social Decision Making. *MSB* = Moral System of Belief. *POS* = Positive Sense of Self. *PRO* = Prosocial Connectedness. *DEP* = Depression. *AGG* = Aggression. ~ Indicates the confidence interval does not include zero. * $p \leq .05$. ** $p \leq .01$

Table 26

Summary of Mediation Analyses for Observed Outcomes and Mediators on Gaps on Overall Acculturation

				Outcomes			
Mediator	SC	SDM	MSB	POS	PRO	DEP	AGG
Parentification							
Indirect Effect (C-C')	-.364	-.304	-.362	-.263	-.387	.076	.011
Direct Effect (C')	2.029	2.472	2.193	1.189	.740	-.378	-.672
Total Effect (C)	1.665	2.168	1.832	.926	.353	-.302	-.661
R^2	.031	.046	.082	.064	.218**	.023	-.016
Passive/Inconsistent Parenting							
Indirect Effect (C-C')	-.008	.014	.004	-.005	.005	-.049	.009
Direct Effect (C')	1.932	4.301	4.167*	-.107	.279	-.275	-1.407
Total Effect (C)	1.924	4.315	4.171*	-.112	.284	-.324	-1.399
R^2	-.012	-.022	.036	-.013	.034	.066	.064
Parental Monitoring							
Indirect Effect (C-C')	.054	.019	-.001	-.107	-.200	.030	-.001
Direct Effect (C')	1.278	1.633	2.270	.094	-.442	-.157	-.762
Total Effect (C)	1.332	1.652	2.268	-.013	-.841	-.128	-.763
R^2	.034	-.004	.164**	.130**	.145**	.111*	.067
Accepting Parenting							
Indirect Effect (C-C')	.142	.316	.166	.235	.219	-.052	-.054
Direct Effect (C')	1.633	1.879	2.790	-.629	-1.023	-.258	-.971
Total Effect (C)	1.775	2.195	2.956	-.393	-.804	-.310	-1.025
R^2		.059	.090*	.018	-.010	.042	.055
Nurturing Parenting							
Indirect Effect (C-C')	-.105	-.054	-.132	-.179	-.124	.017	-.014
Direct Effect (C')	1.253	2.198	3.005	-.207	.300	.194	-.885
Total Effect (C)	1.147	2.144	2.873	-.385	.176	.211	-.899
R^2	-.017	-.018	.053	.033	-.017	.030	.030

Note. *SC* = Self-Control. *SDM* = Social Decision Making. *MSB* = Moral System of Belief. *POS* = Positive Sense of Self. *PRO* = Prosocial Connectedness. *DEP* = Depression. *AGG* = Aggression. ~ Indicates the confidence interval does not include zero. * $p \leq .05$. ** $p \leq .01$

APPENDIX A

Parent Survey

General Information

Parent Information

Date: __ __/__ __/__ __ __ __
Month Day Year

1. Parent/ caregiver:†Mother (1)†Father (2)†Other (3): _____

2. Name: _____, _____
Last First

3. Gender:†Male (1)†Female (2)

4. Date of Birth: __ __/__ __/__ __ __ __
Month Day Year

5. Place of birth: _____, _____, _____
City State Country

6. Place of birth :†Small town (1)†Large town (2)†City (3)

7. Number of years in the U.S.: __ __ (if born outside of the U.S.)

8. Telephone: __ __ __-__ __ __-__ __ __ __ Alt number: __ __ __-__ __ __-__ __ __ __

9. Address:

_____
Number Street

_____
City State Zip Code

10. How long have you lived at this address?

__ __ (years) OR __ __ (months) if less than one year

11. What is your marital status?

1-†Married 4-†Never been married/ Single
2-†Divorced 5-†Member of unmarried couple
3-†Separated 6-†Widowed

12. What is **your** ethnic or racial background? (Mark all that apply)

0-†Hispanic/Latino
1-†Black/African American
2-†Alaskan Native
3-†American Indian/Native American
4-†Asian or Pacific Islander
5-†European American
6-†Mixed Ethnicity
7-†Other: _____

Child Information

13. Name of your child: _____ _____ _____
Last First MI

14. Place of birth: _____, _____, _____
City State Country

15. Date of birth: __ __ / __ __ / __ __ __ __
Month Day Year

16. Age of your child: _____

17. Gender of your child: 0-†Male 1- †Female

18. Please fill in the racial or ethnic group of your **child** (Mark all that apply)

0-†Hispanic/Latino
1-†Black/African American
2-†Alaskan Native
3-†American Indian/Native American
4-†Asian or Pacific Islander
5-†European American
6-†Mixed Ethnicity Specify: _____
7-†Other: _____

Household Information

List who is living in your home and their relationship to you? INCLUDING YOURSELF (Please include people who live in your apartment who are not part of your family):

Name	**Relationship**	**Age**
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

19. Which of these categories best represents your totals household income from all sources in the LAST YEAR? (Mark one)

1-┤Less than $10,000
2-┤$10,000 to $14,999
3-┤$15,000 to $24,999
4-┤$25,000 to $34,999
5-┤$35,000 to $49,999
6-┤$50,000 and up

20. What is current employment status?

1-┤Employed (specify: _____)
2-┤Unemployed
3-┤Retired
4-┤Other (on permanent or temporary disability).
Specify: _____

OFFICE	
Total #	# nuclear
# <16 yrs	# extended
# adults	# non relatives
Composition	

1 = only nuclear
2 = extended
3 = non-relative in home

21. What is the highest level of education that you completed?

1-┤Some elementary
2-┤6th grade
3-┤Some middle school
4-┤8th grade
5-┤Some high school
6-┤12th grade

4-┤Some college
5-┤AA degree
6-┤BA degree
4-┤MA degree
5-┤PhD/MD/JD

Instructions **Read each statement and indicate which applies to you.**					
	The options are:	1= The United States	2= From my family's country of origin	3= Both place	4= Neither place
1	I am most comfortable being with people from…	1	2	3	4
2	My best friends are from…	1	2	3	4
3	The people I best fit in with are from	1	2	3	4
4	My favorite music is from…	1	2	3	4
5	My favorite TV shows are from…	1	2	3	4
6	The holidays I celebrate are from…	1	2	3	4
7	The food I eat at home is from…	1	2	3	4
8	The way I do things and the way I think about things are from…	1	2	3	4

Instructions **Think about the last three (3) months when you are answering these questions about you and your child.**						
		1= Almost Always	**2= Usually**	**3= It depends**	**4= Seldom**	**5= Never**
1	How often in the past 3 months did you know what your child did during his/her free time?	1	2	3	4	5
2	In the past 3 months, how often did you know what your child spends his/her money on?	1	2	3	4	5
3	Now think of the past 3 months. How often did you know when your child had an exam or paper due at school?	1	2	3	4	5

		1= Knows all of them	**2= Knows most of them**	**3= Know several**	**4= Know a couple**	**5= Knows none of them**
4	Do you know who your child has as friends during his/her free time?	1	2	3	4	5

		1= Everything	2= Most things	3= Something	4= Very little	5= Nothing
5	In the past 3 months, how much did you normally know about where your child went and what he/she did after school?	1	2	3	4	5

		1= Never	2= A few rare times	3= Several times	4= Many times	5= Most of the time
6	In the last 3 months, how often have you had no idea of where your child was at night?	1	2	3	4	5

Instructions

Now we would like to know more about how you act towards your child. For each sentence, decide whether it is like you, somewhat like you, or not like you.

	The options are:	1= Not like me	2= Somewhat like me	3= Like me
1	I make my child feel better after talking over his/her worries with him/her.	1	2	3
2	I am not very patient with my child.	1	2	3
3	I am very strict with my child.	1	2	3
4	I will not talk to my child when she/he displeases me.	1	2	3
5	I soon forget a rule I have made.	1	2	3
6	I seem to see my child's good points more than his/her faults.	1	2	3
7	I do not insist that my child does his/her homework.	1	2	3
8	I almost always speak to my child in a warm and friendly voice	1	2	3

9	I allow my child to go out as often as she/he wants.	1	2	3
10	I think my child's ideas are silly.	1	2	3
11	I punish my child when she/he does not obey.	1	2	3
	The options are:	**1= Not like me**	**2= Somewhat like me**	**3= Like me**
12	I am always telling my child how she/he should behave.	1	2	3
13	I seldom insist that my child does anything.	1	2	3
14	I keep reminding my child about things she/he is not allowed to do.	1	2	3
15	I am less friendly with my child if she/he does not see things my way.	1	2	3
16	I punish my child for doing something one day, but ignore it the next.	1	2	3
17	I understand my child's problems and worries.	1	2	3
18	I do not tell my child what time to be home when she/he goes out.	1	2	3
19	I almost always punish my child in some way when she/he is bad.	1	2	3
20	I sometimes allow my child to do things that I say are wrong.	1	2	3
21	I forget to help my child when she/he needs it.	1	2	3
22	I give my child as much freedom as she/he wants.	1	2	3
23	I don't forget very quickly the things my child does wrong.	1	2	3
24	It depends on my mood whether a rule is enforced or not.	1	2	3

25	I avoid looking at my child when she/he has disappointed me.	1	2	3
26	I do not bother to enforce rules with my child.	1	2	3
27	I let my child go anyplace she/he wants without asking.	1	2	3
28	I only keep rules when it suits me.	1	2	3
	The options are:	**1= Not like me**	**2= Somewhat like me**	**3= Like me**
29	I am able to make my child feel better when she/he is upset.	1	2	3
30	I see to it that my child obeys when I tell him/her something.	1	2	3
31	I let my child dress in any way she/he pleases.	1	2	3
32	I frequently change the rules my child is supposed to follow.	1	2	3
33	I let my child get away without doing work she/he has been told to do.	1	2	3
34	I am cold and distant to my child if she/he takes someone else's side in an argument.	1	2	3
35	I would like to be able to tell my child what to do all the time.	1	2	3
36	I am always getting after my child.	1	2	3
37	I almost always complain about what my child does.	1	2	3
38	I allow my child to spend his/her money in any way she/he likes.	1	2	3
39	I stop talking to my child if she/he has hurt my feelings until my child pleases me again.	1	2	3
40	I get cross (mad) and nervous when my child is noisy around the house.	1	2	3

41	I cheer her/him up when she/he is sad.	1	2	3
42	I often blow my top when my child bothers me.	1	2	3
43	I lose my temper with my child when she/he doesn't help around the house.	1	2	3
44	I let my child go out any evening she/he wants.	1	2	3
45	I want to control whatever my child does.	1	2	3
	The options are:	**1= Not like me**	**2= Somewhat like me**	**3= Like me**
46	I have a good time at home with my child.	1	2	3
47	I let my child do anything she/he likes to do.	1	2	3
48	I don't give my child any peace until she/he does what I want.	1	2	3
49	I will not have anything to do with my child when she/he has upset me until she/he finds a way to make up.	1	2	3
50	I don't seem to know what my child needs or wants.	1	2	3
51	I get cold and distant for awhile and will not say anything when I disapprove of what my child has done.	1	2	3
52	I insist that my child follow a rule one day and then I forget about it the next.	1	2	3
53	I am not interested in changing my child; I like my child as she/he is.	1	2	3
54	I act as though my child is in the way.	1	2	3
55	I change my mind to make things easier for myself.	1	2	3

56	I speak to my child in a cold, matter-of-fact voice when she/he upsets me.	1	2	3

Instructions

Think about how you get along with your son/daughter, and answer the following statements. Some of these statements may seem the same or similar to another, but they are all different. Please consider if any of the following statements apply to your child and indicate the option that best describes how true each statement is for you.

		1= Definitely false	2= For the most part false	3= Don't know	4= For the most part true	5= Definitely true
57	I put the wishes of my mate before the wishes of my child.	1	2	3	4	5
58	I watch closely what my child eats and when he/she eats.	1	2	3	4	5
59	I feel my child should be given comfort and understanding when he/she is scared or upset.	1	2	3	4	5
60	I express affection by hugging, kissing, and holding my child.	1	2	3	4	5
61	I find some of my greatest satisfaction in my child.	1	2	3	4	5
62	I find it difficult to punish my child.	1	2	3	4	5
63	I worry about the bad and sad things that can happen to her/him as she/he grows up.	1	2	3	4	5
64	I give up some of my own interests because of my child.	1	2	3	4	5
65	I tend to spoil my child.	1	2	3	4	5
66	I joke and play with my child.	1	2	3	4	5
67	My child and I have warm, intimate	1	2	3	4	5

	times together.					
68	I sometimes feel that I am too involved with my child	1	2	3	4	5
69	I make sure my child knows that I appreciate what she/he tries or accomplishes.	1	2	3	4	5
		1= Definitely false	2= For the most part false	3= Don't know	4= For the most part true	5= Definitely true
70	I worry about the health of my child.	1	2	3	4	5
71	There is a good deal of conflict between my child and me.	1	2	3	4	5
72	I make sure I know where my child is and what he/she is doing.	1	2	3	4	5
73	I find it interesting and educational to be with my child for long periods of time.	1	2	3	4	5
74	I don't want my child to be looked upon as different from others.	1	2	3	4	5
75	I get pleasure form seeing my child eating well and enjoying his/her food.	1	2	3	4	5

<u>Instructions</u>

The next statements are about what people may think or believe. Remember, there are no right or wrong answers.

Tell me how much you believe that…

		1= Not at all	**2= A little**	**3= Somewhat**	**4= Very much**	**5= Completely**
1.	One's belief in God gives inner strength and meaning of life.	1	2	3	4	5
2.	Parents should teach their children that the family always comes first.	1	2	3	4	5
3.	Children should be taught that it is their duty to care for their parents when their parents get old.	1	2	3	4	5

4.	Children should always do things to make their parents happy.	1	2	3	4	5
5.	No matter what, children should always treat their parents with respect.	1	2	3	4	5
6.	Children should be taught that it is important to have a lot of money.	1	2	3	4	5
7.	People should learn how to take care of themselves and not depend on others.	1	2	3	4	5
8.	God is first; family is second.	1	2	3	4	5
9.	Family provides a sense of security because they will always be there for you.	1	2	3	4	5
10.	Children should respect adult relatives as if they were parents.	1	2	3	4	5
		1= Not at all	**2= A little**	**3= Somewhat**	**4= Very much**	**5= Completely**
11.	If a relative is having a hard time financially, one should help them out if possible.	1	2	3	4	5
12.	When it comes to important decisions, the family should ask for advice from close relatives.	1	2	3	4	5
13.	Men should earn most of the money for the family so women can stay home and take care of the children and the home.	1	2	3	4	5
14.	One must be ready to compete with others to get ahead.	1	2	3	4	5
15.	Children should never question their parents' decisions.	1	2	3	4	5
16.	Money is the key to happiness.	1	2	3	4	5
17.	The most important thing parents can teach their children is to be independent from others.	1	2	3	4	5
18.	Parents should teach their children to pray.	1	2	3	4	5
19.	Families need to watch over and protect teenage girls more than teenage boys.	1	2	3	4	5
20.	It is always important to be united as a family.	1	2	3	4	5
21.	A person should share their home with relatives if they need a place to stay.	1	2	3	4	5
22.	Children should be on their best behavior when visiting homes of friends or relatives.	1	2	3	4	5

23.	Parents should encourage children to do everything better than others.	1	2	3	4	5
24.	Owning a lot of nice things makes one very happy.	1	2	3	4	5
25.	Children should always honor their parents and never say bad thing about them.	1	2	3	4	5
26.	As children get older their parents should allow them to make their own decisions.	1	2	3	4	5
27.	If everything is taken away, one still has their faith in God.	1	2	3	4	5
28.	It is important to have close relationships with aunts/uncles, grandparents, and cousins.	1	2	3	4	5
29.	Older kids should take care of and be role models for their younger brothers and sisters.	1	2	3	4	5
30.	Children should be taught to always be good because they represent the family.	1	2	3	4	5
31.	Children should follow their parents' rules, even if they think the rules are unfair.	1	2	3	4	5
32.	It is important for the man to have more power in the family than the woman.	1	2	3	4	5
		1= Not at all	**2= A little**	**3= Somewhat**	**4= Very much**	**5= Completely**
33.	Personal achievements are the most important things in life.	1	2	3	4	5
34.	The more money one has, the more respect they should get from others.	1	2	3	4	5
35.	When there are problems in life, a person can only count on him or herself.	1	2	3	4	5
36.	It is important to thank God every day for all one has.	1	2	3	4	5
37.	Holidays and celebrations are important because the whole family comes together.	1	2	3	4	5
38.	Parents should be willing to make great sacrifices to make sure their children have a better life.	1	2	3	4	5
39.	A person should always think about their family when making important decisions.	1	2	3	4	5
40.	It is important for children to understand that their parents should have the final say when decisions	1	2	3	4	5

	are made in the family.					
41.	Parents should teach their children to compete to win.	1	2	3	4	5
42.	Mothers are the main people responsible for raising children.	1	2	3	4	5
43.	The best way for a person to feel good about him or herself is to have a lot of money.	1	2	3	4	5
44.	Parents should encourage children to solve their own problems.	1	2	3	4	5
45.	It is important to follow the Word of God.	1	2	3	4	5
46.	It is important for family members to show their love and affection to one another.	1	2	3	4	5
47.	It is important to work hard and do one's best because this work reflects on the family.	1	2	3	4	5
48.	Religion should be an important part of one's life.	1	2	3	4	5
49.	Children should always be polite when speaking to any adult.	1	2	3	4	5
50.	A wife should always support her husband's decisions, even if she does not agree with him.	1	2	3	4	5

<u>Instructions</u>:
Please read each statement and circle your answer.

How much do you <u>TRY to know</u> . . .

	The options are	1= Don't try	2= Try a little	3= Try a lot
1.	…who your child's friends are?	1	2	3
2.	…where your child goes at night?	1	2	3
3.	…how you child spends his/her money?	1	2	3
4.	…what your child does with his/her free time?	1	2	3
5.	…where your child is at most afternoons after school?"	1	2	3

***NOW* tell us how much does your parent <u>REALLY knows</u> . . .**

	The options are	1= Don't know	2= Know little	3= Know a lot
6.	…who your child's friends are?	1	2	3
7.	…where your child goes at night?	1	2	3
8.	…how you child spends his/her money?	1	2	3
9.	…what your child does with his/her free time?	1	2	3
10.	…where your child is at most afternoons after school?"	1	2	3

<u>Instructions:</u>
Please answer the questions about your use of the English language, using the following responses:

How well do you *<u>speak</u>* ***English***:	1= Not at all	2= A little	3= Pretty well	4= Extremely well
1. at school or work	1	2	3	4
2. with American friends	1	2	3	4
3. on the phone	1	2	3	4
4. with strangers	1	2	3	4
5. in general	1	2	3	4
How well do you *<u>understand</u>* ***English***:	1= Not at all	2= A little	3= Pretty well	4= Extremely well
6. on television or in movies	1	2	3	4
7. in newspapers and magazines	1	2	3	4
8. words in songs	1	2	3	4
9. in general	1	2	3	4

Instructions: **Please answer the questions about your use of the Spanish language, using the following responses:**				
How well do you *speak* ***Spanish***:	1= Not at all	2= A little	3= Pretty well	4= Extremely well
1. at school or work	1	2	3	4
2. with American friends	1	2	3	4
3. on the phone	1	2	3	4
4. with strangers	1	2	3	4
5. in general	1	2	3	4
How well do you *understand* ***Spanish***:	1= Not at all	2= A little	3= Pretty well	4= Extremely well
6. on television or in movies	1	2	3	4
7. in newspapers and magazines	1	2	3	4
8. words in songs	1	2	3	4
9. in general	1	2	3	4

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION!

APPENDIX B

Encuesta de Padres

Información General

Información Personal

Fecha: __ __/__ __/__ __ __ __
Mes Día Año

1. Padre/ tutor:†Mamá (1)†Papá (2)†Otro (3): _____

2. Nombre: _____, _____
Apellido Nombre

3. Sexo:†Masculino (1)†Femenino (2)

4. Fecha de Nacimiento: __ __/__ __/__ __ __ __
Mes Día Año

5. Lugar de origen: _____, _____, _____
Ciudad Estado Pais

6. Lugar de origen es :

†Pueblo pequeño (ej. rancho) (1) †Pueblo grande/ municipio (2) †Ciudad (3)

7. Número de años en los Estados Unidos: __ __ (Si nació fuera de los Estados Unidos)

8. Número de Teléfono: __ __ __-__ __ __-__ __ __ __

Número Alternativo: __ __ __-__ __ __-__ __ __ __

9. Domicilio:

_____
Número Calle

_____
Ciudad Estado Código Postal

10. Cuanto tiempo ha vivido usted en este domicilio?

__ __ (años) O __ __ (meses) si es menos de un año

11. ¿Qué es su estado civil?

1-†Casado/a 4-†Nunca me he casado/ Soltero/a
2-†Divorciado/a 5-†Viviendo con pareja

3-†Separado/a 6-†Viudo/a

12. ¿A que grupo étnico pertenece usted ? (Marque todos que apliquen)
0-†Hispano/Latino 4-†Asiático/ Islas Pacificas
1-†Afro Americano 5-†Europeo Americano
2-†Nativo de Alaska 6-†Diferentes grupos étnicos
3-†Indio Americano/Nativo Americano 7-†Otro: _____

Información sobre su hijo/a

13. Nombre de su hijo/a: _____ _____ _____
Apellido Nombre Inicial

14. Lugar de nacimiento: _____, _____, _____
Ciudad Estado País

15. Fecha de nacimiento: __ __ / __ __ / __ __ __ __
Mes Día Año

16. Edad de su hijo/a: _____

17. Sexo de su hijo/a: 0-†Masculino 1- †Femenino

18. Por favor indique el grupo étnico al cual su **hijo/a** pertenece (Marque todos que apliquen)

0-†Hispano/Latino 4-†Asiático/ Islas Pacificas
1-†Afro Americano 5-†Europeo Americano
2-†Nativo de Alaska 6-†Diferentes grupos étnicos
3-†Indio Americano/Nativo Americano 7-†Otro: _____

Información Sobre el Hogar

Anote todas las personas que están viviendo en su casa, el parentesco a usted y la edad de cada persona. (Por favor anote a todas las personas que viven en su casa aunque no tengan ningún parentesco con usted)

Nombre	**Parentesco**	**Edad**
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

19. ¿ Cual de estas categorías representa su ingreso del ano pasado? (Marque uno)

1-┤Menos de $10,000
2-┤$10,000 a $14,999
3-┤$15,000 a $24,999
4-┤$25,000 a $34,999
5-┤$35,000 a $49,999
6-┤$50,000 o más

20. ¿Qué es su estado de empleo?
1-┤Empleado/Tiene trabajo (especifique: _____)
2-┤Desempleado
3-┤Retirado/ Jubilado
4-┤Otro (deshabilitado permanentemente o temporalmente).

Especifique: _____

OFFICE	
Total #	# nuclear
# <16 yrs	# extended
# adults	# non relatives
Composition 1 = only nuclear 2 = extended 3 = non-relative in home	

21. ¿Cual es el nivel más alto nivel de escuela que usted completo?
1-┤Algo de primaria
4-┤Algo de colegio

2-┼ 6to año
3-┼ Algo de Secundaria
4-┼ Tercero de secundaria
5-┼ Algo de preparatoria
6-┼ Tercero de preparatoria

5-┼ Título de Asociado
6-┼ Título de Licenciatura
4-┼ Título de Maestría
5-┼ Título Avanzado (ej. Doctorado)

<u>Instrucciones</u>
Lea cada pregunta y seleccione la mejor opción para cada declaración.

	Las opciones son:	1= Los Estados Unidos	2= El país de donde llego originalmente mi familia	3= Ambos lugares	4= Ningún lugar
1	Para mi es más cómodo estar con gente que es de:	1	2	3	4
2	Mis mejores amigos son de:	1	2	3	4
3	La gente con la que me llevo mejor es de:	1	2	3	4
4	Mi música preferida es de:	1	2	3	4
5	Mis programas de televisión preferidos son de:	1	2	3	4
6	Los días festivos que celebro son de:	1	2	3	4
7	La comida que como es de	1	2	3	4
8	El modo que pienso sobre las cosas es como:	1	2	3	4

<u>Instrucciones:</u>
Piense sobre los últimos *<u>tres</u>*** (3) meses cuando este contestando estas preguntas sobre usted y su hijo/a**

		1= Casi siempre	**2= Normal -mente**	**3= Depen -de**	**4= Casi nunca**	**5= Nunca**
7	¿Que tan frecuente en los últimos 3 meses sabia usted lo que estaba haciendo si hijo/a durante su tiempo libre?	1	2	3	4	5
8	¿En los últimos 3 meses, que tan frecuente sabia usted lo que su hijo/a estaba gastando su de el/ella?	1	2	3	4	5

9	Ahora piense en los últimos 3 meses. Que tan frecuentemente sabia usted cuando su hijo/a tenia un examen o reporte que entregar a la escuela?	1	2	3	4	5

		1= Los conozco a todos	2= Conozco la mayoría	3= Conozco a varios	4= Conozco un par de ellos	5= Conozco ningunos
1	¿Sabe usted a quien tiene su hijo/a como amigos/as en la escuela?	1	2	3	4	5

		1= Todo	2= La mayoría de las cosas	3= Algunas cosas	4= Muy poco	5= Nada
1	¿Durante los últimos 3 meses, normalmente cuanto sabía usted sobre donde iba su hijo/a y lo que hacia el/ella después de escuela?	1	2	3	4	5

		1= Nunca	2= Raramente	3= Varias veces	4= Muchas veces	5= La mayoría del tiempo
1	¿Durante los últimos 3 meses, que tan frecuente no sabía donde estaba su hijo/a durante la noche?	1	2	3	4	5

<u>Instrucciones</u>

Ahora quisiéramos saber mas sobre como usted se lleva (actúa) con su hijo/a. Para cada declaración decida si es como usted, si es un poco como usted, o si no es como usted.

		1= No como yo	2= Algo como yo	3= Como yo
76	Yo hago sentir mejor a mi hijo/a después de hablar con el/ella sobre sus preocupaciones.	1	2	3
77	Yo no soy muy paciente con mi hijo/a.	1	2	3
78	Yo soy muy estricto con mi hijo/a.	1	2	3

79	Yo no le hablo a mi hijo/a cuando el/ella me desplace/disgusta.	1	2	3
80	Pronto se me olvida una regla que ha hecho.	1	2	3
81	Yo tiendo a ver los buenos puntos de mi hijo/a más que sus faltas.	1	2	3
82	Yo no insisto en que mi hijo/a haga su tarea escolar.	1	2	3
83	Casi siempre yo le hablo a mi hijo/a en un tono de voz calurosa y amigable.	1	2	3
		1= No como yo	**2= Algo como yo**	**3= Como yo**
84	Yo le permito a mi hijo/a que salga las veces que quiera.	1	2	3
85	Yo pienso que las ideas de mi hijo/a son tontas.	1	2	3
86	Yo castigo a mi hijo/a cuando el/ella no obedece.	1	2	3
87	Yo siempre le estoy diciendo a mi hijo/a como el/ella se debe portar.	1	2	3
88	Yo raramente le insisto a mi hijo/a a que haga cualquier cosa.	1	2	3
89	Yo sigo recordándole a mi hijo/a de las cosas que el/ella no esta permitido hacer.	1	2	3
90	Yo soy menos amigable con mi hijo/a si el/ella no ve las cosas de mi manera.	1	2	3
91	Yo castigo a mi hijo/a por hacer algo un día, pero lo ignoro la próxima vez.	1	2	3
92	Yo entiendo los problemas y las preocupaciones de mi hijo/a.	1	2	3
93	Cuando mi hijo/a sale, yo no le digo a la hora que debe regresar a la casa.	1	2	3
94	Casi siempre castigo a mi hijo/a de alguna forma cuando se porta mal.	1	2	3

95	Yo a veces le permito a mi hijo/a que las cosas que yo digo son malas.	1	2	3
96	Se me olvida ayudarle a mi hijo/a cuando el/ella lo necesita.	1	2	3
97	Yo le doy a mi hijo/a toda la libertad que el/ella quiere.	1	2	3
98	A mi no se me olvidan rápidamente las cosas que mi hijo/a hace mal.	1	2	3
99	Dependiendo en mi estado de ánimo las reglas se cumplen o no se cumplen.	1	2	3
100	Yo evito mirar a mi hijo/a cuando el/ella me ha desilusionado.	1	2	3
		1= No como yo	**2= Algo como yo**	**3= Como yo**
101	Yo no me molesto en enforzar que mi hijo/a que cumpla las reglas.	1	2	3
102	Yo le permito a mi hijo/a ir a cualquier lugar que quiere sin preguntar.	1	2	3
103	Yo solo mantengo las reglas cuando me conviene.	1	2	3
104	Yo puedo ayudar a mi hijo/a a sentirse mejor cuando esta triste o molesto/a.	1	2	3
105	Yo me aseguro de que mi hijo/a obedezca cuando le digo que haga algo.	1	2	3
106	Yo le permito a mi hijo/a vestirse de cualquier manera que a el/ella le guste.	1	2	3
107	Yo frecuentemente cambio las reglas que mi hijo/a debe seguir.	1	2	3
108	Yo dejo que mi hijo/a se salga con la del sin hacer el trabajo que se le ha mandado hacer.	1	2	3
109	Yo me porto frío/a y distante con mi hijo/a se el/ella apoya el punto de vista de otra persona en una discusión.	1	2	3
110	A mi me gustaría poderle decir a mi hijo/a que debe de hacer todo el tiempo.	1	2	3

111	Yo siempre estoy detrás de mi hijo/a.	1	2	3
112	Yo casi siempre me quejo de lo que hace mi hijo/a.	1	2	3
113	Yo le permito a mi hijo/a que se gaste su dinero en la manera que el/ella quiera.	1	2	3
114	Yo dejo de hablarle a mi hijo/a si el/ella me ha herido mis sentimientos hasta que el/ella me complazca otra vez.	1	2	3
115	Yo me pongo molesto/a y nervioso/a cuando mi hijo/a hace mucho ruido en la casa.	1	2	3
116	Yo alegro a mi hijo/a cuando el/ella esta triste.	1	2	3
117	Yo seguido pierdo la cabeza cuando mi hijo/a me molesta.	1	2	3
		1= No como yo	**2= Algo como yo**	**3= Como yo**
118	Yo pierdo mi temperamento con mi hijo/a cuando el/ella no ayuda en la casa.	1	2	3
119	Yo le permito a mi hijo/a que salga cualquier noche que el/ella quiere.	1	2	3
120	Yo quiero controlar todo lo que mi hijo/a hace.	1	2	3
121	Yo disfruto del tiempo en casa con mi hijo/a.	1	2	3
122	Yo dejo que mi hijo/a haga cualquier cosa que le guste hacer.	1	2	3
123	Yo no le doy tranquilidad a mi hijo/a hasta que el/ella hace lo que yo quiero.	1	2	3
124	Yo no quiero nada que ver con mi hijo/a cuando el/ella me ha molestado hasta que el/ella halle una manera de hacer la paz.	1	2	3
125	Parece que yo no se que es o que necesita o quiere mi hijo/a.	1	2	3

126	Me porto frío y distante por un rato, y no le digo nada a mi hijo/a cuando desapruebo d lo que ha hecho.	1	2	3
127	Yo insisto que mi hijo/a siga una regla un día pero me olvido de ella la próxima vez.	1	2	3
128	Yo no estoy interesado/a en cambiar a mi hijo/a; me gusta mi hijo/a tal come es.	1	2	3
129	Yo me comporto como que si m hijo/a me estorba.	1	2	3
130	Yo cambio de opinión para que se me hagan más fáciles las cosas.	1	2	3
131	Yo le hablo a mi hijo/a de una manera fría e impersonal cuando el/ella me ha disgustado.	1	2	3

<u>Instrucciones</u>

Piense en como se lleva en general con su hijo(a). Algunas de las declaraciones parecen ser igual o similares a otras. Pero cada declaración es diferente, y se deben de considerar separadas. Por favor considere si cada una de las siguientes declaraciones se refieren a su niño(a) y indique la opción que mejor describa cuanto cada declaración es cierta para usted.

		1= Definitiva-mente falso	**2= Por la mayor parte falso**	**3= No se**	**4= Por la mayor parte cierto**	**5= Definitiva-mente cierto**
132	Yo pongo los deseos de mi compañero(a) antes de los deseos de mi niño(a).	1	2	3	4	5
133	Yo vigilo muy de cerca lo que mi niño(a) come y cuando come.	1	2	3	4	5
134	Yo pienso que mi niño(a) debe ser consolado y comprendido cuando tiene miedo o esta molesto.	1	2	3	4	5
135	Yo muestro mi cariño abrazando, besando, y sosteniendo a mi niño(a).	1	2	3	4	5
136	Yo encuentro algunas de mis mayores satisfacciones en mi niño(a).	1	2	3	4	5

137	Encuentro difícil el tener que castigar a mi niño(a).	1	2	3	4	5
138	Yo me preocupo de las cosas malas y tristes que le puedan pasar a mi niño(a) cuando crezca.	1	2	3	4	5
139	Yo abandono algunos de mis intereses por mi niño(a).	1	2	3	4	5
140	Tengo la tendencia de mimar mucho a mi hijo(a).	1	2	3	4	5
141	Yo bromeo y juego con mi niño(a).	1	2	3	4	5
142	Mi niño(a) y yo tenemos momentos agradables e íntimos juntos(as).	1	2	3	4	5
143	A veces siento que estoy demasiado involucrado(a) con mi niño(a).	1	2	3	4	5
144	Yo me aseguro de que mi niño(a) sepa que yo aprecio lo que el/ella intenta o realiza.	1	2	3	4	5
145	Yo me preocupo por la salud de mi niño(a).	1	2	3	4	5
		1= Definitiva-mente falso	**2= Por la mayor parte falso**	**3= No se**	**4= Por la mayor parte cierto**	**5= Definitiva-mente cierto**
146	Hay mucho conflicto entre mi niño(a) y yo.	1	2	3	4	5
147	Yo me aseguro de donde esta mi niño(a) y lo que esta haciendo.	1	2	3	4	5
148	Yo lo encuentro interesante y educativo pasar con mi niño(a) por largos periodos.	1	2	3	4	5
149	No quiero que a mi niño(a) lo/la vean diferente a los demás.	1	2	3	4	5
150	Yo obtengo placer de ver que mi niño(a) come bien y que disfruta de su	1	2	3	4	5

	comida.					

Instrucciones

Las siguientes frases son acerca de lo que la gente puede pensar o creer. Recuerda, no hay respuestas correctas o incorrectas. Dígame que tanto cree que.

		1= Nada	2= Poquito	3= Algo	4= Bastante	5= Completa-mente
51.	La creencia en Dios da fuerza interna y significado a la vida.	1	2	3	4	5
52.	Los padres deberían enseñarle a sus hijos que la familia siempre es primero.	1	2	3	4	5
53.	Se les debería ensenar a los niños que es su obligación cuidar a sus padres cuando ellos envejezcan.	1	2	3	4	5
54.	Los niños siempre deberían hacer las cosas que hagan a sus padres felices.	1	2	3	4	5
55.	Sea lo que sea, los niños siempre deberían tratar a sus padres con respecto.	1	2	3	4	5
56.	Se les debería ensenar a los niños que es importante tener mucho dinero.	1	2	3	4	5
57.	La gente debería aprender como cuidarse sola y no depender de otros.	1	2	3	4	5
58.	Dios esta primero, la familia esta segundo.	1	2	3	4	5
59.	La familia provee un sentido de seguridad, porque ellos siempre estarán allí para usted.	1	2	3	4	5
		1= Nada	**2= Poquito**	**3= Algo**	**4= Bastante**	**5= Completa-mente**
60.	Los niños deberían respetar a familiares adultos como si fueran sus padres.	1	2	3	4	5
61.	Si un pariente esta teniendo dificultades económicas, uno debería ayudarlo si puede.	1	2	3	4	5

62.	La familia debería pedir consejos a sus parientes más cercanos cuando se trata de decisiones importantes.	1	2	3	4	5
63.	Los hombres deberían ganar la mayoría del dinero para la familia para que las mujeres puedan quedarse en casa y cuidar a los hijos y el hogar.	1	2	3	4	5
64.	Uno tiene que estar listo para competir con otros si uno quiere salir adelante.	1	2	3	4	5
65.	Los hijos nunca deberían cuestionar las decisiones de de los padres.	1	2	3	4	5
66.	El dinero es la clave para la felicidad.	1	2	3	4	5
67.	Lo más importante que los padres pueden enseñarle a sus hijos es que sean independientes de otros.	1	2	3	4	5
68.	Los padres deberían enseñarles a sus hijos a rezar.	1	2	3	4	5
69.	Las familias necesitan vigilar y proteger más las niñas adolescentes que los niños adolescentes.	1	2	3	4	5
70.	Siempre es importante estar unidos como familia.	1	2	3	4	5
71.	Uno debería compartir su casa con parientes si ellos necesitan donde quedarse.	1	2	3	4	5
72.	Los niños deberían portarse se la mejor manera cuando visitan las casas de amigos o familiares.	1	2	3	4	5
73.	Los padres deberían animar a los hijos para que hagan todo mejor que los demás.	1	2	3	4	5
74.	Tener muchas cosas buenas lo hace a uno muy feliz.	1	2	3	4	5
75.	Los niños siempre deberían honrar a sus padres y nunca decir cosas malas de ellos.	1	2	3	4	5

		1= Nada	2= Poquito	3= Algo	4= Bastante	5= Completa-mente
76.	Según los niños van creciendo, los padres deberían dejar que ellos tomen sus propias decisiones.	1	2	3	4	5
77.	Si a uno le quitan todo, todavía le queda la fe en Dios.	1	2	3	4	5
78.	Es importante mantener relaciones cercanas con tíos, abuelos u primos.	1	2	3	4	5
79.	Los hermanos grandes deberían cuidar u darles el buen ejemplo a los hermanos y hermanas menores.	1	2	3	4	5
80.	Se les debería ensenar a los niños a que siempre sean buenos porque ellos representan a la familia.	1	2	3	4	5
81.	Los niños deberían seguir las reglas de sus padres, aun cuando piensen que no son justas.	1	2	3	4	5
82.	En la familia es importante que el hombre tenga mas poder que la mujer.	1	2	3	4	5
83.	Los logros personales son las cosas más importantes en la vida.	1	2	3	4	5
84.	Entre mas dinero uno tenga, mas el respeto que uno debería recibir.	1	2	3	4	5
85.	Cuando hay problemas en la vida, uno solo puede contar con si mismo.	1	2	3	4	5
86.	Es importante darle gracias a Dios todos los días por todo lo que tenemos.	1	2	3	4	5
87.	Los días festivos y las celebraciones son importantes porque se reúne toda la familia.	1	2	3	4	5
88.	Los padres deberían estar dispuestos a hacer grandes sacrificios para asegurarse que sus hijos tengan una vida mejor.	1	2	3	4	5
89.	Uno siempre debería considerar a su familia cuando toma	1	2	3	4	5

	decisiones importantes.					
90.	Es importante que los niños entiendan que sus padres deberían de tener la ultima palabra cuando se toman decisiones en la familia.	1	2	3	4	5
91.	Los padres deberían de enseñarles a sus hijos a competir para ganar.	1	2	3	4	5
92.	Las madres son la persona principal responsable por la crianza de los hijos.	1	2	3	4	5
		1= Nada	**2= Poquito**	**3= Algo**	**4= Bastante**	**5= Completa-mente**
93.	La mejor manera de sentirse bien acerca de uno mismo es tener mucho dinero.	1	2	3	4	5
94.	Los padres deberían de animar a sus hijos a que resuelvan sus propios problemas.	1	2	3	4	5
95.	Es importante seguir a palabra de Dios.	1	2	3	4	5
96.	Es importante que los miembros de la familia muestren su amor y afecto unos a los otros.	1	2	3	4	5
97.	Es importante trabajar duro y hacer lo mejor que uno pueda porque el trabajo de uno se refleja en la familia.	1	2	3	4	5
98.	La religión debería ser una parte importante de la vida.	1	2	3	4	5
99.	Los niños siempre deberían ser amables cuando hablan con cualquier adulto.	1	2	3	4	5
100.	Una esposa debería siempre apoyar las decisiones de su espose, aunque no este de acuerdo con el.	1	2	3	4	5

<u>Instrucciones</u>

Por favor lea cada frase y circule su respuesta.

¿Que tanto <u>TRATA de saber</u> usted

	Las opciones son	1= No trato	2= Trato un poco	3= Trato mucho

11.	…quienes son los amigos de su hijo/a?	1	2	3
12.	…a donde su hijo/a va en la noche?	1	2	3
13.	…como gasta su hijo/a el dinero?	1	2	3
14.	…que hace su hijo/a durante su tiempo libre?	1	2	3
15.	…donde esta su hijo/a en las tardes después de escuela?"	1	2	3

AHORA díganos que tanto <u>sabe EN VERDAD</u> sobre				
	Las opciones son	1= No se	2= Se un poco	3= Se mucho
16.	…quienes son los amigos de su hijo/a?	1	2	3
17.	…a donde su hijo/a va en la noche?	1	2	3
18.	…como gasta su hijo/a el dinero?	1	2	3
19.	…que hace su hijo/a durante su tiempo libre?	1	2	3
20.	…donde esta su hijo/a en las tardes después de escuela?"	1	2	3

<u>Instrucciones</u>

Por favor conteste las siguientes preguntas sobre su capacidad con el inglés.

Que tan bien habla ***Inglés***:	1= Nada	2= Un poco	3= Bien	4= Muy Bien
10. en la escuela o el trabajo	1	2	3	4
11. con amigos Americanos	1	2	3	4
12. en el teléfono	1	2	3	4
13. con desconocidos	1	2	3	4

14. en general	1	2	3	4
Que tan bien entiende ***Inglés***:	1= Nada	2= Un poco	3= Bien	4= Muy Bien
1. en la televisión o películas	1	2	3	4
2. en los periódicos o revistas	1	2	3	4
3. en las palabras en canciones	1	2	3	4
4. en general	1	2	3	4

Instrucciones Por favor conteste las siguientes preguntas sobre su capacidad con el español.				
Que tan bien habla ***Español***:	1= Nada	2= Un poco	3= Bien	4= Muy Bien
1. en la escuela o el trabajo	1	2	3	4
2. con amigos Americanos	1	2	3	4
3. en el teléfono	1	2	3	4
4. con desconocidos	1	2	3	4
5. en general	1	2	3	4
Que tan bien entiende ***Español***:	1= Nada	2= Un poco	3= Bien	4= Muy Bien
5. en la televisión o películas	1	2	3	4
6. en los periódicos o revistas	1	2	3	4
7. en las palabras en canciones	1	2	3	4
8. en general	1	2	3	4

¡GRACIAS POR SU PARTICIPACION!

APPENDIX C

Student Survey
General Information

This survey has a series of questions that will let us know what you think and believe should be done in different circumstances. Each section has different instructions, so make sure to read the instructions for all sections.

Remember, we are asking what ***you*** think, not what other people think. There are no right or wrong answers, make sure you answer each question honestly.

Remember, you do not have to answer any question that you do not want to answer. You can also stop answering questions at any moment without any problems.

Thanks for your help.

General Information:

1. Name: _____ _____ _____
   Last First Middle

2. Date: __ __ / __ __ / __ __ __ __
   Month Day Year

3. Gender: 0- ☐ Male 1- ☐ Female

4. Place of Birth: _____, _____
   City State

5. If you were born outside of the United States, at what age did you come to the U.S?
   _____

6. Date of Birth: __ __ / __ __ / __ __ __ __
   Month Day Year

7. Age: _____

8. Grade: _____

Instructions **Read each statement and indicate which applies to you.**					
	The options are:	1= The United States	2= From my family's country of origin	3= Both place	4= Neither place
1	I am most comfortable being with people from…	1	2	3	4
2	My best friends are from…	1	2	3	4
3	The people I best fit in with are from	1	2	3	4
4	My favorite music is from…	1	2	3	4
5	My favorite TV shows are from…	1	2	3	4
6	The holidays I celebrate are from…	1	2	3	4
7	The food I eat at home is from…	1	2	3	4
8	The way I do things and the way I think about things are from…	1	2	3	4

Instructions

Each statement below is about different adult responsibilities. For each one, how often you have done each.

		1= Very often	**2= Often**	**3= Occasionally**	**4= Rarely**	**5= Never or does not apply to me**
1.	I babysat my younger brother/sister.	1	2	3	4	5
2.	My parents were away for more than 24 hours, and I was the main person who assumed responsibility for my siblings(s).	1	2	3	4	5
3.	I cleaned the house for my family.	1	2	3	4	5
4.	I restored peace if conflicts developed between my parents.	1	2	3	4	5

5.	My parent(s) at times became physically ill, and I was responsible for taking care of them.	1	2	3	4	5
		1= Very often	**2= Often**	**3= Occasionally**	**4= Rarely**	**5= Never or does not apply to me**
6.	I was the mediator or "go-between" when a conflict arose between my siblings.	1	2	3	4	5
7.	My parent(s) asked for my advice when making a decision about my sibling's misbehavior.	1	2	3	4	5
8.	One parent would come to me to discuss the other parent.	1	2	3	4	5
9.	I was responsible for deciding what action to take if one of my sibling(s) misbehaved, even when my parent(s) were present.	1	2	3	4	5
10.	My parent(s) sought my advice on adult matters.	1	2	3	4	5
11.	My parents would argue, and I would wind up on the side of one of them.	1	2	3	4	5
12.	I provided emotional support and/or comfort for my sibling(s).	1	2	3	4	5
13.	I was responsible for dressing my sibling(s) or insuring that he or she (they) got dressed.	1	2	3	4	5
14.	My parent(s) let me have a lot of influence when they were making important adult decisions.	1	2	3	4	5
15.	My parent(s) discussed their financial issues and problems with me.	1	2	3	4	5
16.	I did the dishes for members of my family.	1	2	3	4	5
17.	When my sibling(s) had problems I took a lot of responsibility for solving them.	1	2	3	4	5
18.	I made dinner for members of my family.	1	2	3	4	5
19.	I made rules, spoken or unspoken for my sibling(s).	1	2	3	4	5
20.	When one of my sibling(s) had a	1	2	3	4	5

	personal concern, they came to me for advice.					
21.	I did the laundry for members of my family.	1	2	3	4	5
22.	I was responsible for bathing my sibling(s).	1	2	3	4	5
23.	I consoled one or both of my parents when they were distressed.	1	2	3	4	5
24.	My father shared personal problems or concerns with me as if I were another adult.	1	2	3	4	5
		1= Very often	**2= Often**	**3= Occasionally**	**4= Rarely**	**5= Never or does not apply to me**
25.	My sibling(s) came to me when they were having difficulties with our parent(s).	1	2	3	4	5
26.	One (or both) of my parents asked for my input (rather than my other parent's input) when making an important decision.	1	2	3	4	5
27.	I would decide what time my sibling(s) went to bed for the evening, even when my parent(s) were home.	1	2	3	4	5
28.	One (or both) of my parents asked for my input (rather than my other parent's input) when making an important decision.	1	2	3	4	5
29.	My mother shared personal problems with me as if I were another adult.	1	2	3	4	5

Instructions

Below are some questions about language abilities. Think about how good you and your parents are at speaking English and Spanish. Circle the answer that best matches your response to each statement

		1= English only	**2= More English than Spanish**	**3= Both English and Spanish equally**	**4= More Spanish than English**	**5= Spanish only**

1	I am capable of speaking	1	2	3	4	5
2	My mom is capable of speaking	1	2	3	4	5
3	My dad is capable of speaking	1	2	3	4	5

Instructions

For these questions, circle the answer that best matches your response to each statement

		1= Yes	**0= No**
4	Have you ever translated for your mom?	1	0
5	Have you ever translated for father?	1	0

Instructions

Think about how often you have translated for your parents, and what things you usually translate. How often have you translated for your parents?

		0= not at all	**1= at least once**	**2= a few times**	**3= weekly**	**4= daily**
6	Homework or school assignments	0	1	2	3	4
7	Materials from school (letters, report cards, and notes)	0	1	2	3	4
8	During meetings or conversations between your mom and people that work at your school	0	1	2	3	4
9	Household matters related to money (bills and notes from the bank)	0	1	2	3	4
10	Household matters not relating to money (chores, brothers/sisters or relatives)	0	1	2	3	4
11	Immigration/naturalization papers	0	1	2	3	4
12	Media (TV programs, news, and newspapers)	0	1	2	3	4
13	Meetings or conversations between your mom and her boss/people from work	0	1	2	3	4
14	Things having to do with her health (during doctor visits, medication instructions)	0	1	2	3	4

Instructions

Think about when you translate for your parents. How much do you like translating for…

		0= I don't like it at all	1= I prefer not to	2= I don't mind	3= I like it a little	4= I like it a lot
15	How much do you like translating for mom?	0	1	2	3	4
16	How much do you like translating for dad?	0	1	2	3	4

Instructions

Please describe how you have been feeling the past two weeks. There are no correct or incorrect responses. Choose the phrase that best describes how you have been feelings recently.

1.	I am sad	1= I am sad once in a while
		2= I am sad many times
		3= I am sad all of the time
2.	Nothing will ever work out for me:	1= Nothing will ever work out for me
		2= I am not sure if things will work out for me
		3= Things will work out for me ok
3.	I do things ok	1= I do most things ok
		2= I do many things wrong
		3= I do everything wrong
4.	I have fun	1= I have fun in many things
		2= I have fun in some tings
		3= Nothing is fun at all
5.	I am bad	1= I am bad all of the time
		2= I am bad many times

		3= I am bad once in a while
6.	I think about bad things happening to me	1= I think about bad things happening to me once in a while
		2= I worry that bad things will happen to me
		3= I am sure bad things will happen to me
7.	I hate myself	1= I hate myself
		2= I do not like myself
		3= I like myself
8.	Bad things are my fault	1= All bad tings are my fault
		2= Many bad things are my fault
		3= Bad things are not usually my fault
9.	I feel like crying	1= I feel like crying everyday
		2= I feel like crying many days
		3= I feel like crying once in a while
10.	Things bother me	1= Things bother me all the time
		2= Things bother me many times
		3= Things bother me once in a while
11.	I like being with people	1= I like being with people
		2= I do not like being with people
		3= I do not like to be with people at all
12.	Make up my mind about things	1= I cannot make up my mind about things
		2= It is hard to make up my mind about things
		3= I make up my mind about things easily
13.	I look OK	1= I look OK
		2= There are some bad things about my looks

		3= I look ugly
14.	I push myself to do my schoolwork	1= I have to push myself all the time to do my schoolwork
		2= I have to push myself many times to do my schoolwork
		3= Doing school work is not a big problem
15.	I have trouble sleeping	1= I have trouble sleeping every night
		2= I have trouble sleeping many nights
		3= I sleep pretty well
16.	I am tired	1= I am tired once in a while
		2= I am tired many days
		3= I am tired all of the time
17.	I do not feel like eating	1= Most days I do not feel like eating
		2= Many days I do not feel like eating
		3= I eat pretty well
18.	I worry about aches and pains	1= I do not worry about aches and pains
		2= I worry about aches and pains
		3= I worry about aches and pains all the time
19.	I feel alone	1= I do not feel alone
		2= I feel alone many times
		3= I feel alone all the time
20.	I have fun at school	1= I never have fun at school
		2= I have fun at school only once in a while
		3= I have fun at school many times
21.	I have friends	1= I have plenty of friends
		2= I have some friends but I wish I had more

		3= I do not have friends
22.	My schoolwork is	1= My schoolwork is alright
		2= My schoolwork is not as good as before
		3= I do very badly in subjects I used to be good at
23.	I can be as good as other kids	1= I can never be as good as other kids
		2= I can be as good as other kids if I want to
		3= I am just as good as other kids
24.	I am not sure if anybody loves me	1= Nobody really loves me
		2= I am not sure if anybody loves me
		3= I am sure that somebody loves me
25.	I do what I am told	1= I usually do what I am told
		2= I do not do what I am told most of times
		3= I never do what I am told
26.	I get along with people	1= I get along with people
		2= I get into fights many times
		3= I get into fights all of the time

Instructions

The following items ask about things that have happened **(when you were not just playing around but were doing something hurtful)** in the past month.

***In the LAST 30 DAYS*, how many times have you:**

		1= Never	**2= Once or twice**	**3= 3-5 times**	**4= 6 or more times**
1.	Shoved or pushed someone?	1	2	3	4
2.	Yelled or screamed really loud at someone?	1	2	3	4
3.	Threatened to hit or physically harm someone to their face?	1	2	3	4
4.	Been in a fight in which you hit someone?	1	2	3	4

5.	Thrown something at someone?	1	2	3	4
6.	Hit or slapped someone?	1	2	3	4
7.	Insulted someone's family to their face?	1	2	3	4
8.	Teased someone to their face?	1	2	3	4
9.	Put someone down to their face?	1	2	3	4
10.	Not let someone be in your group anymore because you were mad at them?	1	2	3	4
11.	Told someone you wouldn't like them unless they did what you wanted them to do?	1	2	3	4
12.	Spread rumors about someone?	1	2	3	4
		1= Never	**2= Once or twice**	**3= 3-5 times**	**4= 6 or more times**
13.	Said mean things about someone behind their back?	1	2	3	4
14.	Carried a weapon (gun, knife, club, etc.)?	1	2	3	4
15.	Carried a weapon (gun, knife, club, etc.) at school?	1	2	3	4
16.	Used cell phone pictures to make fun of someone?	1	2	3	4
17.	Used text-messaging to make fun of someone?	1	2	3	4
18.	Used a chat room or Internet website to make fun of someone?	1	2	3	4
19.	Used cell phone pictures to threaten someone with physical harm?	1	2	3	4
20.	Used text-messaging to threaten someone with physical harm?	1	2	3	4
21.	Used a chat room or Internet website to threaten someone with physical harm?	1	2	3	4
22.	Been in a fight in when you were injured and had to be treated by a doctor or nurse?	1	2	3	4

23.	Written mean things about someone where others can see it?	1	2	3	4
24.	Skipped school because you felt that you would be unsafe at school or on your way to or from school?	1	2	3	4

Instructions

We are going to ask you different questions about yourself—your attitudes and your behavior. There are no right or wrong answers, but please be honest.

	The following questions ask what you think about yourself. Circle the number and/or answer that is closest to what you choose.	**1= Strongly disagree**	**2= Disagree**	**3= Agree**	**4= Strongly Agree**
1.	In general I am satisfied with myself.	1	2	3	4
2.	At times I think that I am no good at all.	1	2	3	4
3.	I feel that I have a number of good qualities.	1	2	3	4
4.	I am able to do things as well as most other people.	1	2	3	4
		1= Strongly disagree	**2= Disagree**	**3= Agree**	**4= Strongly Agree**
5.	I feel I do not have much to be proud of.	1	2	3	4
6.	I definitely feel useless at times.	1	2	3	4
7.	I feel that I am a person of worth, at least equal to others.	1	2	3	4
8	I wish I could have more respect for myself.	1	2	3	4
9.	Overall, I tend to feel that I am a failure.	1	2	3	4
10.	I have a positive attitude about myself.	1	2	3	4
11.	When I disagree with others I share my views.	1	2	3	4
12.	I feel that my opinions are valuable enough to share.	1	2	3	4
13.	I am good at identifying my own strengths.	1	2	3	4

14.	I am good at identifying my own weaknesses.	1	2	3	4
15.	I can make a difference in my own life.	1	2	3	4
16.	I know what I need to do to be a better person.	1	2	3	4
17.	I think that my life has “purpose” or meaning.	1	2	3	4
18.	I think a lot about the future and how I want to live my life.	1	2	3	4
	These next questions ask about your general behavior in certain situations	**1= Strongly disagree**	**2= Disagree**	**3= Agree**	**4= Strongly Agree**
19.	I have a hard time sitting still.	1	2	3	4
20.	I have a hard time finishing what I start.	1	2	3	4
21.	I do things without thinking.	1	2	3	4
22.	I can stop myself from losing my temper.	1	2	3	4
23.	I can control my angry feelings.	1	2	3	4
24.	I can do things to calm down when upset.	1	2	3	4
25.	I lose my temper pretty easily.	1	2	3	4
		1= Strongly disagree	**2= Disagree**	**3= Agree**	**4= Strongly Agree**
26.	I’m more concerned with what happens to me in the short run than in the long run.	1	2	3	4
27.	I often act on the spur of the moment without stopping to think.	1	2	3	4
28.	I don’t devote much thought and effort to preparing for the future.	1	2	3	4
29.	I don’t devote much thought and effort to preparing for the future.	1	2	3	4

30.	I find it hard to resist pressure from friends.	1	2	3	4
31.	After I do something it's hard to tell what will happen next.	1	2	3	4
32.	It's hard to wait for something I want.	1	2	3	4
33.	It's hard for me to concentrate on something if I don't like what I'm doing.	1	2	3	4
34.	My feelings are so strong that it can be hard to think clearly about what I'm doing.	1	2	3	4
	The next questions ask about making decisions—what you think about and how you make decisions.	**1= Strongly disagree**	**2= Disagree**	**3= Agree**	**4= Strongly Agree**
35.	I think about the consequences of my decisions.	1	2	3	4
36.	I think of all possible risks before I make decisions.	1	2	3	4
37.	I like to evaluate my daily actions.	1	2	3	4
38.	I consider alternatives before making decisions.	1	2	3	4
39.	I think about how my actions will affect others.	1	2	3	4
40.	I think about how my actions will affect me in the long run.	1	2	3	4
41.	I like to evaluate my thoughts.	1	2	3	4
42.	There are consequences to my decisions.	1	2	3	4
		1= Strongly disagree	**2= Disagree**	**3= Agree**	**4= Strongly Agree**
43.	I can tell that my way of thinking has improved with age.	1	2	3	4
44.	Sometimes I take risks just for the fun of it.	1	2	3	4

45.	I am better at decision-making than my friends.	1	2	3	4
46.	My decision-making ability has improved with age.	1	2	3	4
47.	When making a decision, I like to consider all of the alternatives.	1	2	3	4
48.	When making a decision, I try to find out the disadvantages of all alternatives.	1	2	3	4
49.	When making decisions I like to collect a lot of information.	1	2	3	4
50.	Before making a decision, I try to be clear about my objectives.	1	2	3	4
51.	When making a decision, I take a lot of care before choosing.	1	2	3	4
52.	I avoid making decisions.	1	2	3	4
53.	Even after I have made a decision I delay acting upon it.	1	2	3	4
54.	I prefer to leave decisions to others.	1	2	3	4
55.	I do not like to take responsibility for making decisions.	1	2	3	4
56.	If a decision can be made by me or another person, I let the other person make it.	1	2	3	4
57.	I prefer that people who are better informed decide for me.	1	2	3	4
58.	I do not make decisions unless I really have to.	1	2	3	4
59.	When I think about the consequences of my decisions, I focus mainly on the negative consequences or the bad things that might happen.	1	2	3	4
		1= Strongly disagree	**2= Disagree**	**3= Agree**	**4= Strongly Agree**

60.	When I have a big decision to make, I think about similar past decisions I made and what happened.	1	2	3	4
61.	When I have a big decision to make, I make sure that I get all the facts.	1	2	3	4
62.	When I have a big decision to make, I usually seek out advice from people whom I know to be knowledgeable.	1	2	3	4
63.	When I think about my decisions, I focus mainly on the positive consequences.	1	2	3	4
64.	When I have a big decision to make about doing something that requires a certain skill, I often don't bother to think about how much skill I have.	1	2	3	4
65.	When I have a big decision to make, I usually follow the advice of anyone who gives it to me.	1	2	3	4
66.	When I have a big decision to make, I make it and then pay attention to how it turns out.	1	2	3	4
67.	When I have a big decision to make, I usually believe that I will make a good decision.	1	2	3	4
68.	I delay making decisions until it is too late.	1	2	3	4
	The next questions ask what you think is right and wrong.	**1= Strongly disagree**	**2= disagree**	**3= Agree**	**4= Strongly Agree**
69.	It's hard for me to see why someone else gets upset.	1	2	3	4
70.	I really like to watch people open presents, even when I don't get a present myself.	1	2	3	4
71.	Those who have no friends probably don't want any.	1	2	3	4
72.	In general, it is wrong to hit other people.	1	2	3	4
73.	If you're angry, it is OK to say mean things to others.	1	2	3	4

74.	If other people are cheating, I think I can too.	1	2	3	4
		1= Strongly disagree	**2= disagree**	**3= Agree**	**4= Strongly Agree**
75.	It is usually OK to push or shove other people around if you're mad.	1	2	3	4
76.	It is wrong to insult other people.	1	2	3	4
77.	It is wrong to take it out on others by saying mean things when you're mad.	1	2	3	4
78.	It is generally wrong to get in physical fights with others.	1	2	3	4
79.	It is important to stick to your word.	1	2	3	4
80.	It is OK to cheat if nobody knows.	1	2	3	4
81.	It is important to help those less fortunate than me.	1	2	3	4
82.	In general, it is OK to shout at others and say bad things.	1	2	3	4
83.	I cheat if I can get away with it.	1	2	3	4
84.	I always play by the rules.	1	2	3	4
85.	It makes me sad to see someone get hurt.	1	2	3	4
86.	It is easy for me to see how other's feel.	1	2	3	4
87.	It is important to keep promises.	1	2	3	4
88.	In general, it is OK to take your anger out on others by using physical force.	1	2	3	4

89.	It is important to consider other people's feelings.	1	2	3	4
90.	It is wrong to take advantage of others for your own personal gain.	1	2	3	4
91.	I would cheat if I thought it would help me win.	1	2	3	4
The following questions ask about your relationship with others:		**1= Strongly disagree**	**2= Disagree**	**3= Agree**	**4= Strongly Agree**
92.	There are people I can depend on to help me if I really need it.	1	2	3	4
93.	I know an adult I can turn to for guidance in times of stress.	1	2	3	4
94.	If something went wrong, no one would come to my assistance.	1	2	3	4
95.	There is an adult I could talk to about important decisions in my life.	1	2	3	4
96.	My friends really try to help me.	1	2	3	4
97.	There is no one I can depend on for help if I really need it.	1	2	3	4
98.	There is no adult I can feel comfortable talking about my problems with.	1	2	3	4
99.	There are people I can count on in an emergency.	1	2	3	4
100.	There is a special person in my life who cares about my feelings.	1	2	3	4
101.	I know where to go if I need advice.	1	2	3	4
102.	There is a special person with whom I can share my joys and sorrows.	1	2	3	4
103.	My family really tries to help me.	1	2	3	4

104.	I can talk about my problems with my friends.	1	2	3	4
105.	I have a special person who is a real source of comfort to me.	1	2	3	4
106.	There is a trustworthy adult I could turn to for advice if I were having problems.	1	2	3	4
107.	I can count on my friends when things go wrong.	1	2	3	4
108.	I can talk about my problems with my family.	1	2	3	4
		1= Strongly disagree	**2= Disagree**	**3= Agree**	**4= Strongly Agree**
109.	I have friends with whom I can share my joys and sorrows.	1	2	3	4
110.	My family is willing to help me make decisions.	1	2	3	4
111.	I get the emotional help and support I need from my family.	1	2	3	4
112.	There is a special person who is around when I am in need.	1	2	3	4
113..	I know about opportunities available to me (such as sports, clubs, religious activities, etc.).	1	2	3	4

<u>Instructions</u>

The next statements are about what people may think or believe. Remember, there are no right or wrong answers. Tell me how much you believe that…

		1= Not at all	**2= A little**	**3= Somewhat**	**4= Very much**	**5= Completely**
1.	One's belief in God gives inner strength and meaning of life.	1	2	3	4	5
2.	Parents should teach their children that the family always comes first.	1	2	3	4	5
3.	Children should be taught that	1	2	3	4	5

	it is their duty to care for their parents when their parents get old.					
4.	Children should always do things to make their parents happy.	1	2	3	4	5
5.	No matter what, children should always treat their parents with respect.	1	2	3	4	5
6.	Children should be taught that it is important to have a lot of money.	1	2	3	4	5
7.	People should learn how to take care of themselves and not depend on others.	1	2	3	4	5
8.	God is first; family is second.	1	2	3	4	5
9.	Family provides a sense of security because they will always be there for you.	1	2	3	4	5
10.	Children should respect adult relatives as if they were parents.	1	2	3	4	5
		1= Not at all	**2= A little**	**3= Somewhat**	**4= Very much**	**5= Completely**
11.	If a relative is having a hard time financially, one should help them out if possible.	1	2	3	4	5
12.	When it comes to important decisions, the family should ask for advice from close relatives.	1	2	3	4	5
13.	Men should earn most of the money for the family so women can stay home and take care of the children and the home.	1	2	3	4	5
14.	One must be ready to compete with others to get ahead.	1	2	3	4	5
15.	Children should never question their parents' decisions.	1	2	3	4	5
16.	Money is the key to happiness.	1	2	3	4	5

17.	The most important thing parents can teach their children is to be independent from others.	1	2	3	4	5
18.	Parents should teach their children to pray.	1	2	3	4	5
19.	Families need to watch over and protect teenage girls more than teenage boys.	1	2	3	4	5
20.	It is always important to be united as a family.	1	2	3	4	5
21.	A person should share their home with relatives if they need a place to stay.	1	2	3	4	5
22.	Children should be on their best behavior when visiting homes of friends or relatives.	1	2	3	4	5
23.	Parents should encourage children to do everything better than others.	1	2	3	4	5
24.	Owning a lot of nice things makes one very happy.	1	2	3	4	5
25.	Children should always honor their parents and never say bad thing about them.	1	2	3	4	5
26.	As children get older their parents should allow them to make their own decisions.	1	2	3	4	5
27.	If everything is taken away, one still has their faith in God.	1	2	3	4	5
28.	It is important to have close relationships with aunts/uncles, grandparents, and cousins.	1	2	3	4	5
		1= Not at all	**2= A little**	**3= Somewhat**	**4= Very much**	**5= Completely**
29.	Older kids should take care of and be role models for their younger brothers and sisters.	1	2	3	4	5
30.	Children should be taught to always be good because they represent the family.	1	2	3	4	5
31.	Children should follow their parents' rules, even if they think the rules are unfair.	1	2	3	4	5

32.	It is important for the man to have more power in the family than the woman.	1	2	3	4	5
33.	Personal achievements are the most important things in life.	1	2	3	4	5
34.	The more money one has, the more respect they should get from others.	1	2	3	4	5
35.	When there are problems in life, a person can only count on him or herself.	1	2	3	4	5
36.	It is important to thank God every day for all one has.	1	2	3	4	5
37.	Holidays and celebrations are important because the whole family comes together.	1	2	3	4	5
38.	Parents should be willing to make great sacrifices to make sure their children have a better life.	1	2	3	4	5
39.	A person should always think about their family when making important decisions.	1	2	3	4	5
40.	It is important for children to understand that their parents should have the final say when decisions are made in the family.	1	2	3	4	5
41.	Parents should teach their children to compete to win.	1	2	3	4	5
42.	Mothers are the main people responsible for raising children.	1	2	3	4	5
43.	The best way for a person to feel good about him or herself is to have a lot of money.	1	2	3	4	5
44.	Parents should encourage children to solve their own problems.	1	2	3	4	5
45.	It is important to follow the Word of God.	1	2	3	4	5
46.	It is important for family members to show their love and affection to one another.	1	2	3	4	5
		1= Not at all	**2= A little**	**3= Somewhat**	**4= Very much**	**5= Completely**

47.	It is important to work hard and do one's best because this work reflects on the family.	1	2	3	4	5
48.	Religion should be an important part of one's life.	1	2	3	4	5
49.	Children should always be polite when speaking to any adult.	1	2	3	4	5
50.	A wife should always support her husband's decisions, even if she does not agree with him.	1	2	3	4	5

<u>Instructions:</u>

Please read each statement and circle your answer

How much does your parent <u>TRY to know</u> . . .

	The options are	1= Doesn't try	2= Tries a little	3= Tries a lot
21.	…who your friends are?	1	2	3
22.	…where you go at night?	1	2	3
23.	…how you spend your money?	1	2	3
24.	…what you do with your free time?	1	2	3
25.	…where you are most afternoons after school?"	1	2	3

***NOW* tell us how much does your parent <u>REALLY knows</u> . . .**

	The options are	1= Doesn't know	2= Knows a Little	3= Knows a lot
26.	…who your friends are?	1	2	3
27.	…where you go at night?	1	2	3
28.	…how you spend your money?	1	2	3
29.	…what you do with your free time?	1	2	3
30.	…where you are most afternoons after school?"	1	2	3

Instructions:

Please answer the following questions about language using the following responses:

How well do you **speak** ***English***:	1= Not at all	2= A little	3= Pretty well	4= Extremely well
15. at school or work	1	2	3	4
16. with American friends	1	2	3	4
17. on the phone	1	2	3	4
18. with strangers	1	2	3	4
19. in general	1	2	3	4
How well do you **understand** ***English***:	1= Not at all	2= A little	3= Pretty well	4= Extremely well
20. on television or in movies	1	2	3	4
21. in newspapers and magazines	1	2	3	4
22. words in songs	1	2	3	4
23. in general	1	2	3	4
How well do you **speak** ***Spanish***:	1= Not at all	2= A little	3= Pretty well	4= Extremely well
1. at school or work	1	2	3	4
2. with American friends	1	2	3	4
3. on the phone	1	2	3	4
4. with strangers	1	2	3	4
5. in general	1	2	3	4

How well do you **<u>understand</u>** ***Spanish***:	1= Not at all	2= A little	3= Pretty well	4= Extremely well
6. on television or in movies	1	2	3	4
7. in newspapers and magazines	1	2	3	4
8. words in songs	1	2	3	4
9. in general	1	2	3	4

APPENDIX D

Encuesta Para Estudiantes
Información General

Esta encuesta tiene una serie de preguntas que nos permite saber como piensas y que crees que se deba de hacer en ciertas circunstancias. Cada sección tiene sus instrucciones.

Recuerda que estamos preguntando lo que ***tú*** piensas, no lo que otras personas piensen. No hay respuestas correctas o incorrectas, asi que por favor responde honestamente.

Recuerda que no tienes que contestar ninguna pregunta que no quieras. Puedes también dejar de contestar las preguntas en cualquier momento sin que vaya a haber algún problema para ti.

Gracias por tu ayuda.

Información General:

9. Nombre: _____ _____ _____
Apellido Nombre Inicial

10. Fecha: __ __ / __ __ / __ __ __ __
Mes Día Año

11. Sexo: 0- ☐ Masculino (Niño) 1- ☐ Femenino (Niña)

12. Lugar de nacimiento:_____, _____
Ciudad Estado

13. Si naciste fuera de los Estado Unidos, a que edad veniste __ __

14. Fecha de nacimiento: __ __ / __ __ / __ __ __ __
Mes Día Año

15. Edad: _____

16. Grado: _____

Instrucciones

Lee cada pregunta y selecciona la mejor opción para cada declaración.

	Las opciones son:	1= Los Estados Unidos	2= El país de donde llego originalmente mi familia	3= Ambos lugares	4= Ningún lugar
1	Para mi es más cómodo estar con gente que es de:	1	2	3	4
2	Mis mejores amigos son de:	1	2	3	4
3	La gente con la que me llevo mejor es de:	1	2	3	4
4	Mi música preferida es de:	1	2	3	4
5	Mis programas de televisión preferidos son de:	1	2	3	4
6	Los días festivos que celebro son de:	1	2	3	4
7	La comida que como es de	1	2	3	4
8	El modo que pienso sobre las cosas es como:	1	2	3	4

Instrucciones

Cada pregunta sobre diferentes responsabilidades de adultos. Para cada una de estos, por favor indica que tan frecuente has tenido que hacer cada uno.

		1= Muy frecuente	**2= Frecuente**	**3= Ocasionalmente**	**4= Raramente**	**5= Nunca**
1.	Yo cuide a mi(s) hermano/a(s) menores.	1	2	3	4	5
2.	Mis padres estuvieron fuera de la casa por más de 24 horas, y yo fui responsable por mi(s) hermano/a(s).	1	2	3	4	5
3.	Yo he limpiado la casa para mi familia.	1	2	3	4	5
4.	Si conflictos (problemas) ocurrían entre mis padres, yo restauraba la paz.	1	2	3	4	5

5.	Cuando mis padres se han enfermado yo he sido responsable de cuidarlos.	1	2	3	4	5
6.	Cuando a habido un conflicto entre mis hermano/a(s) yo he sido la persona que les ha ayudado a resolver el problema.	1	2	3	4	5
7.	Mis padres me han pedido consejos sobre que hacer cuando un hermano/a se ha portado mal.	1	2	3	4	5
		1= Muy frecuente	**2= Frecuente**	**3= Ocasionalmente**	**4= Raramente**	**5= Nunca**
8.	Uno de mis padres a venido a mi a hablar conmigo sobre el otro padre.	1	2	3	4	5
9.	Yo he sido responsable de decidir que hacer si uno de mis hermano/a(s) se había portado mal, sin importar que uno de mis padres estuviera presente.	1	2	3	4	5
10.	Uno de mis padres me ha pedido consejos sobre problemas/cosas de adultos.	1	2	3	4	5
11.	Mis padres han discutido, y yo termine estando en el lado de uno de los dos.	1	2	3	4	5
12.	Yo le he dado apoyo emocional y/o consuelo a mis hermano/a(s).	1	2	3	4	5
13.	Yo he sido responsable de vestir a mis hermano/a(s) o de asegurarme de que se vistieran.	1	2	3	4	5
14.	Yo he tenido mucha influencia cuando mis padres han tenido que hacer decisiones importantes de adultos.	1	2	3	4	5
15.	Mis padres han hablado sobre problemas de dinero conmigo.	1	2	3	4	5
16.	Yo he lavado los trastes para mi familia.	1	2	3	4	5
17.	Cuando mis hermano/a(s) han tenido problemas, yo me hice responsable de resolvérselos.	1	2	3	4	5
18.	Yo he cocinado la cena para mi familia.	1	2	3	4	5
19.	Yo he hecho reglas para mis	1	2	3	4	5

	hermano/a(s).					
20.	Cuando uno de mis hermano/a(s) tenía un problema personal, han venido a mí para un consejo.	1	2	3	4	5
21.	Yo les he lavado la ropa a los miembros de mi familia.	1	2	3	4	5
22.	Yo he sido responsable de bañar a mis hermano/a(s).	1	2	3	4	5
23.	Yo he consolado a uno o ambos de mis padres cuando se han sentido angustiados.	1	2	3	4	5
24.	Mi papa compartió problemas personales conmigo como si fuera otro adulto.	1	2	3	4	5
25.	Mis hermano/a(s) han venido a mí cuando han tenido problemas con nuestros padres.	1	2	3	4	5
26.	Uno de mis padres ha pedido mi opinión sobre decisiones importantes en vez de pedir la opinión del otro padre.	1	2	3	4	5
		1= Muy frecuente	**2= Frecuente**	**3= Ocasionalmente**	**4= Raramente**	**5= Nunca**
27.	Aunque mis padres estuvieran en casa, yo decidí la hora que mis hermano/a(s) se tenían que ir a dormir.	1	2	3	4	5
28.	Mis padres han pedido mi opinión sobre decisiones importantes.	1	2	3	4	5
29.	Mi mama compartió problemas personales conmigo como si fuera otro adulto.	1	2	3	4	5

<u>Instrucciones</u>

Abajo hay algunas preguntas sobre habilidades de lenguaje. Piensa sobre que bien tu y tus padres pueden hablar inglés y español. Circula la mejor opción para cada pregunta.

		1= Inglés solamente	**2= Mas Inglés que Español**	**3= Inglés y Español Igual**	**4= Mas Español que Inglés**	**5= Español solamente**
1	Yo puedo hablar	1	2	3	4	5
2	Mi mamá puede hablar	1	2	3	4	5
3	Mi papá puede hablar	1	2	3	4	5

Instrucciones **Circula la mejor opción para cada pregunta.**			
		1= Si	**0= No**
4	Haz traducido para mamá?	1	0
5	Haz traducido para tu papá?	1	0

Instrucciones **Piensa que tan frecuentemente haz traducido y que es lo que haz traducido. ¿Que tan frecuente haz traducido para tus padres?**						
		0= Nunca	**1= Una vez**	**2= Algunas veces**	**3= Semanalmente**	**4= Diariamente**
6	Tarea o trabajo de la escuela	0	1	2	3	4
7	Materiales de la escuela (cartas, carta de calificaciones, y notas)	0	1	2	3	4
8	Durante juntas o conversaciones entre tu padres y personas que trabajan en tu escuela	0	1	2	3	4
9	Cosas de la casa que tengan que ver con el dinero (biles, cuentas, y notas del banco)	0	1	2	3	4
10	Cosas de la casa que no tengan que ver con dinero (quehaceres, hermanos/hermanas o parientes)	0	1	2	3	4
		0= Nunca	**1= Una vez**	**2= Algunas veces**	**3= Semanalmente**	**4= Diariamente**
11	Documentos/papeles de inmigración	0	1	2	3	4
12	Programas de televisión, las noticias, o el periódico	0	1	2	3	4
13	Juntas o conversaciones entre tus padres y su supervisor u otras personal del trabajo	0	1	2	3	4
14	Cosas que tengan que ver con la salud de tus padres (durante visitas al doctor, instrucciones de medicinas)	0	1	2	3	4

Instrucciones **Piensa en cuando estas traduciendo para tus padres. Que tanto te gusta traducir para…**					
	0= No me	**1= Prefiero**	**2= No me**	**3= Me gusta**	**4= Me gusta**

		gusta para nada	no hacerlo	molesta	poquito	mucho
15	¿Que tanto te gusta traducir para tu mamá?	0	1	2	3	4
16	¿Qué tanto te gusta traducir para tu papá?	0	1	2	3	4

Instrucciones **Por favor, describe como te has sentido en las últimas dos semanas.**		
1.	Estoy triste	1= Estoy triste de vez en cuando.
		2= Estoy triste muchas veces.
		3= Estoy triste todo el tiempo.
2	Nada me saldrá bien	1= Nada me saldrá bien.
		2= No estoy seguro si las cosas me saldrán bien.
		3= Las cosas me saldrán bien.
3.	Hago bien las cosas	1= Hago bien la mayoría de las cosas.
		2= Hago muchas cosas mal.
		3= Hago todo mal.
4.	Yo me divierto	1= Me divierto en muchas cosas
		2= Me divierto en algunas cosas.
		3= Nada es divertido.
5.	Yo soy malo/a	1= Soy malo(a) todo el tiempo.
		2= Soy malo(a) muchas veces.
		3= Soy malo(a) de vez en cuando.
6.	Yo pienso sobre cosas malas que me vayan a pasar	1= De vez en cuando pienso que me van a pasar cosas malas.
		2= Me preocupo que me vayan a pasar cosas malas.
		3= Estoy seguro que me van a pasar cosas terribles.
7.		1= Me odio.

	Me odio	2= No me gusto.
		3= Me gusto.
8.	Cosas malas son mi culpa	1= Todas las cosas malas son mi culpa.
		2= Muchas cosas malas son mi culpa.
		3= Generalmente, las cosas malas no son mi culpa.
9.	Tengo ganas de llorar	1= Tengo ganas de llorar todos los días.
		2= Muchos días tengo ganas de llorar.
		3= Tengo ganas de llorar de vez en cuando.
10.	Cosas me molestan	1= Las cosas me molestan todo el tiempo.
		2= Las cosas me molestan muchas veces.
		3= Las cosas me molestan de vez en cuando.
11.	Me gusta estar con gente	1= Me gusta estar con la gente.
		2= Muchas veces no me gusta estar con la gente.
		3= No quiero estar con la gente en absoluto.
12.	Decidirme sobre cosas	1= No me puedo decidir acerca de las cosas.
		2= Me es difícil decidir acerca de las cosas.
		3= Decido fácilmente acerca de las cosas.
13.	Me veo bien	1= No me veo bien.
		2= Hay algunas cosas malas en mi apariencia.
		3= Me veo feo.
14.	Me esfuerzo para hacer mi tarea/trabajo de al escuela	1= Todo el tiempo me tengo que esforzar para hacer mi tarea.
		2= Muchas veces me tengo que esforzar para hacer mi tarea.
		3= El hacer mi tarea no es un problema grande.

15.	Tengo dificultad para dormir	1= Todas las noches tengo dificultad para dormir.
		2= Muchas noches tengo dificultad para dormir.
		3= Duermo bastante bien.
16.	Estoy cansado/a	1= De vez en cuando estoy cansado.
		2= Muchos días estoy cansado.
		3= Todo el tiempo estoy cansado.
17.	No tengo ganas de comer	1= La mayoría de los días no tengo ganas de comer.
		2= Muchos días no tengo ganas de comer.
		3= Como bastante bien.
18.	Me preocupo sobre dolores	1= No me preocupo de los dolores.
		2= Me preocupo de los dolores.
		3= Me preocupo de los dolores todo el tiempo.
19.	Me siento solo/a	1= No me siento solo.
		2= Me siento solo muchas veces.
		3= Me siento solo todo el tiempo.
20.	Me divierto en la escuela	1= Nunca me divierto en la escuela.
		2= Solo de vez en cuando me divierto en la escuela.
		3= Nunca me divierto en la escuela.
21.	Tengo amigos/as	1= Tengo muchos amigos(as).
		2= Tengo algunos amigos(as) pero desearía tener más.
		3= No tengo muchos amigos(as).
22.	Mi trabajo de la escuela es	1= Mi trabajo de la escuela esta bien.
		2= Mi trabajo de la escuela no esta tan bien como antes.
		3= Me va muy mal en materias que antes iban bien.

23.	Yo puedo ser bueno/a como otros niños/as	1= Nunca podré ser tan bueno como otros niños.
		2= Puedo ser tan bueno como otros niños si quiero.
		3= Soy tan bueno como otros niños.
24.	No estoy seguro/a si alguien me quiere	1= Nadie me quiere verdaderamente.
		2= No estoy seguro si alguien me quiere.
		3= Estoy seguro que alguien me quiere.
25.	Hago lo que me dicen	1= Por lo general hago lo que me dicen.
		2= Muchas veces no hago lo que me dicen.
		3= Nunca hago lo que me dicen.
26.	Me llevo bien con la gente	1= Me llevo bien con la gente.
		2= Me meto en peleas muchas veces.
		3= Me meto en peleas todo el tiempo.

Instrucciones

Las siguientes oraciones hablan sobre cosas que han sucedido **(no porque estabas bromeando, sino porque querías lastimar a alguien)** en el último mes.

En los ÚLTIMOS 30 DÍAS, ¿cuántas veces:

		1= Nunca	**2= Una o dos veces**	**3= 3-5 veces**	**4= 6 ó más veces**
1.	Has empujado a alguien?	1	2	3	4
2.	Le has levantado la voz o gritado a alguien?	1	2	3	4
		1= Nunca	**2= Una o dos veces**	**3= 3-5 veces**	**4= 6 ó más veces**
3.	Has amenazado a alguien con golpearle o lastimarle la cara?	1	2	3	4
4.	Has estado en una pelea en la que le pegaste a alguien?	1	2	3	4

5.	Le has lanzado un objeto a alguien?	1	2	3	4
6.	Le has pegado o has abofeteado a alguien?	1	2	3	4
7.	Has insultado a un familiar de alguien en su propia cara?	1	2	3	4
8.	Te has burlado de alguien en su propia cara?	1	2	3	4
9.	Has humillado a alguien en su propia cara?	1	2	3	4
10.	Has impedido que alguien siga en tu grupo porque te enojaste con esa persona?	1	2	3	4
11.	Le has dicho a alguien que no lo querrías a menos que hiciera lo que tú le pedías?	1	2	3	4
12.	Has esparcido rumores acerca de otra persona?	1	2	3	4
13.	Has hablado mal de una persona a sus espaldas?	1	2	3	4
14.	Has cargado un arma (pistola, cuchillo, palo, etc.)?	1	2	3	4
15.	Has cargado un arma (pistola, cuchillo, palo, etc.) a la escuela?	1	2	3	4
16.	Has usado fotos en un teléfono celular para burlarte de alguien?	1	2	3	4
17.	Has enviado mensajes electrónicos (*text-messaging*) para burlarte de alguien?	1	2	3	4
18.	Has usado el internet o un "*chat room*" para burlarte de alguien?	1	2	3	4
19.	Has usado fotos del teléfono celular para amenazar a alguien con hacerle daño físico?	1	2	3	4
20.	Has enviado mensajes electrónicos (*text-messaging*) para amenazar a alguien con hacerle daño físico?	1	2	3	4
21.	Has usado el internet o un "*chat room*" para amenazar a alguien con hacerle daño físico?	1	2	3	4
22.	Has estado en una pelea en la que te lastimaron y tuviste que ser atendido por un médico o una enfermera?	1	2	3	4

		1= Nunca	2= Una o dos veces	3= 3-5 veces	4= 6 ó más veces
23.	Has escrito groserías acerca de alguien donde otras personas pueden verlo?	1	2	3	4
24.	Has faltado a clases porque sentías que no estarías a salvo en la escuela o en el camino de ida o de vuelta?	1	2	3	4

Instrucciones:

Vamos a hacerle unas preguntas diferentes acerca de usted mismo, tus actitudes y su comportamiento. No hay respuestas correctas o incorrectas, pero por favor sea honesto.

Las siguientes preguntas son lo que usted piensa de sí mismo. Circula el número y / o la respuesta que está más cerca de lo que usted elija.		1= Totalmente en desacuerdo	2= En desacuerdo	3= Desacuerdo	4= Totalmente de acuerdo
1.	En general estoy satisfecho con mi mismo.	1	2	3	4
2.	A veces pienso que no soy bueno para nada.	1	2	3	4
3.	Siento que tengo una serie de buenas cualidades.	1	2	3	4
4.	Puedo hacer cosas tan bien como la mayoría.	1	2	3	4
5.	Siento que no tengo mucho para estar orgulloso.	1	2	3	4
6.	Definitivamente me siento inútil a veces.	1	2	3	4
7.	Siento que soy una persona valiosa, por lo menos igual a los demás.	1	2	3	4
8	Me gustaría poder tener mas respeto por mi mismo.	1	2	3	4
9.	En general, pienso que soy un fracaso.	1	2	3	4
10.	Tengo una actitud positiva sobre mi mismo.	1	2	3	4
11.	Cuando no estoy de acuerdo con otros	1	2	3	4

	comparto mis opiniones				
12.	Siento que mis opiniones son lo suficientemente valioso para compartir.	1	2	3	4
13.	Soy bueno en la identificación de mis propias fortalezas.	1	2	3	4
14.	Soy bueno en la identificación de mis propias debilidades.	1	2	3	4
15.	Puedo hacer una diferencia en mi propia vida.	1	2	3	4
		1= Totalmente en desacuerdo	**2= En desacuerdo**	**3= Desacuerdo**	**4= Totalmente de acuerdo**
16.	Yo se lo que tengo que hacer para ser una mejor persona.	1	2	3	4
17.	Creo que mi vida tiene un propósito o significado.	1	2	3	4
18.	Creo mucho en el futuro y como quiero vivir mi vida.	1	2	3	4
Las siguientes preguntas son acerca de su comportamiento general en determinadas situaciones		**1= Totalmente en desacuerdo**	**2= En desacuerdo**	**3= Desacuerdo**	**4= Totalmente de acuerdo**
19.	Tengo dificultad para estar quieto.	1	2	3	4
20.	Tengo dificultar en terminar lo que empiezo.	1	2	3	4
21.	Hago las cosas sin pensar.	1	2	3	4
22.	Yo puedo dejar de perder mi temperamento.	1	2	3	4
23.	Puedo controlar mis sentimientos malos.	1	2	3	4
24.	Puedo hacer cosas para calmarme cuando estoy alterado.	1	2	3	4
25.	Yo me enojo con facilidad.	1	2	3	4

26.	Estoy mas preocupado con lo que me sucede en el corto tiempo que en el largo tiempo.	1	2	3	4
27.	A menudo actúo sobre el impulse del momento sin detenerme a pensar.	1	2	3	4
28.	Yo no dedico mucho pensamiento y esfuerzo para prepararme para el futuro.	1	2	3	4
29.	Prefiero ganar un premio pequeño hoy en día que un gran premio en un mes.	1	2	3	4
30.	Es difícil resistir la presión de los amigo.	1	2	3	4
31.	Después de hacer algo difícil se lo que sucederá después.	1	2	3	4
		1= Totalmente en desacuerdo	**2= En desacuerdo**	**3= Desacuerdo**	**4= Totalmente de acuerdo**
32.	Es difícil esperar por algo que yo quiero.	1	2	3	4
33.	Es difícil para concentrarme en algo si no me gusta lo que estoy haciendo.	1	2	3	4
34.	Mis sentimientos son tan fuertes que es difícil en pensar con claridad acerca de lo que estoy haciendo.	1	2	3	4
Las siguientes preguntas son acerca de lo que piensa y como toma decisiones.		**1= Totalmente en desacuerdo**	**2= En desacuerdo**	**3= De acuerdo**	**4= Totalmente de acuerdo**
35.	Pienso en las consecuencias de mis decisiones.	1	2	3	4
36.	Pienso en todos los riesgos posibles antes de tomar decisiones.	1	2	3	4
37.	Me gusta evaluar mis acciones diarias.	1	2	3	4

38.	Considero las alternativas antes de tomar decisiones.	1	2	3	4
39.	Pienso en como mis acciones afectaran a otros.	1	2	3	4
40.	Pienso en como mis acciones me afectara en el largo plazo.	1	2	3	4
41.	Me gusta evaluar mis pensamientos.	1	2	3	4
42.	Mis decisiones tiene consecuencias.	1	2	3	4
43.	Puedo ver que mi manera de pensar ha mejorado con la edad.	1	2	3	4
44.	A veces tomo los riesgos solo por el gusto de hacerlo.	1	2	3	4
45.	Soy mejor en tomar decisiones que mis amigos.	1	2	3	4

		1= Totalmente en desacuerdo	**2= En desacuerdo**	**3= De acuerdo**	**4= Totalmente de acuerdo**
46.	Mi capacidad de tomar decisiones ha mejorado con la edad.	1	2	3	4
47.	Al tomar una decisión, me gusta considerar todas las alternativas.	1	2	3	4
48.	Al tomar una decisión, trato de encontrar las desventajas de todas las alternativas.	1	2	3	4
49.	Al tomar decisiones, me gusta colectar mucha información.	1	2	3	4
50.	Antes de tomar una decisión, trato de ser claro acerca de mis objetivos.	1	2	3	4

51.	Antes de tomar una decisión, tomo mucho cuidado antes de elegir.	1	2	3	4
52.	Yo evito tomar decisiones.	1	2	3	4
53.	Después de haber tomado una decisión tardo en actuar.	1	2	3	4
54.	Prefiero dejar las decisiones a los demás.	1	2	3	4
55.	No me gusta tomar la responsabilidad en tomar decisiones.	1	2	3	4
56.	Si una decisión puede ser tomada por mi o por otra persona, dejo que la otra persona lo haga.	1	2	3	4
57.	Yo prefiero que la gente que están mejor informados decidan por mi.	1	2	3	4
58.	Yo no tomo decisiones a menos que realmente tenga que hacerlo.	1	2	3	4
59.	Cuando pienso en las consecuencias de mis decisiones, me concentro en las consecuencias negativas o las cosas malas que pueden ocurrir.	1	2	3	4
60.	Cuando tengo una gran decisión para hacer, pienso en las decisiones anteriores que hice y lo que sucedió.	1	2	3	4
61.	Cuando tengo una gran decisión que hacer, me aseguro de que tengo todos los hechos.	1	2	3	4
		1= Totalmente en desacuerdo	**2= En desacuerdo**	**3= De acuerdo**	**4= Totalmente de acuerdo**
62.	Cuando tengo una gran decisión que hacer, por lo general busco personas que estén bien informados.	1	2	3	4
63.	Cuando pienso en mis decisiones, pienso principalmente en las consecuencias positivas.	1	2	3	4

64.	Cuando tengo una gran decisión para hacer algo que requiere una cierta habilidad, a menudo no me molesto en pensar acerca de la cantidad de habilidad que poseso.	1	2	3	4
65.	Cuando tengo una gran decisión para hacer, por lo general sigo el consejo de cualquier persona.	1	2	3	4
66.	Cuando tengo una gran decisión para hacer, lo hago y luego presto atención al resultado.	1	2	3	4
67.	Cuando tengo una gran decisión para hacer, por lo general creo que voy a hacer una buena decisión.	1	2	3	4
68.	Me demoro tomar decisiones hasta que es demasiado tarde.	1	2	3	4
Las siguientes preguntas son acerca de que cree usted que es correcto y incorrecto.		**1= Totalmente en desacuerdo**	**2= En desacuerdo**	**3= De acuerdo**	**4= Totalmente de acuerdo**
69.	Es difícil para haber por que alguien mas se enoja.	1	2	3	4
70.	Me gusta mucho ver a alguien mas abrir regalos aun cuando no recibo un regalo yo mismo.	1	2	3	4
71.	Los que no tienen amigos probablemente no los quieren.	1	2	3	4
72.	En general, no es correcto golpear a otras personas.	1	2	3	4
73.	Si usted esta enojado, esta bien decir cosas malas a otras personas.	1	2	3	4
74.	Si otras personas están hacienda trampa, creo que yo también puedo.	1	2	3	4
		1= Totalmente en desacuerdo	**2= En desacuerdo**	**3= De acuerdo**	**4= Totalmente de acuerdo**

75.	Por lo general, esta bien empujar a otras personas cuando estas enojado.	1	2	3	4
76.	No es correcto insultar a otras personas.	1	2	3	4
77.	Cuando estas enojado es incorrecto echarle la culpa a los demás diciéndoles cosas feas.	1	2	3	4
78.	En general es incorrecto al entrar en peleas con otros.	1	2	3	4
79.	Es importante atenerse a su palabra.	1	2	3	4
80.	Esta bien en hacer trampas si nadie lo sabe.	1	2	3	4
81.	Es importante en ayudar a aquellos menos afortunados que yo.	1	2	3	4
82.	En general esta bien en gritarle a los demás y decirle cosas malas.	1	2	3	4
83.	Hago trampa si puedo salir con la suya.	1	2	3	4
84.	Yo siempre juego por las reglas.	1	2	3	4
85.	Me da tristeza ver a alguien mas lastimado.	1	2	3	4
86.	Es fácil para mi ver como se sienten los demás.	1	2	3	4
87.	Es importante mantener las promesas.	1	2	3	4
88.	En general esta bien en tomar su enojo en otras personas con el uso de la fuerza física.	1	2	3	4
89.	Es importante considerar los sentimientos de otras personas.	1	2	3	4
90.	Es incorrecto aprovecharse de los demás para su beneficio personal.	1	2	3	4
91.	Yo usaría trampas si pensaba que me ayudaría a ganar.	1	2	3	4

Las siguientes preguntas son acerca de su relación con los demás:		**1= Totalmente en desacuerdo**	**2= En desacuerdo**	**3= De acuerdo**	**4= Totalmente de acuerdo**
92.	Hay gente a la que puedo depender cuando realmente necesito ayuda.	1	2	3	4
93.	Conozco un adulto que yo puedo acudir para guiarme en tiempos de estrés.	1	2	3	4
94.	Si algo sale mal no hay nadie que vendrá a mi ayuda.	1	2	3	4
95.	Conozco un adulto que podré hablar sobre las decisiones importantes en mi vida.	1	2	3	4
96.	Mis amigos realmente tratan de ayudarme.	1	2	3	4
97.	No hay nadie que yo pueda depender si realmente necesito la ayuda.	1	2	3	4
98.	No hay ningún adulto que yo pueda sentirme cómodo al hablar sobre mis problemas.	1	2	3	4
99.	Hay gente que yo pueda contar en una emergencia.	1	2	3	4
100.	Hay una persona especial en mi vida que se preocupa por mis sentimientos.	1	2	3	4
101.	Se a donde ir si necesito consejos.	1	2	3	4
102.	Hay una persona especial con quien puedo compartir mis alegrías y tristezas.	1	2	3	4
103.	Mi familia realmente trate de ayudarme.	1	2	3	4
104.	Puedo hablar de mis problemas con mis amigos.	1	2	3	4
105.	Tengo una persona especial que es una	1	2	3	4

	verdadera fuente de consuelo para mí.				
106.	Hay un adulto confiado que podría acudir para consejos si estuviera teniendo problemas.	1	2	3	4
107.	Puedo contar con mis amigos cuando las cosas van mal.	1	2	3	4
108.	Puedo hablar de mis problemas con mi familia.	1	2	3	4
		1= Totalmente en desacuerdo	**2= En desacuerdo**	**3= De acuerdo**	**4= Totalmente de acuerdo**
109.	Yo tengo amigos con quien puedo compartir mis alegrías y tristezas.	1	2	3	4
110.	Mi familia esta dispuesta en ayudarme tomar decisiones.	1	2	3	4
111.	Tengo la ayuda emocional y el apoyo que necesito de mi familia.	1	2	3	4
112.	Hay una persona especial alrededor de mí cuando estoy en necesidad.	1	2	3	4
113..	Yo se acerca de las oportunidades disponibles para mi (como deportes, organizaciones, actividades religiosas, etc.).	1	2	3	4

<u>Instrucciones</u>

Las siguientes frases son acerca de lo que la gente puede pensar o creer. Recuerda, no hay respuestas correctas o incorrectas. Dime que tanto crees que.

		1= Nada	**2= Poquito**	**3= Algo**	**4= Bastante**	**5= Completamente**
1.	La creencia en Dios da fuerza interna y significado a la vida.	1	2	3	4	5
2.	Los padres deberían enseñarle a sus hijos que la familia siempre es primero.	1	2	3	4	5
3.	Se les debería ensenar a los niños que es su obligación cuidar a sus padres cuando ellos envejezcan.	1	2	3	4	5
4.	Los niños siempre deberían hacer las cosas que hagan a sus padres	1	2	3	4	5

	felices.					
5.	Sea lo que sea, los niños siempre deberían tratar a sus padres con respecto.	1	2	3	4	5
6.	Se les debería ensenar a los niños que es importante tener mucho dinero.	1	2	3	4	5
7.	La gente debería aprender como cuidarse sola y no depender de otros.	1	2	3	4	5
8.	Dios esta primero, la familia esta segundo.	1	2	3	4	5
9.	La familia provee un sentido de seguridad, porque ellos siempre estarán allí para usted.	1	2	3	4	5
10.	Los niños deberían respetar a familiares adultos como si fueran sus padres.	1	2	3	4	5
11.	Si un pariente esta teniendo dificultades económicas, uno debería ayudarlo si puede.	1	2	3	4	5
12.	La familia debería pedir consejos a sus parientes más cercanos cuando se trata de decisiones importantes.	1	2	3	4	5
		1= Nada	**2= Poquito**	**3= Algo**	**4= Bastante**	**5= Completamente**
13.	Los hombres deberían ganar la mayoría del dinero para la familia para que las mujeres puedan quedarse en casa y cuidar a los hijos y el hogar.	1	2	3	4	5
14.	Uno tiene que estar listo para competir con otros si uno quiere salir adelante.	1	2	3	4	5
15.	Los hijos nunca deberían cuestionar las decisiones de de los padres.	1	2	3	4	5
16.	El dinero es la clave para la felicidad.	1	2	3	4	5
17.	Lo más importante que los padres pueden enseñarle a sus hijos es que sean independientes de otros.	1	2	3	4	5
18.	Los padres deberían enseñarles a sus hijos a rezar.	1	2	3	4	5
19.	Las familias necesitan vigilar y proteger más las niñas adolescentes que los niños adolescentes.	1	2	3	4	5
20.	Siempre es importante estar unidos como familia.	1	2	3	4	5
21.	Uno debería compartir su casa con	1	2	3	4	5

	parientes si ellos necesitan donde quedarse.					
22.	Los niños deberían portarse se la mejor manera cuando visitan las casas de amigos o familiares.	1	2	3	4	5
23.	Los padres deberían animar a los hijos para que hagan todo mejor que los demás.	1	2	3	4	5
24.	Tener muchas cosas buenas lo hace a uno muy feliz.	1	2	3	4	5
25.	Los niños siempre deberían honrar a sus padres y nunca decir cosas malas de ellos.	1	2	3	4	5
26.	Según los niños van creciendo, los padres deberían dejar que ellos tomen sus propias decisiones.	1	2	3	4	5
27.	Si a uno le quitan todo, todavía le queda la fe en Dios.	1	2	3	4	5
28.	Es importante mantener relaciones cercanas con tíos, abuelos u primos.	1	2	3	4	5
29.	Los hermanos grandes deberían cuidar u darles el buen ejemplo a los hermanos y hermanas menores.	1	2	3	4	5
30.	Se les debería ensenar a los niños a que siempre sean buenos porque ellos representan a la familia.	1	2	3	4	5
31.	Los niños deberían seguir las reglas de sus padres, aun cuando piensen que no son justas.	1	2	3	4	5
32.	En la familia es importante que el hombre tenga mas poder que la mujer.	1	2	3	4	5
		1= Nada	**2= Poquito**	**3= Algo**	**4= Bastante**	**5= Completamente**
33.	Los logros personales son las cosas más importantes en la vida.	1	2	3	4	5
34.	Entre mas dinero uno tenga, mas el respeto que uno debería recibir.	1	2	3	4	5
35.	Cuando hay problemas en la vida, uno solo puede contar con si mismo.	1	2	3	4	5
36.	Es importante darle gracias a Dios todos los días por todo lo que tenemos.	1	2	3	4	5
37.	Los días festivos y las celebraciones son importantes porque se reúne toda la familia.	1	2	3	4	5
38.	Los padres deberían estar dispuestos a hacer grandes sacrificios para asegurarse que sus	1	2	3	4	5

	hijos tengan una vida mejor.					
39.	Uno siempre debería considerar a su familia cuando toma decisiones importantes.	1	2	3	4	5
40.	Es importante que los niños entiendan que sus padres deberían de tener la ultima palabra cuando se toman decisiones en la familia.	1	2	3	4	5
41.	Los padres deberían de enseñarles a sus hijos a competir para ganar.	1	2	3	4	5
42.	Las madres son la persona principal responsable por la crianza de los hijos.	1	2	3	4	5
43.	La mejor manera de sentirse bien acerca de uno mismo es tener mucho dinero.	1	2	3	4	5
44.	Los padres deberían de animar a sus hijos a que resuelvan sus propios problemas.	1	2	3	4	5
45.	Es importante seguir a palabra de Dios.	1	2	3	4	5
46.	Es importante que los miembros de la familia muestren su amor y afecto unos a los otros.	1	2	3	4	5
47.	Es importante trabajar duro y hacer lo mejor que uno pueda porque el trabajo de uno se refleja en la familia.	1	2	3	4	5
48.	La religión debería ser una parte importante de la vida.	1	2	3	4	5
49.	Los niños siempre deberían ser amables cuando hablan con cualquier adulto.	1	2	3	4	5
50.	Una esposa debería siempre apoyar las decisiones de su espose, aunque no este de acuerdo con el.	1	2	3	4	5

<u>Instrucciones:</u>

Por favor lee cada frase y circula tu respuesta.

¿Que tanto <u>TRATA de saber</u> tu mamá/papá

	Las opciones son	1= No trata	2= Trata un poco	3= Trata mucho
1.	…quienes son tus amigos?	1	2	3
2.	…a donde vas en la noche?	1	2	3

3.	…como gastas tu dinero?	1	2	3
4.	…que haces con tu tiempo libre?	1	2	3
5.	…donde esta en las tardes después de escuela?"	1	2	3
AHORA dinos que tanto <u>sabe EN VERDAD</u> tu mamá/ papá…				
	Las opciones son	1= No sabe	2= Sabe un poco	3= Sabe mucho
6.	…quienes son tus amigos?	1	2	3
7.	…a donde vas en la noche?	1	2	3
8.	…como gastas tu dinero?	1	2	3
9.	…que haces con tu tiempo libre?	1	2	3
10	…donde esta en las tardes después de escuela?"	1	2	3

<u>Instrucciones</u>: **Las siguientes preguntas tienen que ver con el inglés.** **Por favor contesta las siguientes preguntas**				
¿Que tan bien *<u>hablas</u>* ***Inglés***:	1= Nada	2= Un poco	3= Bien	4= Muy Bien
1. … en la escuela o el trabajo	1	2	3	4
2. … con amigos Americanos	1	2	3	4
3. … en el teléfono	1	2	3	4
4. … con desconocidos	1	2	3	4
5. … en general	1	2	3	4
¿Que tan bien *<u>entiendes</u>* ***Inglés***:	**1= Nada**	**2= Un poco**	**3= Bien**	**4= Muy Bien**
1. … en la televisión o películas	1	2	3	4
2. … en los periódicos o revistas	1	2	3	4
3. … en las palabras en	1	2	3	4

canciones				
4. … en general	1	2	3	4
<u>Instrucciones</u>: **Las siguientes preguntas tienen que ver con el español.** **Por favor contesta las siguientes preguntas**				
¿Que tan bien <u>*hablas*</u> ***Español***:	**1= Nada**	**2= Un poco**	**3= Bien**	**4= Muy Bien**
1. … en la escuela o el trabajo	1	2	3	4
2. … con amigos Americanos	1	2	3	4
3. … en el teléfono	1	2	3	4
4. … con desconocidos	1	2	3	4
5. … en general	1	2	3	4
¿Que tan bien <u>*entiendes*</u> ***Español***:	**1= Nada**	**2= Un poco**	**3= Bien**	**4= Muy Bien**
1. en la televisión o películas	1	2	3	4
2. en los periódicos o revistas	1	2	3	4
3. en las palabras en canciones	1	2	3	4
4. en general	1	2	3	4