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ABSTRACT

ETHNIC SOCIALIZATION AND ETHNIC IDENTITY: EXAMINING INTERGENERATIONAL CONFLICT AS A MODERATOR AMONG HMONG AMERICAN ADOLESCENTS

by

MyLou Y. Moua

The University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, 2014
Under the Supervision of Doctor Susie Lamborn

Working from a cultural-ecological perspective, this study focused on ethnic socialization, the socialization messages that parents convey to teach children about their ethnic background, in relation to ethnic identity. In this study, ethnic socialization is conceptualized as a multidimensional construct that is separate from racial socialization. Six ethnic socialization subscales (e.g., Cultural Values, Ethnic Pride, Cultural Heritage, Cultural Embeddedness, Cultural History, and Preparation for Marriage) from parents’ and adolescents’ perspectives were examined in association with ethnic identity for 116 Hmong American parents and their adolescents. In addition, intergenerational conflict, one aspect of the nature of the parent-child relationship, was examined as a potential moderator between components of ethnic socialization and ethnic identity. It was hypothesized that the association between each component of ethnic socialization and ethnic identity would be stronger at low levels of intergenerational conflict than at higher levels. In addition, we examined gender patterns in the moderator models to determine whether the role of intergenerational conflict as a moderator variable would appear differently for boys and girls. Furthermore, the study examined which of the six ethnic socialization subscales would emerge as the best predictor of ethnic identity. Contrary to our hypothesis, intergenerational conflict did not moderate the association between any of the six ethnic socialization subscales
and ethnic identity in the overall sample. However, intergenerational conflict moderated the association between adolescents’ ethnic socialization and ethnic identity exploration among boys but not among girls. More work is needed to understand the relation between ethnic socialization and ethnic identity for each gender. Of the ethnic socialization subscales that we examined, Cultural Heritage had the strongest association with ethnic identity. Overall, Hmong American parents engaged in a wide variety of ethnic socialization practices that were associated with ethnic identity for Hmong American adolescents.
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Chapter 1. Introduction

From observations gained by looking through the lens of positive psychology, developmental psychologists have sought to understand the unique assets of children and the processes by which these assets can be leveraged. Scholars are finding promising evidence that ethnic identity is associated with multiple, positive developmental outcomes for immigrant youth. The body of research focusing on the processes by which children develop their ethnic identity is growing. The influence of parents on children’s ethnic identity among ethnic minority families is one of these research areas.

Studies have found that the degree to which ethnic minority adolescents identify with their ethnic background is linked with positive outcomes. For example, high levels of ethnic identity relate to high levels of self-esteem, high perceptions of one’s ability to achieve academically, and high levels of prosocial attitudes (Smith et al., 1999). In addition, ethnic identity is associated with lower levels of depressive symptoms (Kiang, Witkow, & Champagne, 2013) and acts as a buffer against normal, daily stress (Kiang et al., 2006). The research surrounding ethnic identity consistently demonstrates that there are many psychological benefits associated with perceiving one’s ethnic background in a positive light. Because of its ability to pervade multiple domains of an adolescent’s life, ethnic identity and the factors that cultivate it have become an area of interest for researchers.

Within the family system, scholars have found that parents play a critical role ethnic identity development during adolescence. Parents’ race- and ethnic-related socialization messages relate to adolescents’ development of a strong sense of ethnic identity (Hughes et al., 2006; Umana-Taylor et al., 2006). Teaching children about their cultural history, encouraging them to use their native language, and promoting ethnic pride are various strategies that parents have used to help their children form a positive perception of their
ethnicity (Brown & Krishnakumar, 2007). For instance, Umana-Taylor and Fine (2004) found that teaching children about their ethnic background was strongly associated with ethnic identity among Mexican-American adolescents. Similar results for ethnically diverse youth have also been found (Umana-Taylor, Bhanot & Shin, 2006; Supple, Ghazarian, Frabutt, Plunkett, & Sands, 2006; Knight, Bernal, Garza, Cota, & Ocampo, 1993b). Of the different sources in the child’s ecology, such as school, the media, and peers, that can relay messages about one’s ethnic background, parents’ socialization patterns are the focus of this study. Researchers refer to the parenting mechanisms of socializing children about their cultural background as ethnic socialization.

Ethnic socialization is viewed as an adaptive parenting pattern for immigrant families. Because of parents’ unique ecological contexts and situations, there are variations in the approaches they use to prepare their children to become responsible and successful members of their community. Garcia Coll et al.’s (1996) cultural ecological model suggests that immigrant parents’ cultural traditions, migration history, and level of acculturation are among the many factors that impact how they raise their children in a new country. The child-rearing patterns that immigrant parents emphasize will also depend on the parents’ socioeconomic status, family values, and socialization goals. Many immigrant parents emphasize the importance of understanding what it means to be a member of a particular ethnic group when promoting their children’s ability to adapt and function successfully in a society in which they are minorities. Engaging in ethnic socialization practices is one way for parents to assist their children in achieving this socialization goal.

Though the nature of immigrant parents’ socialization patterns is now regarded as adaptive, researchers focusing on immigrant families have not always perceived it this way. For instance, one approach that past studies have used is to compare the socialization patterns of immigrant and ethnic minority families to nonimmigrant families to explain the
differential outcomes of immigrant youth (Garcia Coll et al., 1996). Although this approach provides valuable information across cultures, it generally illustrates the shortcomings of immigrant families. In addition, the conclusions derived from these studies suggest that immigrant families are not using the right strategies – the ones that mainstream families use – to socialize their children. Some studies assume that once immigrant families become more acculturated, their parenting patterns will more closely mirror those of the mainstream culture; this change is supposed to help their children to become better adjusted. In essence, this approach decontextualizes the roles of immigrant families’ race, ethnicity, and culture in their choice of socialization patterns (Garcia Coll et al., 1996). A comparative approach to studying immigrant parents’ socialization patterns has limitations when applied to understanding immigrant children’s normative developmental processes.

Adopting the cultural-ecological framework as a guide, the author examined the parenting patterns of immigrant families within their cultural context. Instead of holding the child rearing strategies of white, middle-class families as the standard by which to evaluate how immigrant parents interact with their children, this researcher assumes that cultural differences in parenting behaviors do not equate to substandard styles of socialization and explores whether these differences can be a source of strength for immigrant youth (Garcia Coll et al., 1996). Working from a cultural-ecological approach, the author views ethnic socialization as a culturally adaptive process and hopes to broaden knowledge of how these practices promote children’s ethnic identity. Research shows that ethnic socialization is a key factor that relates to adolescents’ ethnic identity, but more information is needed to build on this understanding.

Exploring whether the quality of the parent-child relationship shapes how ethnic socialization relates to ethnic identity is one area that can add to the existing literature. Researchers speculate that parents’ ethnic socialization efforts will have a stronger
association with adolescents’ ethnic identity when adolescents have a positive relationship with their parents (Gartner, Kiang, & Supple, 2013; Gonzales-Backen, 2013). Okagaki and Moore (2000) found that children are more likely to have a stronger desire to adopt different aspects of their parents’ culture when they have a positive parent-child relationship than in a context where the child is emotionally distant from the parent. Another study found that maternal warmth was positively associated with ethnic identity among a large group of immigrant Chinese-Canadian early adolescents (Su, 2002). In a qualitative study, Davey and colleagues (2003) also found that Jewish American adolescents whose parents communicated clear expectations, engaged in acts of negotiation, and used persuasion were more likely to have a stronger sense of ethnic identity than adolescents whose parents were more lenient. Although these few studies seem to suggest that the quality of the parent-child relationship plays a role in adolescents’ overall level of ethnic identification, fewer studies have examined it as a potential moderator between ethnic socialization and ethnic identity.

Levels of intergenerational conflict between an adolescent and his or her parents is one indicator of the quality of the parent-child relationship. In immigrant families, the parent-child relationship is often described by the relative differences in parents’ and children’s values, beliefs, and practices. Influenced by their upbringing in America, immigrant children may perceive their parents as traditional and old-fashioned when they talk about values and customs from their country of origin. On the other hand, immigrant parents may view their children as out of control because they internalize mainstream values that may not necessarily correspond to the parents’ cultural values. Whether or not these perceived differences in culture and values between parents and children lead to high levels of intergenerational conflict, the nature of the parent-child relationship may have serious implications for how parents’ socialization efforts relate to the children’s developmental
outcomes. In this study, the researcher used levels of intergenerational conflict to conceptualize the quality of the parent-child relationship.

**Summary of Past Studies**

The assessment of ethnic socialization as a multidimensional construct in relation to ethnic identity within the context of a third variable is the approach that the researcher used in the current study. Based on a review of empirical studies, two current trends are evident: (1) the conceptualization and measurement of ethnic socialization as a multidimensional construct that is separate from racial socialization, and (2) the move away from direct relations to moderator models to assess how a third variable, such as levels of intergenerational conflict, may modify the relation between ethnic socialization and ethnic identity. Previous studies have followed one of these approaches, but they have not yet merged the two trends.

In the current study, ethnic socialization is conceptualized as a multidimensional construct that is separate from racial socialization. In the past, scholars have used the term ethnic socialization and racial socialization interchangeably to refer to parents’ transmission of ethnic- and race-related messages to their children. However, some scholars emphasize that ethnic socialization and racial socialization are two separate constructs (Brown & Krishnakumar, 2007; Paasch-Anderson & Lamborn, 2013). Ethnic socialization involves parenting practices related to teaching children about their own ethnic group; whereas, racial socialization refers to parents’ efforts to prepare their children for discriminatory experiences. As a multidimensional construct, ethnic socialization is also conceptualized as consisting of different components. Therefore, studies that use a multidimensional measure, such as Brown and Krishnakumar’s (2007) ethnic socialization scale, make it possible to examine different dimensions of ethnic socialization in relation to the same outcome measure.
Furthermore, current studies focusing on ethnic socialization and ethnic identity are moving away from direct relation models to moderator models. Past studies examining the direct relation between ethnic socialization and ethnic identity generally support the finding that there is a robust association between the two variables (Umana-Taylor, Bhanot, & Shin, 2006; Gartner, Kiang, & Supple, 2013; Supple et al., 2006; Umana-Taylor & Fine, 2004; Knight et al., 1993b). Building on this knowledge, scholars are examining the association between ethnic socialization within the context of a third variable. The ecological perspective encourages scholars to understand why the association between ethnic socialization and ethnic identity may be stronger for some adolescents than for other adolescents. In addition, it helps us to identify the contextual characteristics that foster and promote a strong linkage between ethnic socialization and ethnic identity. This study examined the level of intergenerational conflict as a moderator between ethnic socialization and ethnic identity. The researcher hypothesized that the relation between ethnic socialization and ethnic identity would be stronger for adolescents who perceive less intergenerational conflict than for adolescents who perceive more intergenerational conflict with their parents.

The absence of studies using both approaches within the same study is one limitation of past studies. To move this research area one step forward, the author conceptualized ethnic socialization as a multidimensional measure and applied a moderator model to understand the relation between each dimension of ethnic socialization and ethnic identity within the context of a third variable. In light of the limited number of studies using both approaches, the author hoped to discern whether different types of ethnic socialization have varying relations with children’s ethnic identity within different contexts and situations. Specifically, the current study used a multidimensional measure of ethnic socialization to evaluate how specific dimensions of ethnic socialization relate to ethnic identity.
Rather than assess the overall degree of ethnic socialization, this study used Brown and Krishnakumar’s ethnic socialization measure, which includes five different subscales: Cultural Values, Cultural Embeddedness, Cultural History, Celebrating Cultural Heritage, and Promoting Ethnic Pride (Brown & Krishnakumar, 2007). To determine the differential association of each ethnic socialization subscale with the same outcome measure, each subscale was evaluated independently in relation to ethnic identity. For instance, a past study found that the ethnic socialization subscale of cultural heritage was negatively associated with grades, but that cultural values were positively associated with grades (Brown, Linver, Evans, & DeGennaro, 2009).

Additionally, this study assessed the relation between ethnic socialization and ethnic identity within the context of intergenerational conflict by operationalizing intergenerational conflict as one characteristic of the overall quality of the parent-child relationship. Specifically, the study evaluated whether intergenerational conflict modifies the way in which parents’ ethnic socialization efforts relate to adolescents’ ethnic identity. Based on previous findings, the researcher hypothesized that ethnic socialization and ethnic identity would be positively related at low levels of intergenerational conflict; and that at high levels of intergenerational conflict, the two variables would not be related. Because this study independently evaluated the association of five ethnic socialization subscales with ethnic identity, it was proposed that this hypothesis would apply to some but not all of the associations.

This study also examined gender patterns among the moderator models by considering how gender interacts with levels of intergenerational conflict to inform the association between ethnic socialization and ethnic identity. The study tested separate moderator models for boys and girls to determine whether intergenerational conflict would
emerge as a significant moderator between ethnic socialization and ethnic identity. The main research goals of this study were to answer the following questions:

1. Do adolescents’ perceptions of intergenerational conflict moderate the association between each of the five dimensions of ethnic socialization and ethnic identity?

2. Does gender play a role in how the moderation occurs?

3. What is the best set of variables for predicting ethnic identity?

These research questions were examined among Hmong families in the United States, an understudied immigrant and refugee population.
Chapter 2. Literature Review

To provide background for the study, research on Hmong American families will be summarized. Following this summary, the cultural-ecological framework will be described. Then conceptualizations of ethnic socialization, ethnic identity, and intergenerational conflict will be presented.

Summary of Research on Hmong American Families

More than 30 years ago, the first wave of Hmong refugees from Thailand and Laos settled in the United States; yet few research studies focus on Hmong families, and even fewer are available on the normative development of Hmong children. Many studies on Hmong youth tend to center on their delinquent behaviors, early marriage patterns, and academic failures as outcomes. Even though these studies may aim to understand the risks adolescents of immigrant and refugee families may encounter, the overrepresentation of these kinds of studies may not accurately portray the many Hmong youth who are well adjusted. The objective of this research is to explore the association between Hmong parents’ socialization practices and the extent to which adolescents identify with their ethnic background. In addition to understanding the normal, daily interactions of Hmong parents and their adolescent children, this study’s focus on youth’s positive developmental outcomes. The study uses a resiliency approach to identify and evaluate factors that can promote optimal development and act as potential buffers against the challenges and stressors that many at-risk, immigrant and refugee youth may experience. Because of the diverse factors that shape children’s development, the parents’ socialization experiences (Garcia Coll et al., 1996) as well as the cultural experiences and history of the Hmong must be taken into consideration. In this section, an overview of the history of the Hmong, the parenting
practices of Hmong families, Hmong youth’s ethnic identity, and parent-child conflicts in Hmong families is provided.

**History and current demographics of the Hmong.** After conflict over domination by the Chinese, the Hmong migrated to the mountainous areas of Southeast Asia where they faced less competition for land on which to farm, raise livestock, and establish villages (Hamilton-Merritt, 1993; Vang, 2008). The villages were often organized into areas that were occupied by different clans (made up of extended family members). Because of their ability to navigate the different regions and jungles of Laos, the Hmong of Laos were recruited by the United States’ Central Intelligence Agency to monitor and control the supply trail located in Laos that was used by North Vietnam to deploy troops and supplies during the Vietnam War. However, when the United States pulled out of Southeast Asia, the Hmong, allies of the United States, were suddenly left to fend for themselves. In order to avoid political persecution and possible execution because of their past collaboration with the United States, many Hmong fled their home country for foreign countries as refugees.

Currently, there are over 250,000 Hmong in the United States, with large communities in California, Minnesota, Wisconsin, and North Carolina (Pfeifer et al., 2013). California has the largest population of Hmong, with a community of 95,000 individuals. With a large concentration of Hmong in the Minneapolis-St. Paul area, Minnesota is home to the second largest number of Hmong, with over 63,000 individuals. Wisconsin has a total Hmong population of 48,000, with Milwaukee having the greatest number, followed by Wausau, Madison, Sheboygan, and Green Bay. In general, the Hmong population is relatively young, with approximately 42% under the age of 18, in contrast to 23% of the total US population who are under the age of 18 (Pfeifer et al, 2013).

**Overview on parenting practices of Hmong families.** A limited number of studies are available on the parenting practices of Hmong families in the United States.
Small (2006) revealed that Hmong adolescents perceive their parents to be warm, knowledgeable about their whereabouts, and engaged in shared decision making with them. These aspects of parenting were positively associated with self-esteem and academic outcomes, and negatively associated with risky behaviors. However, Hmong adolescents’ perceptions of these three parenting attributes were significantly lower when compared to European adolescents’ perceptions. They concluded that there are cultural variations in the degree to which parents adopt these parenting behaviors.

Xiong et al. (2005) shared insights into what Southeast Asian immigrant parents and youth perceive as characteristics of “good” parents and adolescents. Drawing samples from families with Cambodian, Hmong, Laotian, and Vietnamese backgrounds, the study revealed that among the four ethnic groups, both parents and adolescents identified being nurturing as an important attribute of parents. In addition, effective styles of communication and active engagement in behavioral monitoring of adolescents’ activities were among some of the other qualities described by parents as effective parenting. Even though Hmong parenting practices mostly reflect mainstream parenting models, the socialization goals they have for their adolescent children closely mirrored cultural values. For instance, parents from all groups considered being knowledgeable about their culture and home language to be positive traits in their adolescent children.

From interviews conducted with Hmong American adolescents, Lamborn, Nguyen, and Bocanegra (2013) identified several themes that characterize Hmong parents’ normative parenting patterns. In comparing the different identified themes, the study determined that adolescents’ described their parents as providing support and enforcing authority. In general, Hmong adolescents perceived their parents positively when they expressed nurturance, warmth, and acceptance. In addition, parents held high expectations for their children, were knowledgeable about their adolescents’ activities, and emphasized high levels of family
obligations and responsibilities within the home. To a smaller extent, some adolescents described their parents as granting autonomy and encouraging acculturation into the mainstream culture. However, some adolescents provided negative examples of these same dimensions, including discussions of parents’ lack of involvement in the adolescent’s life. The authors of the study concluded that Hmong parents’ socialization patterns reflected aspects of both the mainstream parenting models and Asian models of parenting, but proposed that neither of these two models were sufficient to accurately portray Hmong parents’ choice of parenting practices.

In a mixed-method study of Hmong American adolescents, Lamborn and Moua (2008) found that 40% of mothers and about 33% of fathers displayed authoritative parenting. Using the dimensions of mainstream parenting models (i.e., acceptance, involvement, behavioral monitoring, high expectations, and autonomy support) and dimensions of their traditional cultural values (i.e., dependence on family, extended family, family responsibilities, respect for elders, and ethnic pride) to examine adolescents’ open-ended responses, they emphasized the importance of using aspects of both parenting models to interpret adolescents’ descriptions of their parents. Adolescents revealed that their parents were generally warm and involved, that they monitored their behaviors, and held high expectations for them; but they also emphasized that their parents stressed the importance of family dependency, family responsibilities, and extended families. Lamborn et al. (Lamborn, Nguyen, & Bocanegra, 2013; Lamborn & Moua, 2008) suggest that a “culturally blended parenting” model that incorporated aspects of mainstream and cultural models would best reflect Hmong parents’ socialization practices.

Ethnic socialization is one type of culturally adaptive parenting practice that ethnic minorities use to help their children cope with the realities and challenges of being an ethnic minority member and to prepare children to function successfully within the ethnic majority
Focusing on the ethnic socialization practices of Hmong families, Moua and Lamborn (2012) interviewed a small sample of Hmong adolescents. Adolescents were instructed to provide examples of how their mothers or caregivers helped them to understand their ethnic background. Organizing adolescents’ responses into themes, they identified ten categories. Encouraging adolescents to participate in cultural events, sharing history related to the Hmong people, preparing traditional dishes, speaking the Hmong language, and wearing traditional clothing were the five categories mentioned by more than 50% of the adolescents. Fewer adolescents mentioned family ties, marriage preparation, religion, ethnic pride, and high expectations. They concluded that Hmong parents, similar to parents in other immigrant groups, emphasized the importance of ethnic socialization in their daily parenting practices and that ethnic socialization is best conceptualized as a multidimensional construct.

Building on this research on parenting practices of Hmong families in the United States, the current study aims to capture the ethnic socialization practices of Hmong families to increase knowledge about the normal daily interactions between Hmong parents and their children from a quantitative approach. Although there are numerous studies on the parenting practices of Asian immigrant families, there are fewer studies on the parenting patterns of Southeast Asian and refugee families (Chao & Tseng, 2002). The extant studies have primarily focused on families from Chinese and East Asian backgrounds. Because of the inherent differences in cultural practices, socioeconomic status, experiences of racism and discrimination, historical experiences, and immigration trends, studies of the larger, panethnic group of Asians can be misleading when applied to Southeast Asian families. In addition, studies of Southeast Asian families will not only add scholarly knowledge to the general understanding of parenting processes and their associations with developmental outcomes but will also have serious implications for informing prevention strategies,
intervention programs, and public policies in regard to the growing number of Hmong children in the United States.

**Overview of ethnic identity and Hmong adolescents.** Growing up as ethnic minority members, adolescents will experience self-reflection about their ethnic background. Adolescents will have to answer tough questions about what it means to belong to their specific ethnic group, what differences there are between their ethnicity and other ethnicities, and how they feel about being part of their ethnic group (Rotheram & Phinney, 1987). Adolescents explore these questions throughout their development with information being conveyed to them from multiple sources. The research studies on Hmong youth suggest that they develop complex cultural identities.

Nguyen and Brown (2010) interviewed a small group of Hmong adolescents about the ways in which they expressed their ethnic identities. They revealed that the ethnic identities of Hmong youth fall into three main categories: Fobby, Americanized, and Bicultural. Hmong youth with a “fobby” ethnic identity were highly embedded in the Hmong culture; whereas, youth with an Americanized identity were more likely to adhere to the American culture. In contrast, adolescents with a bicultural identity were integrated in both cultures. The study highlighted Hmong adolescents’ use of language and choice of clothing as expressions of their ethnic identities.

Other qualitative research on Hmong youth presents typologies of identities, including Lee’s studies on Hmong high school boys (Lee, 2004). Three types of Hmong American boys’ expressions of masculinity were presented, including the traditional, hypermasculine, and balanced identities. Hmong American boys with traditional identities were most likely to have greater family responsibilities and view family obligation as an important part of fulfilling their role as sons. However, these responsibilities often competed with their schoolwork. Displaying behaviors that rejected both the American’s and Hmong’s
ideal of masculinity, Hmong boys with a hypermasculine identity felt disconnected from their school and were often viewed negatively by their parents. In contrast, boys with balanced identities were the most well-adjusted of the three groups. These boys were most likely to adopt the idea that education serves as a social mobility tool while also embracing traditional aspects of their culture. Hmong American girls are held to the same bicultural standards as Hmong American boys (Lee, 2007). Hmong American girls are expected to pursue higher education, be fluent in the Hmong language, and embrace the Hmong culture. These qualitative studies draw from an acculturation perspective to understand Hmong youth’s ethnic identities. In contrast, the current study conceptualized ethnic identity in terms of adolescents’ exploration and commitment to their ethnic identity and examined it from a quantitative approach.

**Parent-child conflict in Hmong families.** Parent-child conflict is a recurring theme in immigrant families, and appears in the literature on Hmong families as well. Intergenerational conflict can stem from multiple sources, including language gaps, acculturation gaps, dissonance in cultural values, the over Americanization of youth, lack of understanding of parents, or the normal parent-adolescent relationship. Research on Hmong youth suggests that high levels of intergenerational conflict between youth and parents relate to negative outcomes, including depressive symptoms, problem behaviors, alcohol use, and academic difficulties (Xiong et al., 2008; Lee et al., 2009), which aligns with other studies associating negative outcomes with high levels of intergenerational conflict (Juang, Syed, & Cookston, 2012; Park et al., 2013).

Supple et al.’s (2010) study on Hmong college students revealed that a cultural gap exists between Hmong parents and their children. Hmong American young adults were recruited from a local university to participate in focus group discussions about the relationships they have with their parents. One theme that emerged from the open-ended
responses was intergenerational differences between parents and Hmong youth as a source of acculturative stress. The parents’ continuing emphasis on their children maintaining their cultural traditions because of fear that they were losing aspects of their culture was in direct contrast to the Hmong youth’s desire to adopt aspects of the new culture. The act of balancing both cultures was difficult for the Hmong young adults. Despite the presence of cultural gaps, Hmong youth generally described their parents as being supportive and felt a strong obligation toward their parents. They concluded that cultural gaps do not necessarily pose challenges for Hmong youth and may be a normal part of Hmong American families.

Lee et al. (2009) examined intergenerational conflict among a sample of 120 Hmong college students. The results indicated that there was no gender difference among levels of intergenerational conflict. However, gender was a significant moderator between intergenerational conflict and different outcomes. Higher levels of intergenerational conflict were associated with alcohol use for Hmong women, but men with high levels of intergenerational conflict were less likely to use tobacco and more likely to have completed their first year of college. They suggested that high levels of family conflict may be indicative of dissonant acculturation as well as higher levels of parental monitoring. Even though research studies have generally found intergenerational conflict to be associated with negative outcomes, the results of this study suggested the possibility of intergenerational conflict acting as a protective factor for Hmong Americans, particularly for Hmong American men.

The author aims to build on the existing literature on the normal daily interactions between Hmong parents and their children by examining their ethnic socialization practices, the adolescents’ ethnic identity, and the association between ethnic socialization and ethnic identity within the context of intergenerational conflict. The next section will elaborate on the ecological framework (the study’s theoretical framework) in more detail. Then the author
shifts to the discussion on each of the three variables (ethnic socialization, ethnic identity, and intergenerational conflict) in terms of their conceptualizations and measurements.

**The Ecological Approach: A Theoretical Framework and Guide**

The ecological perspective is the theoretical framework of the current study. The ecological approach is a developmental framework that aims to understand human development within its ecological context. Several models, including Bronfenbrenner’s Ecological Model, Darling and Steinberg’s Contextual Model of Parenting, Garcia Coll’s Integrative Model, Umana-Taylor’s Ecological Model, Supple’s Contextual Model, and Gonzales-Backen’s Ecological Model of Ethnic Identity Formation will be presented in this section.

**Bronfenbrenner’s Ecological Model.** Developed during a scientific period of experimental psychology, Bronfenbrenner’s Ecological Model emerged as a new approach for studying human development in which Bronfenbrenner argued for conducting research beyond the scope of scientific laboratories (Bronfenbrenner, 1986). Bronfenbrenner argued that the nature and course of human growth should be examined in its natural settings. In general, Bronfenbrenner’s Ecological Model argues that proximal processes influence children’s developmental outcomes, that the relations between proximal processes and developmental outcomes vary as a function of individual characteristics, and that the associations between proximal processes and development differ depending on the characteristics of the child’s environment. Each respective argument provides the basis for identifying three corresponding paradigms for conducting research studies: (1) the simple process approach (the direct relations approach), (2) the person-process approach, and (3) the process-context approach (Bronfenbrenner & Ceci, 1994; Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 1998). Each argument is described below.
The first argument proposes that proximal processes are fundamental forces that influence children’s development. Referred to as “the engines of development,” proximal processes are found within the child’s immediate setting, serve as the primary influences on human development, and have the most impact on children (Bronfenbrenner & Ceci, 1994; Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 1998). Based on Bronfenbrenner’s description, proximal processes, the most “potent influence” on child development, have three key criteria (Bronfenbrenner & Ceci, 1994; Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 1998). To be characterized as a proximal process, it must be able to engage the developing child, the child must be exposed to it, and the process must continue to become more and more sophisticated as the child develops into a more complex being (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 1998). Studies that examine the relations between proximal processes and children’s developmental outcomes are identified as taking a simple process approach. These studies generally consider two variables: a process and an outcome. Examining the direct relation between these two variables, studies working from this approach do not consider the role of children’s individual characteristics and the contextual environment. See Figure 1 for an illustration of the simple process model.
In contrast to the model’s first argument, the second argument focuses on the role of individual characteristics as a context for understanding children’s development (Bronfenbrenner & Ceci, 1994). It states that the association between proximal processes and developmental outcomes varies from one type of individual to another. Additionally, it recognizes development as a bidirectional process in which children are products of external forces and active agents in influencing how these processes impact them (Bronfenbrenner, 1995). With the goal of identifying whether the same process-outcome link occurs for different groups of individuals, these person-process models often operationalize children’s individual characteristics as potential moderators in the relation between proximal processes and development. Figure 2 provides an example of a person-process model.

Individual characteristics, such as adolescents’ gender, can have significant impact on the developing child’s own development. For example, scholarly work on immigrant girls often highlight the strict behavioral control parents exert over their daughters in comparison to their sons, with particular focus on issues around dating, peer relationships, and activities outside the home (Suarez-Orozco & Qin, 2006; Dion & Dion, 2001). When parents’ perceive acculturation to the receiving culture as a potential threat to their traditional
gendered norms, immigrant parents may actually adhere to stricter behavioral monitoring than they would in their country of origin. This is particularly salient for Hmong girls growing up in the United States as parents view acculturated Americanized girls as becoming sexually promiscuous and incompatible with the mores of the traditional cultural expectations of young Hmong girls.

The gender of immigrant children can shape the families’ immigration and resettlement processes. Hmong parents often expect their daughters to come home straight from school and assist their families with household responsibilities. In Latino families, immigrant girls were more likely than boys to help their family within the home (Valenzuela Jr., 1999). Suarez-Orozco and Qin (2006) suggested that because of the need of dual wage earners and low English proficiency levels of parents, immigrant girls were more likely to take on household responsibilities such as caring for siblings and cooking for the family. In a study on Southeast Asian youth, immigrant girls were more likely than boys to indicate managing household chores as a significant daily stressor for them (Duong Tran et al., 1996). As they receive messages about greater gender equality from the receiving country, the perception of inequality in the amount of household responsibilities expected can be a source of tension for Hmong girls. In addition, the excessiveness of family obligations within the home can compete with educational pressures which can be problematic for Hmong daughters who feel compelled to choose one over the other (Ngo, 2006).

Despite parents’ strict behavioral monitoring and the challenges of juggling household responsibilities, some scholars suggest that these strategies may have unanticipated benefits for the immigrant girls. For instance, parents’ close monitoring of their daughters’ behaviors may help prevent them from engaging in delinquent and risky behaviors. Instead of being on the street, immigrant girls are protected from the potentially dangerous activities that can take their attention away from school. In addition, being able to
manage household chores may help immigrant girls develop a sense of responsibility that can extend into their academic work (Suarez-Orozco & Qin, 2006). On the other hand, Hmong parents are more flexible with their sons, allowing them more freedom to socialize outside of the home, which in turn, providing them more opportunities to interact with individuals beyond their family and school peer groups. However, this presents more opportunities for boys to engage in risky behavior that can have detrimental developmental outcomes, which can be lead to discord with their parents.

In addition to parents’ differential parenting practices used for rearing daughters and sons, the images, messages, and stereotypes portrayed by the broader society can have an impact on children’s own development. Like many Asian boys, Hmong boys are often depicted as being unmasculine, describing them as being quiet and feminine. Asian boys are frequently the targets of racial slurs and attacks among their peers (Suarez-Orozco & Qin, 2006). Other studies highlight how Hmong boys are characterized as gang members (Lee, 2004) who are angry and dangerous. These representations of Hmong boys can lead many of them to become disengaged in school as they struggle to understand and define masculinity that is acceptable by their Hmong culture and by the mainstream culture. Facing greater peer pressure, the experiences of Hmong boys present a unique challenge for them to develop a strong sense of identity.

Because of the gendered experiences of immigrant youth, the way in which immigrant youth see themselves as a member of a particular ethnic group may depend on their gender. To develop a strong sense of ethnic identity, immigrant adolescents must negotiate between cultural gendered norms, parental expectations, and their own socialization experiences and may even have to develop an identity that challenges these ideas and beliefs. Past research examining the intersection between gender and ethnic identity of ethnic minority adolescents generally suggests that immigrant girls are more likely to develop a
strong sense of ethnic identity relative to their male counterparts (Baolin-Qin, 2009; Yip & Fuligni, 2002). Because of the expectation that girls grow up to be keepers of cultural traditions and customs, it makes sense that girls develop a greater affinity toward understanding their cultural background. Research studies suggest that girls were more likely to start exploring their ethnic socialization at an earlier age and at a faster rate than boys, with some speculation that females may be more socially and cognitively mature to begin this process than boys (Umana-Taylor, Gonzales-Backen, & Guimond, 2009; Kiang, Witkow, & Champangne, 2013).

In a study with multi-ethnic college young adults, Juang and Syed (2010) found that the association between ethnic socialization and ethnic identity was much stronger for girls than it was for boys. They explained that because of the gendered socialization experiences, such as engaging in stricter behavioral monitoring of girls and limiting their peer interactions, parents’ socialization efforts may have a greater effect on girls. Others have found the association between ethnic socialization and ethnic identity to be stronger for adolescent girls than for boys (Hughes, Hagelskamp, Way, & Foust, 2008; Umana-Taylor & Guimond, 2009). On the other hand, parents’ ethnic socialization may not be as salient as ethnic-related messages received from peers on boys’ ethnic identity formation. Contrary to the general scholarly knowledge of girls being more active participants of cultural activities, the cultural expectation of Hmong boys having extensive knowledge of cultural traditions passed down from past generations can have a distinctive impact on the ethnic identity of Hmong boys.

Parents may differentiate their ethnic socialization practices to reach the different gendered goals that they have for their sons and daughters. Even if parents send similar ethnic socialization messages to their children, the lens by which adolescents interpret these messages may be shadowed by their gender (Brown, Linver, Evans, & DeGennaro, 2009). Therefore, the same level and types of ethnic socialization may still have different impact on
girls’ and boys’ development. In general, examining gender as an individual characteristic takes into consideration how children are active actors in their own development. Because of the inherent gendered experiences of growing up as a Hmong girl or Hmong boy, there might be differences in their perceptions of ethnic socialization and how ethnic socialization relates to ethnic identity. Individual characteristics (e.g., gender) may interact with proximal processes (e.g., ethnic socialization) to inform developmental processes (e.g., ethnic identity) in an immigrant adolescent sample.

![Figure 2. A Person-Process Model](image)

Thirdly, the model also considers the relation between proximal processes and developmental outcomes within their ecological context in which both the developing child and the processes are embedded. Bronfenbrenner (Bronfenbrenner, 1979; Bronfenbrenner, 1995; Bronfenbrenner & Ceci, 1994, 1995) identified five ecological layers, with each layer embedded within a larger ecological system. These ecological layers are called the microsystem, mesosystem, exosystem, macrosystem, and chronosystem. Each layer informs the relation associated between the process and the outcome.

The first two layers of the ecological system directly focus on the immediate setting
in which the child consistently has direct and daily contact. Starting with the innermost layer of the ecological system, the microsystem mainly includes the child’s family, school, and peer groups. Bronfenbrenner (1979) argued that interpersonal relationships serve as the basic foundation for the microsystem. The second layer of the ecological system is the mesosystem, which involves the interplay of two microsystems. Examples of mesosystems include the associations between the child’s family and day care center, the child’s family and peer groups, and the child’s family and school. For an infant or young child, the mesosystem may be quite simple; it may only involve two or three social settings, such as the child’s family and day care center. For an adolescent, the mesosystem expands into a more sophisticated system that entails the associations between multiple social settings; which may include the child’s school, neighborhood, peer groups, and workplace. In essence, the complexity of one’s mesosystem is dynamic, evolving and changing as the child ages (Bronfenbrenner, 1979).

The exosystem, the third lay of ecological variables, incorporates the interrelatedness of two settings: a setting with which the child has daily contact and at least one other setting with which the child does not have direct contact. The child’s exosystem includes an environmental system that is located outside of the immediate family or social setting, but is nevertheless highly influential in the child’s development. The parents’ social networks and their workplaces are examples of these broader social settings. Examining the association between the child’s school and the parents’ workplaces is an example of assessing one aspect of the child’s exosystem.

Moving to broader ecological systems, there are the macrosystem and the chronosystem. The macrosystem includes the general attitudes, ideologies, and belief systems of the culture that act as “blueprints” in the way they impact the smaller ecological systems described earlier. For example, the effect of the joint association between the child’s school
and the parents’ workplaces on the child’s level of independence will vary depending on whether the family is located in the United States or in another country. In this example, the family’s country of residence is a macrosystem-level variable. The relations between the different ecological systems will vary depending on the cultural belief system within each country.

The chronosystem, the broadest ecological system, involves the notion of time. Bronfenbrenner and Ceci (1994) elaborated that when time is incorporated into a research design, researchers assess it as a characteristic of the child’s environment. As time passes, patterns of stability and change in the family’s socioeconomic status, structure, and neighborhood also occur; which in turn, have significant impacts on the child’s development.

Referred to as process-context models, studies working from this approach determine whether the association between the proximal process and outcomes operates differently in diverse ecological contexts. These studies examine contextual factors as moderators in the relation between the process and outcome. These contextual factors can be found in any of the five identified ecological layers. This model can be found in Figure 3.

![Figure 3. A Process-Context Model](image-url)
Darling and Steinberg’s Contextual Model of Parenting. Darling and Steinberg’s (1993) Contextual Model of Parenting applies the process-context approach to understand how parenting practices relate to youth outcomes within the context of the emotional climate of the parent-child relationship. This model distinguishes between three different aspects of parenting characteristics, and proposes that a moderator model can explain how these three aspects of socialization are related to children’s developmental outcomes.

Three parenting characteristics. Darling and Steinberg (1993) emphasize that there are three characteristics of parenting that influence youth outcomes: socialization goals, parenting practices, and the emotional climate between the parents and children. The socialization goals characterize the specific skills, qualities, or behaviors that parents want to instill in their children. In general, the socialization goals are consistent with the outcomes that parents hope to see develop within their children.

Parenting practices or behaviors, such as talking, reading, and spending time with their children, are used by parents to accomplish one socialization goal. For example, to promote the goal of academic success in their children, parents may engage in various parenting practices such as communicating the importance of academic success, supporting their children’s academic decisions, and motivating their children to do better in school. In addition to the parenting behaviors, parenting practices also include the manner in which parents deliver and emphasize these socialization goals.

The emotional climate describes the overall nature of the parent-child relationship. Whereas parenting practices are domain specific and define a specific socialization goal, the emotional climate of the parent-child relationship describes the quality of the relationship across situations and contexts. For instance, parenting style is considered to be one aspect of the emotional climate of the overall parent-child relationship that is relatively stable across situations and interactions. Darling and Steinberg (1993) emphasized that “parenting style
conveys to the child the parents’ attitude toward the child, rather than toward the child’s behavior” (p. 493). Other scholars have used different variables, such as levels of conflict and cohesion, to assess the nature of the parent-child relationship (Collins & Laursen, 2004).

**Relations among the three aspects of parenting and children’s developmental outcomes.** Darling and Steinberg’s Contextual Model Of Parenting (1993) suggests that a moderator model can best illustrate the relations between socialization goals, parenting practices, the emotional climate of the parent-child relationship, and the children’s developmental outcomes. These relationships are illustrated in Figure 4. First, the model suggests that parents’ socialization goals will directly influence their parenting practices. Second, the model argues that the association between parenting practices and children’s outcomes will be moderated by the quality of the parent-child relationship. In this way, the quality of the parent-child relationship will indirectly influence the children’s development. This model has been applied to understand the association between parenting characteristics and students’ academic achievement. For instance, parents engage in different parenting practices, such as being involved in the child’s educational activities, to promote academic achievement. The mechanism by which these parenting practices relate to the children’s academic achievement depends on the quality of the parent-child relationship. For instance, Darling and Steinberg (1993) showed that the association between parental school involvement and academic achievement was stronger for authoritative parents (e.g., parents who are warm and nurturing but are also firm and set high expectations) than for parents who were not authoritative. In this case, the way in which parents interacted with their children “enhance[s] the effectiveness of a specific parenting practice, making it a better practice than it would be in a different stylistic context” (Darling & Steinberg, 1993, p. 493). This suggests that the link between positive parenting practices and outcomes will be stronger within the
context of a positive parent-child relationship as opposed to a poor one. According to this model, the quality of the parent-child relationship is a context for development.

**Garcia Coll et al.’s Integrative Model.** Bronfenbrenner’s Ecological Model provides the groundwork for psychologists to examine the influence of individual characteristics and environment on development; however, important issues related to immigrant and ethnic minority families, such as discrimination, racism, and segregation, are addressed more explicitly and in more detail through the use of later ecological models, such as Garcia Coll et al.’s Integrative Model (1996). Developed to help us understand child development within ethnically diverse families, Garcia Coll et al.’s Integrative Model is a cultural-ecological model that makes three main claims: (1) children’s environmental factors are important for explaining development, (2) children’s social positions are salient factors in their development, and (3) growing up in a cultural context is an adaptive experience for ethnic minority and immigrant children.

Garcia Coll’s Integrative Model borrows aspects of Bronfenbrenner’s Ecological Model by suggesting that environmental factors are important for children’s development. The Integrative Model discusses how various ecological systems, such as the child’s school,
church, and neighborhood, are important ecological contexts for development. Additionally, these systems are thought to interact with the child’s individual characteristics to affect their development. Each context can act as a promoting context, an inhibiting context, or both (Garcia Coll & Szalacha, 2004). Promoting contexts support the growth of children and protect them against harmful encounters with racism, prejudice, and discrimination; whereas, inhibiting contexts present challenges, obstacles, and hurdles to optimal development and are often characterized as environmental settings with insufficient resources. In most instances, environmental contexts encompass both promoting and inhibiting features.

Based on the limited attention to race-related issues in the discussion of ethnic minority and immigrant children’s development in previous studies (Garcia Coll et al., 1996; Garcia Coll & Szalacha, 2004), this ecological model identifies children’s race, ethnicity, social class, and gender as salient factors in their own development. Reflecting aspects of social stratification theory, the model argues that one’s social position is believed to influence the child’s degree of contact with racism, prejudice, and discrimination. Because these experiences will be different for ethnic minority and immigrant children, they have the potential to affect development and should be considered in research studies.

Furthermore, this Integrative Model conceptualizes growing up in a cultural context as an adaptive experience for immigrant and ethnic minority children (Garcia Coll et al., 1996; Garcia Coll & Szalacha, 2004). Past research on ethnic minority and immigrant children often characterized the experiences of growing up in a cultural context by using a deficit lens. These studies tended to attribute developmental shortcomings of ethnic minority and immigrant children to “behavioral, cognitive, linguistic, and motivational deficits” (Garcia Coll & Szalacha, 2004, p. 88). Additionally, some studies emphasized the ineffectiveness of the child rearing strategies and goals of ethnic minority families, which often do not resemble those of mainstream families. Taking a different perspective, Garcia
Coll and her colleagues (1996) highlight ethnic and immigrant parents’ strong emphasis on family cohesion, family obligation, education, and ethnic pride as positive processes linked to adaptive outcomes for children (Garcia Coll & Szalacha, 2004).

**Figure 5. Umana-Taylor's Ecological Model**

**Umana-Taylor’s Ecological Model.** Embracing the Integrative Model’s adaptive approach to understand child development, Umana-Taylor’s Ecological Model focuses on how adaptive cultural processes, like ethnic socialization, inform and promote optimal outcomes for ethnic minority and immigrant youth. Although it is not explicitly mentioned, this model implies that learning about the family’s ethnic heritage is a socialization goal embraced by many parents. This socialization goal influences parents to engage in ethnic socialization practices to teach children about their ethnic background as a process of instilling a strong sense of ethnic pride in their children. Thus, this model focuses on identifying ethnic socialization as a significant predictor of ethnic identity and argues that the manner in which ethnic socialization influences children’s ethnic identity development will vary depending on the children’s own individual characteristics. Reflecting the fact that it is a
person-process model, this model aims to examine the association between ethnic socialization and ethnic identity within the context of the child’s individual characteristics.

**Ethnic socialization as a predictor of ethnic identity.** Umana-Taylor’s Ecological Model proposes that ethnic socialization is directly associated with ethnic identity, or the degree to which children identify with their ethnic group. Examining parents as one of the primary sources of information about ethnicity, this model evaluates whether ethnic socialization is a key process that shapes adolescents’ ethnic identity. This position was supported in a study that included a multiethnic sample of over 600 Chinese, Filipino, Vietnamese, Asian Indian, and Salvadoran American adolescents (Umana-Taylor, Bhanot, & Shin, 2006). They found that ethnic socialization was significantly related to ethnic identity for each ethnic group.

Furthermore, ethnic socialization accounted for more than 49% of the variance in ethnic identity. Similar results were found in a different study with a large Mexican American adolescent sample (Umana-Taylor & Fine, 2004). Again, higher reported levels of ethnic socialization were associated with higher levels of ethnic identity achievement. Together, the results of these studies support the idea that ethnic socialization is a “primary engine” in shaping adolescents’ ethnic identity among ethnically diverse immigrant adolescents.

**Development within the context of individual characteristics.** Reflecting the fact that it is a person-process model, Umana-Taylor’s Ecological Model considers the relation between ethnic socialization and ethnic identity within the context of the developing child’s individual characteristics. The model assumes that the process by which ethnic socialization relates to ethnic identity will differ for various types of individuals. When integrated into the research design, the child’s individual characteristics are conceptualized as moderators in the association between ethnic socialization and ethnic identity.
Adolescents’ level of social development is one individual characteristic that has been evaluated by Umana-Taylor and her colleagues. According to Umana-Taylor (2001), an individual’s abilities to think more abstractly, perceive a situation from various viewpoints, and understand the consequences of different decisions were missing pieces of understanding the association between ethnic socialization and ethnic identity. Arguing that children’s developmental stage will change how ethnic socialization relates to ethnic identity, she hypothesizes that the association between ethnic socialization and ethnic identity will be stronger for adolescents who are more cognitively mature in contrast to adolescents who are less cognitively mature (Umana-Taylor, 2001). Using emotional autonomy as an indicator of adolescents’ social cognitive development, they did not find that it acted as a moderator between ethnic socialization and ethnic identity (Umana-Taylor, 2001).

**Supple et al.’s Contextual Model.** Building upon the previously mentioned models, Supple’s Contextual Model (2006) is an ecological model that focuses on the relation between ethnic socialization and ethnic identity within the context of the family microsystem. Borrowing ideas from Darling and Steinberg’s Contextual Model of Parenting, Supple’s Contextual Model (2006) distinguishes between parents’ aspiration to teach children about their ethnic heritage, ethnic socialization, and ethnic identity. For this model, the aspiration to teach children about their ethnic heritage is assumed to be one socialization goal parents have for their children. This aspect of the model is not clearly stated but is inferred by the model. To achieve this goal, parents engage in various forms of parenting practices, such as encouraging children to learn their native language, to read books about their ethnic background, and to celebrate cultural holidays. These parenting practices are referred to as ethnic socialization in the model. The outcome measure that the model focuses on is ethnic identity, or the child’s degree of identification with their ethnic heritage. According to this
model, ethnic socialization directly predicts adolescents’ ethnic identity; and the association between these two constructs is moderated by other parenting practices.

**Ethnic socialization is strongly associated with ethnic identity.** According to Supple et al.’s Contextual Model (2006), ethnic socialization is a better predictor of ethnic identity than other variables. For instance, Supple et al. (2006) evaluated the association between several family processes and three dimensions of ethnic identity: exploration, resolution, and affirmation. The results revealed that ethnic socialization was a stronger predictor of ethnic identity than level of parental involvement and harsh parenting. They found that ethnic socialization was the only variable that was significantly related to two of the three aspects of ethnic identity (i.e., ethnic exploration and ethnic resolution). Additionally, ethnic socialization was a better predictor of ethnic identity than neighborhood characteristics (i.e., neighborhood risk, percentage of Latino families, and percentage of families living under the poverty level) and demographic characteristics (i.e., birthplace, bilingualism, age, and gender). In light of these findings, Supple et al.’s study (2006) concludes that ethnic socialization is a critical factor in the development of children’s ethnic identity.

Other parenting practices as moderators between ethnic socialization and ethnic identity. Supple’s contextual model examines the association between ethnic socialization and ethnic identity within the context of other parenting practices. Supple et al. (2006) conceptualized parental involvement and harsh parenting as two parenting practices that may potentially moderate the link between ethnic socialization and ethnic identity exploration, resolution, and affirmation. The study found that ethnic socialization was significantly related to two of the three components of ethnic identity, ethnic exploration and ethnic resolution. They also found that ethnic socialization interacted with parental involvement to predict ethnic affirmation. For adolescents who perceived their parents as involved, ethnic socialization was positively associated with ethnic affirmation. On the other hand, the
association between the two variables was not significant for adolescents who perceived their parents as less involved (Supple et al., 2006). Furthermore, harsh parenting also moderated the association between ethnic socialization and ethnic affirmation. Ethnic socialization and ethnic affirmation were positively related at low levels of harsh parenting; whereas, at high levels of harsh parenting, ethnic socialization and ethnic affirmation were negatively correlated (Supple et al., 2006).
Gonzales-Backen’s Ecological Model of Ethnic Identity Formation. Gonzales-Backen’s Ecological Model of Ethnic Identity Formation (2013) focuses on ethnic identity formation among biethnic adolescents. Working from Garcia Coll et al.’s Integrative Model, this model identifies several factors within adolescents’ ecology that are thought to play important roles in their ethnic identity formation, including their individual characteristics (i.e., physical attributes and cognitive abilities), contextual factors (i.e., ethnic group composition within neighborhood and school), and family variables. Within the broader category of family variables, the model clearly articulated the central role of ethnic socialization as having a direct influence on adolescents’ ethnic identity development.

Additionally, the researchers proposed that the quality of the parent-adolescent relationship would moderate the association between ethnic socialization and ethnic identity for adolescents. The researchers also argued that, as active agents in their own ethnic identity development, adolescents are more likely to participate in ethnic identity exploration and commit to an ethnic identity (i.e., resolution) if they have a positive relationship with their parents. In comparison, the association between ethnic socialization and ethnic identity was
proposed to be weaker when the adolescent has a poor relationship with the parents. Even though this model was developed in reference to biethnic adolescents, the model can also be applied to other adolescents. Past studies have not evaluated the quality of the parent-child relationship as a potential moderator between ethnic socialization and ethnic identity.

**Summary.** The ecological perspective has been applied by past studies to understand how ethnic socialization, as a parenting practice, relates to ethnic identity for immigrant adolescents and to identify potential moderator factors. These moderator factors include the child’s individual characteristics, other parenting variables, and the quality of the parent-child relationship. Darling and Steinberg’s contextual model of parenting and Gonzales-Backen’s ecological model of ethnic identity formation suggest that the quality of the parent-child relationship may moderate the association between parents’ ethnic socialization efforts and adolescents’ sense of identification with their ethnic background. However, the quality of the parent-child relationship has not been evaluated as a moderator between ethnic socialization and ethnic identity in past studies. This section provided the background to understand the
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current study that examined the association between ethnic socialization and ethnic identity within the context of the quality of the parent-child relationship, as indicated by levels of intergenerational conflict between parent and child.
Chapter 3. Ethnic Socialization, Ethnic Identity, and Intergenerational Conflict:
Conceptualizations and Measures

The ecological perspective has been applied by past studies to understand how ethnic socialization, as a parenting practice, relates to ethnic identity for immigrant adolescents and to identify potential factors that may modify the way in which ethnic socialization relates to ethnic identity. These factors include the child’s individual characteristics, other parenting variables, and the quality of the parent-child relationship. Darling and Steinberg’s Contextual Model of Parenting and Gonzales-Backen’s Ecological Model of Ethnic Identity Formation suggest that the emotional climate, or the quality of the parent-child relationship, may moderate the association between parents’ ethnic socialization efforts and adolescents’ sense of identification with their ethnic background. However, the quality of the parent-child relationship has not been evaluated as a moderator between ethnic socialization and ethnic identity in past studies. This section provided the background to understand the current study that examines the association between ethnic socialization and ethnic identity within the context of the quality of the parent-child relationship, as indicated by levels of intergenerational conflict between parent and child.

To aid in understanding the three constructs that were examined in this study, information on the different ways of conceptualizing and measuring ethnic socialization, ethnic identity, and intergenerational conflict are described and assessed in this section. Starting with ethnic socialization, the researcher explores multiple ways that ethnic socialization has been conceptualized in the literature.

**Ethnic Socialization**
Ethnic socialization has been conceptualized in different ways. One study defines ethnic socialization as “the developmental processes by which children acquire the behaviors,
perceptions, values, and attitudes of an ethnic group, and come to see themselves and others
as members of such group” (Rotheram & Phinney, 1987, p. 11). Another study describes
ethnic socialization as “the transmission from adults to children regarding race and ethnicity”
(Hughes et al., 2006, p. 748). These definitions illustrate that there are diverse
conceptualizations of ethnic socialization used by researchers in the field. Rotheram and
Phinney define ethnic socialization in terms of parenting patterns associated with parents
teaching children about their own cultural heritage; whereas, Hughes’ definition suggests that
ethnic socialization involves teaching children about ethnic- and race-related issues.

Conceptualizations of ethnic socialization generally diverge into two main groups of
studies. One group of studies conceptualizes ethnic socialization within a racial socialization
framework. This group of studies suggests that racial socialization is synonymous with ethnic
socialization by using these terms interchangeably. Another group of studies views ethnic
socialization as a concept that is distinct from racial socialization. As we will see in the next
section, these approaches provide different information about ethnic socialization.

Each perspective will be described, and corresponding quantitative measures of
ethnic socialization will also be discussed. Other researchers have examined the diverse
conceptualizations and measures of ethnic socialization in more detail, including qualitative
measures of ethnic socialization (Brown & Krishnakumar, 2007; Hughes et al., 2006). The
two main ways of conceptualizing ethnic socialization that will be presented are: (1)
embedding ethnic socialization within racial socialization, and (2) distinguishing ethnic
socialization from racial socialization.

Conceptualizing Ethnic Socialization Within a Racial Socialization Framework.
One approach for examining ethnic socialization is to conceptualize it within a racial
socialization framework. The racial socialization framework seeks to understand how “ethnic
minority parents promote racial pride in their children, orient them to race-related barriers,
and prepare them to succeed in mainstream endeavors” (Hughes & Johnson, 2001). The goal of racial socialization is to prepare children for discriminatory and prejudicial treatment from others. Within this framework, ethnic socialization is one of many socialization strategies that parents use to prepare their children to deal effectively with discrimination-related experiences. For instance, one model guided by this perspective identified ethnic socialization (labeled cultural socialization) as one of four types of racial socialization. The other three strategies included preparation for bias, promoting racial mistrust, and egalitarianism (Hughes, 2003). Past scholars have recognized that the concepts of racial socialization and ethnic socialization have been blended (Brown & Krishnakumar, 2007; Hughes et al., 2006), even proposing the term “ethnic-racial socialization” as a broader, overarching concept (Hughes et al., 2006). This strategy has been adopted because of the inherent difficulties in distinguishing the two concepts in past research. Referring to “racial socialization” when applied to African American families and “ethnic socialization” when referring to other ethnic groups (Hughes et al., 2006), some researchers assume that the two concepts are identical.

Measuring ethnic socialization from the racial socialization framework is similar to viewing it as embedded within the broader concept of racial socialization. For example, Hughes and Chen’s (1997) measure includes three dimensions of racial socialization and one dimension of ethnic socialization. The measure consists of both racial socialization and ethnic socialization strategies, but is referred to as a racial socialization measure. These studies generally report the overall racial socialization score or the degree to which each dimension of racial socialization relates to an outcome. Rather than using one dimension to characterize ethnic socialization within a racial socialization measure, studies working from the racial socialization perspective may also include two or more dimensions of ethnic socialization. For instance, the Teenager Experience of Racial Socialization Scale (TER)
(Stevenson, et al., 2002; Stevenson, et al., 2005) is a racial socialization measure that consists of five subscales. Parents’ emphasis on cultural pride (teaching children to be proud of their ethnic background) and cultural history appreciation are two ethnic socialization subscales. The other three subscales pertain to racial socialization. Although some studies include more than one dimension of ethnic socialization, it is considered to be an aspect of racial socialization; and the measures reflect this understanding.

Most of the literature that conceptualizes ethnic socialization within a racial socialization framework has focused on African American families (Bennett, Jr., 2006; Caughy et al., 2002; Caughy et al., 2006; Coard et al., 2004; Constantine & Blackmon, 2002; Hughes & Chen, 1997; Hughes & Johnson, 2001; Marshall, 1995; McHale et al., 2006; Stevenson et al., 2002; Stevenson et al., 2005; Thornton et al., 1990). Studies have also applied this framework to families of various ethnicities, such as Latino American, European American, Russian American, Chinese American, and Dominican American families (Hughes, 2003; Hughes, Bachman, et al., 2006), but the available studies on non-African American families are much fewer.

**Ethnic Socialization as Conceptually Distinct From Racial Socialization.** A second approach to examining ethnic socialization is to differentiate it as a separate construct from racial socialization. Rather than viewing ethnic socialization as a strategy to prepare children for discriminatory treatment, this approach strives to understand how parental socialization messages help children learn to become members of their own ethnic group. Scholars, such as Brown and Krishnakumar (2007), propose that ethnic socialization educates children about their own ethnic background; whereas, racial socialization teaches children how to deal with prejudice and discrimination, and how to interact with people from other backgrounds. Ethnic socialization, therefore, involves routine cultural communication between parents and children to promote a strong sense of ethnic pride. Teaching children
one’s native language, cultural history, religion, cultural holidays, food and cooking, and family interdependence are some strategies that parents employ in their ethnic socialization practices (Gonzalez et al., 2006). When examining ethnic socialization measures derived from this approach, the assessment tools describe ethnic socialization either as a unidimensional or a multidimensional construct. Unidimensional and multidimensional measures of ethnic socialization are described next.

Several unidimensional measures of ethnic socialization are available, including the Cultural Maintenance Measure and the Cultural Socialization Scale. The Cultural Maintenance Measure is a unidimensional ethnic socialization measure (Phinney et al., 2001). Although this study defined ethnic socialization as a multidimensional process, it did not use a measure that reflected multiple dimensions of ethnic socialization. This measure grouped the various aspects of ethnic socialization together and did not allow for their comparison. The Cultural Socialization Scale (CSS) (Romero, Cuellar, and Roberts, 2000), a unidimensional measure of ethnic socialization, includes items pertaining to the American cultural socialization subscale and the Latino cultural socialization subscale. Items from each of the subscales reflected dimensions of ethnic knowledge, ethnic social preference, and ethnic role behaviors; however, the scale combines them into a single score to indicate parents’ overall degree of ethnic socialization. In general, unidimensional measures of ethnic socialization do not provide adequate information about how different aspects of ethnic socialization may relate to an outcome and assume that the associations between various aspects of ethnic socialization and an outcome will be similar.

Only a few multidimensional measures of ethnic socialization are available. After a comprehensive review of the literature, two multidimensional measures were found: the Familial Ethnic Socialization measure (FES) and the Adolescent Racial and Ethnic Socialization Scale (ARESS). The Familial Ethnic Socialization measure (Gonzalez et al.,
2006; Supple et al., 2006; Umana-Taylor & Fine, 2004; Umana-Taylor, Bhanot, & Shin, 2006), a multidimensional measure that has been applied to ethnically diverse samples, consists of twelve items that can be categorized into two dimensions: covert familial ethnic socialization and overt familial ethnic socialization. Covert ethnic socialization occurs when “parents are not intentionally trying to teach their children about ethnicity but may be inadvertently doing so with their choice of décor and everyday activities” (Umana-Taylor & Fine, 2004, p. 40); whereas, overt familial ethnic socialization exemplifies “family members purposefully and directly attempting to teach adolescents about their ethnicity” (Umana-Taylor & Fine, 2004, p. 40). The dimensions included in this measure reflect the transmission process and not the ethnic socialization messages that parents may emphasize in their communication with their children. However, in most studies, a total score has been used, which results in a unidimensional measure of ethnic socialization.

As a multidimensional measure, Brown and Krishnakumar’s (2007) Adolescent Racial and Ethnic Socialization Scale separates racial socialization and ethnic socialization into two separate constructs. Each component of ethnic socialization and racial socialization includes several subscales. For instance, the racial socialization component consists of three dimensions: Coping with Racism and Discrimination, Promoting Cross-Racial Relationships, and Racial Barrier Awareness. The ethnic socialization component consists of five different dimensions: Cultural Values, Cultural Embeddedness, Cultural History, Cultural Heritage, and Ethnic Pride (Brown & Krishnakumar, 2007). The measure’s multiple subscales allow researchers to compare different subscales within the same dimension. For example, studies can examine whether the ethnic socialization subscale of Cultural Values has a stronger association with ethnic identity than Cultural History. Evaluating which ethnic socialization subscale has a stronger association with adolescents’ grades, one study found that the ethnic socialization subscales of Cultural Heritage and Cultural Values were both associated with
adolescents’ grades, after taking into consideration the other variables and subscales. However, they found that Cultural Heritage was negatively associated with grades and that Cultural Values was positively associated with grades (Brown et al., 2009). This study was able to examine the differential association of each ethnic socialization dimension in relation to the same outcome variable. Developed specifically for African American families, the ARESS has only been validated and evaluated for African American families (Brown & Krishnakumar, 2007; Brown, Linver, & Evans, 2009; Brown, Linver, Evans, & DeGennaro, 2009). Thus, it is unclear how the ARESS applies to other ethnic groups.

**Ethnic Identity**

Ethnic identity refers to an individual’s level of identification with their ethnic group. It involves an individual’s self-perception with respect to their own cultural beliefs, values, and behaviors. Exploring what it means to be a member of an ethnic group and developing a strong sense of ethnic pride are two components of ethnic identity. Developmental psychologists suggest that forming an ethnic identity is an important part of growing up. This phase of development is particularly salient for adolescents because it is during adolescence that children have the necessary tools, such as mental maturation and social responsibility, to explore and develop their identity (Umana-Taylor, Diversi, & Fine, 2002). In this section, three topics are discussed: ethnic identity models, the developmental progression of ethnic identity, and measures of ethnic identity.

**Ethnic Identity Models.** A number of ethnic identity models have emerged from the developmental perspectives. Erikson’s Psychosocial Theory and Marcia’s Personal Identity Development are two earlier models that have guided current models of ethnic identity. Next, two current models of ethnic identity are presented, including Phinney’s Three Stage Model of Ethnic Identity and Umana-Taylor’s Ethnic Identity Model.
**Erikson’s Psychosocial Theory.** Erikson’s Psychosocial Theory is one central developmental framework that scholars have relied on to conceptualize and measure ethnic identity. The psychosocial perspective states that all individuals go through a series of stages, each involving a special developmental task that must be resolved before they can move on to the next developmental stage (Kroger, 2003). During adolescence, the individual encounters an identity crisis in which he or she must develop a sense of identity that will propel them into a specific trajectory toward adulthood. By engaging in intensive analysis, exploration, and reflection of different ways of looking at themselves, adolescents can reach two possible outcomes: identity achievement or identity diffusion (Kroger, 2003). Adolescents who have explored and committed to an identity have successfully formed an identity that will have positive implications in adulthood. In contrast, adolescents who do not successfully achieve an identity are referred to as identity diffused individuals. They either did not engage in the process of identity formation through exploration or explored but did not firmly commit to an identity. Erikson held that being unable to develop an identity during adolescence has negative implications later in life (Kroger, 2003).

**Marcia’s Personal Identity Development.** Expanding on the Eriksonian perspective, the work of Marcia has influenced our current conceptualization of ethnic identity, as well. James Marcia’s work on Personal Identity Development focused on operationalizing Erikson’s concept of identity formation into four identity statuses. Each status is determined by one’s degree of exploration and commitment (Kroger, 2003; Marcia, 1980). Exploration involves the extent to which an individual searches and explores his or her identity. On the other hand, commitment represents the degree to which an individual has made a decision regarding his or her identity. The four possible identity statuses, which are based on different levels of exploration and commitment, include identity diffusion, foreclosure, moratorium,
and identity achievement. In the identity diffusion status, an individual exhibits low levels of exploration and commitment. Foreclosure individuals score low in exploration but high in commitment; whereas, moratorium individuals are generally in the process of exploring (high exploration) but have not yet made a commitment (low commitment). Lastly, an individual reaches a state of achieved identity when she or he scores high in both exploration and commitment. Marcia’s model focuses on personal identity and is not applied to ethnic identity development. Phinney’s Three Stage Model focuses on ethnic minority and immigrant children’s identity as ethnic group members.

**Phinney’s Three Stage Model of Ethnic Identity.** Working from an Eriksonian perspective and drawing from Marcia’s identity statuses, Phinney (1993) theorized about ethnic identity formation using a three-stage model to capture a child’s acquisition of an achieved ethnic identity. Scholars have used the term “ethnic identity” to refer to the extent to which ethnic minority children identify with their ethnic group. According to Phinney’s ethnic identity model, developing a strong sense of ethnic identity involves three stages. The first stage, called the unexamined identity, includes individuals who have not explored their ethnic identity. The second stage is the moratorium stage, which is highly common among adolescents (Phinney, 1993). During this stage, individuals become more aware of cultural values that are relevant to their own ethnic group and report high levels of exploration characterized by actively searching for learning opportunities that will teach them about their ethnic background. Finally, individuals reach the last stage, an achieved ethnic identity, when they have developed an ethnic identity, accepted it, and committed to it.

**Umana-Taylor’s Ethnic Identity Model.** Borrowing different aspects of Phinney’s and Marcia’s models, Umana-Taylor’s Ethnic Identity Model (Umana-Taylor, Yazedjian, & Bamaca-Gomez, 2004) defines ethnic identity as consisting of three independent components: exploration, resolution, and affirmation. Exploration refers to the degree to
which the child has searched, or explored, different venues for understanding what it means to be a member of an ethnic group. In contrast, resolution characterizes the extent to which the child is committed to an ethnic identity. Resolution represents the degree to which the child feels that this ethnic identity is a good fit and accurately reflects who he or she is.

Umana-Taylor’s model also includes a third component of ethnic identity, affirmation, which signifies the child’s feelings toward his or her ethnic group. Umana-Taylor’s model uses Marcia’s four identity statuses to label the four stages of ethnic identity formation: the diffusion identity status, identity foreclosure, moratorium, and achieved identity.

One aspect that sets Umana-Taylor’s ethnic identity model apart from the other models is the incorporation of the third component: affirmation. Past models seem to assume that children who have successfully achieved an ethnic identity feel positively toward their ethnic group. In contrast, this model offers a different possibility. Umana-Taylor argues that individuals with an achieved ethnic identity can feel positively or negatively toward their ethnic group. Because of this third aspect, the model designates a positive or negative label to reflect affirmation toward the ethnic group after the child’s ethnic identity status has been assessed (Umana-Taylor, Yazedjian, & Bamaca-Gomez, 2004). Therefore, this model’s typology includes eight possible ethnic identity statuses: (1) diffuse negative, (2) diffuse positive, (3) foreclosed negative, (4) foreclosed positive, (5) moratorium negative, (6) moratorium positive, (7) achieved negative, and (8) achieved positive.

**Developmental Progression of Ethnic Identity.** Forming an identity is a continuous process that takes place throughout one’s life and becomes more complex as a child ages. Following a developmental trend, ethnic identity development starts at an early age. Even though young children initially learn about their culture and their group membership at a young age (Knight et al., 1993b), they have little understanding about what it means to be a member of an ethnic group (Phinney & Ong, 2007b). Moving into middle and late
adolescence, children become more actively engaged in affirmation, exploration, and commitment.

Through longitudinal studies, it has been found that individuals tend to show increases in ethnic affirmation or to feel more positive toward their ethnic group over time. Fuligni, Hughes, and Way (2009) concluded in their review of past empirical studies that ethnic affirmation increased from junior high school to high school. In addition, Umana-Taylor, Gonzales-Backen, and Guimond’s (2009) evaluation on the developmental trend of ethnic affirmation also made a similar finding. For a Latino adolescent sample, levels of ethnic affirmation increased over a four-year period.

Levels of exploration also increase over time, but scholars suggest that these trends are more complicated and must take into consideration other variables, such as the child’s social context and gender (Fuligni, Hughes, & Way, 2009; Umana-Taylor, Gonzales-Backen, & Guimond, 2009). For instance, Fuligni, Hughes, and Way (2009) found that exploration is more salient among adolescents who are moving into high school than adolescents who are moving into middle school. However, they also argued that levels of exploration depended on the social context of the developing adolescent (Fuligni, Hughes, & Way, 2009). A social environment characterized by few members of the same ethnic group will influence adolescents to engage in higher levels of exploration, because issues of ethnicity are more salient to them. Social environments with large numbers of members of the same ethnic will influence adolescents to engage in exploration at a later age. In a similar way, Umana-Taylor, Gonzales-Backen, and Guimond (2009) suggested that the rate at which adolescents engage in ethnic exploration depends largely on their gender. Over a four-year period, adolescent girls in their study engaged in exploration at a faster rate than adolescent boys. For the adolescent boys, the rate of ethnic exploration was relatively stable within the same time period.
Even though past studies indicate a general increase in ethnic exploration and affirmation from early childhood to adolescence, many adolescents do not commit to an ethnic identity during adolescence. For instance, Yip, Seaton, and Sellars (2006) concluded that less than 33% of the adolescents in their study were in the ethnic-identity-achieved stage. The majority of adolescents in their study had not yet successfully formed an ethnic identity. Furthermore, Phinney and Ong (2007b) argued that the process of developing an ethnic identity does not end in adolescence. Instead, the process continues into emerging adulthood. They found that adolescents who have achieved an ethnic identity will likely reevaluate their ethnic identity later in life because they continue to interact with diverse groups of people and face different life circumstances (Phinney & Ong, 2007b).

**Measures of Ethnic Identity.** According to the developmental framework, stage models are used to conceptualize and understand ethnic identity; however, previous studies often have examined components of ethnic identity as continuous variables, as opposed to using them to define statuses (Umana-Taylor, Gonzales-Backen, & Guimond, 2009). For instance, participants often report the degree to which they explore and the extent to which they are committed to their ethnic identity. Together, the continuous nature of these subscales can be used to calculate a composite score of ethnic identity. In this sense, high scores reflect strong ethnic identification and low scores signify weak ethnic identification. Umana-Taylor’s ethnic identity scale and Phinney’s Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure are two measures of ethnic identity that have been used to assess one’s degree of ethnic identification that have been applied to more than one ethnic group. Each scale conceptualizes exploration and commitment as continuous variables of ethnic identity.

**Umana-Taylor’s Ethnic Identity Scale.** The Ethnic Identity Scale (EIS) is a measure that was developed from Umana-Taylor’s model of ethnic identity. Consisting of 17 total items, the scale encompasses three independent subscales: (1) exploration, (2) resolution, and
(3) affirmation. Evaluated among a diverse ethnic group of adolescents (11th graders) from multiple areas of the United States, strong alpha reliabilities were been reported for each subscale (Umana-Taylor, Yazedjian, & Bamaca-Gomez, 2004). However, there has been some criticism of items included in the affirmation subscale because “the evaluation items were all negatively worded, raising questions of method variance” (Phinney & Ong, 2007a, p. 273).

**Phinney’s Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure.** Phinney’s Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM) is a multiple ethnic group measure that is used to assess an individual’s degree of identification with his or her ethnic group. This measure was developed using Phinney’s Ethnic Identity Model. Although some studies have used short forms of the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (Lee & Yoo, 2004), the original measure consists of 14 items and two subscales: (1) ethnic identity search, and (2) affirmation, belonging, and commitment (Phinney, 1992). An individual’s ethnic identity score is calculated by taking the total score and dividing it by the number of items to create a mean score. A high score indicates high levels of ethnic identity achievement; whereas, a low score reflects low levels of ethnic identity achievement. A key assessment tool in examining ethnic identity among ethnically diverse adolescent samples, this measure has shown strong reliability with alpha coefficients of .80 or above (Phinney, Romero, et al., 2001).

Although the MEIM has been a dominant measure for assessing ethnic identity, it has also been the subject of a few criticisms. For the original MEIM measure, the second component consists of affirmation, belonging, and commitment. The clustering of these three variables into one component assumes that an individual with an achieved ethnic identity will have a positive identification with his or her ethnic group. According to Umana-Taylor, Yazedjian, and their colleagues (2004), this assumption leaves out the possibility that an individual with an achieved ethnic identity can have a negative identification toward his or
her ethnic group. Therefore, they argue that these three variables should be used as separate components of ethnic identity. Because the MEIM combines these variables into a single component, it can be said that the measure does not consider affirmation, belonging, and commitment to be independent aspects of ethnic identity (Umana-Taylor, Yazedjian, & Bamac-Gomez, 2004). Recently, changes were made to the original MEIM to reflect this limitation.

In the latest revised version of the measure (MEIM-R), items that addressed behavioral aspects of ethnic identity were removed because, as Phinney and Ong (2007a) state, ethnic identity is “an internalized sense of self; one can have a strong sense of belonging to a group and yet not be involved in day-to-day ethnic activities” (p. 276). This resulted in two subscales that are referred to as core aspects of ethnic identity: exploration and commitment. Three items pertain to the exploration subscale and three relate to the commitment subscale. The authors suggest that each subscale can be used independently to measure one’s degree of exploration or commitment, or the two subscales can be combined to produce an overall ethnic identity score (Phinney & Ong, 2007a). The reliability coefficients for the subscales are satisfactory (Phinney & Ong, 2007a).

**Intergenerational Conflict**

As in the infancy and early childhood periods, the nature of the parent-child relationship is an important variable for understanding adolescents’ developmental outcomes. Maccoby (1999) defines “relationship” as the follows:

Relationship can be said to exist between two people when their lives are interdependent. By interdependent we mean that two people’s behaviors, emotions, and thoughts are mutually and causally interconnected; that is, that what one does, thinks, and feels depends on what the partner does, thinks, and feels. (p. 159)
Levels of interdependency during adolescence may not be as high as levels of interdependency in infancy, but parents and adolescents continue to adjust their behaviors, emotions, and thoughts relative to the other person.

Relationships have been characterized in different ways. Scholars have examined relationships by assessing power dynamics, the emotions one person has towards the other person, and the level of conflict within the relationship (Maccoby, 1999). Even though the socialization literature predominately examines the nature of the parent-child relationship in terms of parenting styles, such as Darling and Steinberg’s (1993) Contextual Model of Parenting, Maccoby (1999) has argued that parenting styles do not allow for the examination of the parent-child relationship as a unit of analysis. Although scholars have used different indicators to assess the overall nature of the parent-child relationship in past studies, the current study will use levels of intergenerational conflict in examining the parent-child relationship. In this section, three topics will be covered. In the first section, intergenerational conflict is discussed within the context of the immigrant family. Next, conceptualizations and measures of intergenerational conflict are explored and assessed. Lastly, the nature of the parent-child relationship as a context for development will be explored.

**Intergenerational Conflict in Immigrant Families.** Intergenerational conflict has been the focus of much research on understanding parent-child relationships within immigrant families. Two different views exist regarding intergenerational conflict in immigrant families. One view suggests that intergenerational conflict is part of the normal parent-child relationship for immigrant and nonimmigrant families alike; whereas, the second view suggests that intergenerational conflict is experienced differently in immigrant families. These two views will be discussed in this section.

**Viewpoints of intergenerational conflict in immigrant families.** Drawing from a developmental perspective, some authors suggest that conflicts between parents and children
are a normal aspect of the parent-adolescent relationship and do not have serious negative implications for the developing child (Laursen & Collins, 2009; Steinberg, 2000). During the developmental period of adolescence, parents and adolescents often renegotiate expectations and family roles (Hill et al., 2007) and adolescents seek increased autonomy from their parents (Steinberg, 2001). These characteristics of the parent-adolescent relationship can create tensions between parents and adolescents. In a closer examination of the developmental trend of parent-child conflict, scholars working from this perspective suggest that parents and adolescents engage in less parent-child conflict, but their arguments are more heated and intense through the course of adolescence. For instance, when examining the rate of parent-child conflict, research studies tend to conclude that the conflict rate decreased between early adolescence and mid-adolescence and decreased between mid-adolescence and late adolescence (Laursen et al., 1998; Laursen & Collins, 2009). However, the intensity of the parent-child conflict increased between early adolescence and mid-adolescence and stabilized during late adolescence (Laursen et al., 1998). This assertion has been applied to understand intergenerational conflicts within immigrant families, and these studies typically suggest that parent-child conflicts in immigrant families are similar to those in nonimmigrant families (Phinney, Ong, & Madden, 2000). For example, Fuligni (1998) examined parent-child conflicts among adolescents with Mexican, Chinese, and Filipino backgrounds and found that these adolescents reported parent-child conflict patterns that were similar to those reported by European American adolescents. In this study, the parent-child conflict patterns of foreign-born and native-born adolescents within each ethnic background were also compared. Again, the study found similar parent-child conflict patterns among immigrant and nonimmigrant adolescents. This perspective of intergenerational conflict does not indicate the direction of association between parent-child conflict and developmental outcomes but
merely compares levels of parent-child conflict between immigrant and non-immigrant families.

The second viewpoint suggests that intergenerational conflict presents unique challenges for immigrant families. Some authors suggest that the cultural gaps between immigrant parents and children may exacerbate the normal level of parent-adolescent conflict (Choi, 2008), creating a type of conflict that is experienced only in immigrant families. For instance, they argue that intergenerational conflict may change the way family processes operate by increasing levels of miscommunication and misunderstanding between immigrant parents and their children, which magnifies the general level of parent-adolescent conflict (Choi, He & Harachi, 2008). Other scholars who adhere to this second viewpoint suggest that intergenerational conflict may have different consequences for the developing child, depending on the family’s immigrant or nonimmigrant status. For nonimmigrant families, parents may view intergenerational conflicts as part of the adolescent’s normal developmental process (Phinney, Ong, & Madden, 2000). Nonimmigrant parents may attribute the children’s increase in disagreement or differences of opinion to their need for increased autonomy. On the other hand, immigrant parents may view the same conflict in a different way. They may see conflicts with their children as reflections of disrespect or rejection of their ethnic heritage (Espiritu, 2009), and thus may be more likely to experience misunderstandings within their relationship. In this sense, the differences in how immigrant parents view intergenerational conflict may have further implications for the parent-child relationship.

There is controversy within the literature with regards to which perspective best represents intergenerational conflict within immigrant families. One area of controversy is whether intergenerational conflict within immigrant families is similar to that of nonimmigrant families, or whether it is a unique experience within immigrant families.
Scholars working from the first perspective suggest that experiences of intergenerational conflict within immigrant and nonimmigrant families alike are a normal part of growing up. They suggest that parent-child conflict levels in immigrant families are considered a normal aspect of immigrant families and that it is not related to problematic youth adjustments. On the contrary, scholars working from the second perspective believe that the cultural differences between parents and children within immigrant families adds another layer of conflict to the general parent-adolescent conflict experienced by most families.

**Conceptualizations and Measures of Intergenerational Conflict.** Although scholars generally agree that intergenerational conflict reflects tension between parents and children, the challenge for scholars has been creating measurements that can be used across diverse ethnic and immigrant groups. Taking on this challenge, two approaches have been used in the literature to examine intergenerational conflict: (1) the deviation approach, and (2) intergenerational conflict scales.

**The deviation approach.** Using this method, studies compare either the acculturation rate or the values of parents and children. The differences between what parents and children report reflects the level of conflict in their relationship.

**Comparing acculturation level of parents and children.** Within the deviation approach, one way that intergenerational conflict has been conceptualized is by using the acculturation gap between parents and children. According to this conceptualization, some scholars suggest that differences in the parents’ and children’s acculturation rates can explain the level of intergenerational conflicts in immigrant families. For instance, immigrant parents generally adjust to the new country at a slower rate than do their children. Parents may have less contact with the mainstream culture, feel more comfortable interacting with individuals from their home country, and be unwilling to adjust to the new country because of hopes of going back home. On the other hand, immigrant children who arrived at a young age or who
were born in the new country generally have higher rates of acculturation than their parents. Through school, they engage in more interactions with diverse groups of people; they learn
the language much faster; and they have fewer memories, if any, of the home country than
their parents do. When parents and adolescents adjust to the new country at different rates,
this difference characterizes dissonant acculturation (Kwak, 2003). Differences in
acculturation rates can increase intergenerational conflicts between parents and adolescents;
whereas, parents and children who have similar acculturation rates are more likely to have
positive interactions and less likely to have intergenerational conflicts (Foner, 2009).

Based on this conceptualization, one way to measure intergenerational conflict is to
assess the acculturation gap between parents and children. In general, researchers working
from this approach assess both the child’s and the parent’s acculturation levels. Then, they
calculate a deviation score by subtracting the parent’s acculturation level from the child’s
acculturation level (Birman, 2006). The deviation score is used to indicate the acculturation
gap that exists between the child and his or her parent. Based on the assessed acculturation
gap, parent-adolescent pairs are classified into two main groups: (1) pairs with a high
acculturation discrepancy, and (2) pairs with a low acculturation discrepancy. The large
acculturation gap indicates a high level of intergenerational conflict between the parent and
child. Parents and children within the low discrepancy group are considered to have lower
levels of intergenerational conflict. Generally, researchers posit that parents and children with
similar rates of acculturation are more likely to have a more positive relationship than parents
and children who exhibit more differing acculturation rates (Birman, 2006). However, this
approach for measuring the acculturation gap between immigrant parents and children does
not directly measure the intergenerational conflict that may be present in the family.

Comparing values of parents and children. Comparing values of parents and children
is another way studies have used to conceptualize intergenerational conflict within the
deviation approach. For immigrant parents, growing up in a different country and having less interaction with the mainstream culture in the new country may influence them to endorse and practice a specific set of values, beliefs, and understandings. In comparison, adolescents’ interactions with peers, the school system, and the media may influence them to encounter a different set of values. Adolescents may view their parents’ cultural views and practices as “old-fashioned” and “traditional.” Thus, some scholars suggest that tensions may “occur when parental cultural values clash with children’s internalization of the new society’s cultural expectations and values” (Suarez-Orozco et al., 2008, p. 70).

Based on this approach, studies compare the values of parents and children to measure intergenerational conflict. Large discrepancies suggest the presence of high levels of intergenerational conflict, and small discrepancies indicate low levels of intergenerational conflict between parents and children. For example, Phinney, Ong, and Madden (2000) assessed adolescents’ and parents’ endorsement level of family obligations as an indicator of intergenerational conflict. They compared the degree to which adolescents’ reports of family obligations differed from parents’ reports. They found that, for foreign-born adolescents and their foreign-born parents, the value discrepancy between parents and adolescents was relatively low. In this group, the adolescents and their parents strongly endorsed family obligations. For U.S.-born adolescents and their foreign-born parents, the value discrepancy between parents and adolescents was larger. Parents generally reported a strong sense of family obligation, but the adolescents did not have a strong sense of family obligation. The researchers concluded that intergenerational conflicts were more salient in immigrant families with U.S.-born adolescents than in immigrant families with foreign-born adolescents. This evaluation tool measured parents’ and adolescents’ endorsement of family obligation, which is only one of many cultural values.
**Intergenerational conflict scales.** In addition to the deviation approach to measuring intergenerational conflict, several intergenerational conflict scales exist; however, the majority of them were created to measure intergenerational conflict within Asian American families and may not be applicable to other ethnic or immigrant groups. Three intergenerational conflict scales that have been used in past studies include the Intergenerational Congruence in Immigrant Families scale, the Dinh Intergenerational Conflict Inventory, and the Asian American Family Conflict Scale.

The Intergenerational Congruence in Immigrant Families (ICIF) scale (Ying & Tracy, 2004; Ying, Lee, & Tsai, 2004) is a measure designed to assess the extent to which parents and children agree on various issues, such as friends and the amount of time they spend together. Different versions are available for parents and children. High scores reflect high levels of intergenerational congruence between the parent and child, indicating a low level of intergenerational conflict in the relationship. Low scores reflect low levels of intergenerational congruence, and therefore, high levels of intergenerational conflict between the parent and child.

The Dinh Intergenerational Conflict Inventory (DICI) (Dinh et al., 2008) was developed to assess intergenerational conflict within Cambodian families from the adolescents’ perspective. Consisting of ten items, this measure focused on issues that were related to the parent-child relationship, such as disagreements about traditional family roles, parenting behaviors, and maintenance of their cultural heritage. A high score indicates high levels of intergenerational conflict present within the parent-child relationship, and a low score indicates low levels of intergenerational conflict. This measure indicated an adequate alpha reliability (Dinh et al., 2008).

Similarly, the Asian American Family Conflict Scale (Lee et al., 2000) has been a key scale for understanding intergenerational conflict within Asian American families from
the child’s perspective. The original scale includes two main subscales. The first subscale is called Likelihood, which measures the likelihood that a particular conflict will occur between the child and parent. The second subscale is called Seriousness, or the degree of seriousness of the conflict as judged by the child and parent. Although the original scale included two subscales, Lee and Liu (2001) recommended using the Likelihood subscale to assess intergenerational conflict until the Seriousness subscale could be further developed. Studies have followed this recommendation and have mainly used the Likelihood subscale as an indicator of intergenerational conflict. The Asian American Family Conflict Scale-Likelihood is a measure used to assess the degree of conflict between parents and children across several domains. The measure presents different conflicts that typically occur between children and parents, such as differences in academic expectations, perceptions of family obligation, and perceptions of the importance of one’s social life. Although the questionnaire was developed for Asian American families, one study tested a cross-cultural equivalency of the Asian American Family Conflict Scale-Likelihood scale using a Latino and European American sample (Lee & Liu, 2001). They concluded that “a sufficient level of cross-cultural psychometric equivalency was established for this study” (p. 416). However, they also indicated that this conclusion should be accepted with caution by proposing that bias may still exist as Asian Americans reported higher levels of intergenerational conflict relative to Latino and European American college students (Lee & Liu, 2001). One study has also validated this measure among immigrant Vietnamese American and Cambodian American adolescents and reported a strong alpha reliability (Choi et al., 2008).

**Quality of the Parent-child Relationship As a Context for Development.** In general, past studies have linked positive parent-child relationship with numerous positive outcomes for adolescents. Studies examining general levels of the quality of the parent-child relationship have documented the association between positive parent-child relationships and
academic achievement, self-esteem, and self-regulation (Steinberg, 2001). One study found a positive association between the quality of the parent-child relationship and children’s desire to adopt their parents’ cultural beliefs among Mexican American children (Okagaki & Moore, 2000). The study concluded that children are more likely to have a stronger desire to adopt different aspects of their parents’ culture when they have a positive relationship with their parents than when they are emotionally distant from the parents. Another study found that maternal warmth and inductive reasoning were both positively associated with ethnic identity among a large group of immigrant Chinese Canadian early adolescents (Su, 2002). In a qualitative study, Davey and colleagues (2003) also found that Jewish American adolescents whose parents communicated clear expectations, engaged in acts of negotiation, and used persuasion were more likely to have a stronger sense of ethnic identity than adolescents whose parents were more lenient.

In addition to the direct effects of intergenerational conflict, scholars propose that the quality of the parent-child relationship is an important variable to be considered in the association between parenting practices and children’s outcomes. Rudy and Grusec (2001) and Rotherman and Phinney (1987) proposed that positive parent-child relationships promote the transmission of parental values to children and nurture children’s ethnic identity. Similarly, Gonzales-Backen’s (2013) ethnic identity model identifies the child’s family system as having an indirect impact in shaping the association between parents’ ethnic socialization practices and adolescents’ ethnic identity. Gonzales-Backen hypothesized that the association between ethnic socialization and ethnic identity will be much stronger when the adolescent has a positive relationship with the parent. In the context of a poor parent-child relationship, ethnic socialization is hypothesized to not be associated with adolescents’ ethnic identity.
In general, past studies suggest that a positive family environment, as evidenced by children having a positive relationship with their parents provides us with a viable support for the argument that a positive parent-child relationship may promote a stronger link between ethnic socialization and adolescents’ ethnic identity. Scholars, such as and Rotherman and Phinney (1987) and Gonzales-Backen (2013) have also made similar arguments, hypothesizing that a positive parent-child relationship nurtures the association between parents’ ethnic socialization efforts and adolescents’ degree of ethnic identification. However, few studies have used levels of intergenerational conflict as an indicator of the quality of the parent-child relationship and fewer studies have examined the association between intergenerational conflict and ethnic socialization or adolescents’ ethnic identity.

Intergenerational conflict is conceptualized as disagreements between parents and children and represents one feature of the nature of the parent-child relationship that can help to determine whether relationships between parents and adolescents are relatively positive or poor. Past studies have examined both the direct and moderating effects of intergenerational conflict on youth outcomes. Direct effects of intergenerational conflict on development suggest that having less conflict with parents is associated with positive adjustments for adolescents. Even though they stated that discrepancies in reports of cultural values do not necessary lead to more conflict between parents and children, Phinney and Ong (2002) found that larger discrepancies in parents’ and adolescents’ reports of cultural values lead to lower life satisfaction for adolescents. In addition, high levels of parent-child conflict are associated with youth maladjustments, including adolescent delinquency (Laursen & Collins, 1994; Park et al., 2013), higher anxiety levels, depressive symptoms, and lower self-esteem (Juang, Syed, & Cookston, 2012). Frequent parent-child conflict is harmful to the relationship, with negative implications for parents’ and adolescents’ emotional states, parents’ overall self-esteem, parents’ life satisfaction, and adolescents’ attitudes toward their parents (Laursen &
Collins, 1994). In general, a parent-child relationship characterized by high levels of conflict is considered to be related to negative youth outcomes; whereas, a parent-child relationship with low levels of conflict is thought to be a healthier relationship that is conducive to positive outcomes.

On the other hand, some studies present evidence suggesting that levels of conflict with parents may not be as detrimental to adolescent outcomes as expected. In comparison to conflicts with other individuals (e.g., peers, romantic partners, and friends), disagreements between family members are least likely to change social interaction patterns (Laursen & Collins, 1994). The implication is that the effect of intergenerational conflict on development will depend on how the conflict is resolved. In their meta-analysis of studies on parent-adolescent conflicts, Laursen and Collins (1994) reported that when parents are more responsive and open to understanding adolescents’ perspectives, these conflicts present learning opportunities for adolescents that may not necessarily be linked with negative outcomes for them. Furthermore, it has been suggested that conflicts with parents can improve family functioning (Stuart, Ward, Jose, & Narayanan, 2010) and encourage adolescents to reflect on their own identities (Juang et al., 2012; Laursen & Hafen, 2009) and the relationship they have with their parents. Additionally, Laursen and Collins (1994) identified five methods of resolving conflicts, including submission, compromise, standoff, withdrawal, and third-party intervention. Withdrawal and compromise, as choices of conflict resolution, are thought to have better outcomes on the relationship than submission. These complexities in the meaning behind the conflicts that adolescents have with parents and the way in which the conflict is resolved may make it difficult to be used as a moderator variable.

Past studies indicate that levels of intergenerational conflict may represent different meanings. One perspective on intergenerational conflict is that high levels indicate a poor parent-child relationship; whereas, low levels signify a positive parent-child relationship. In
contrast, other scholars offer alternative explanations of high and low levels of parent-child conflicts. Instead of signifying a healthy parent-child relationship, lower rates of parent-child conflict may actually reflect decreases in the amount of social interaction between the parent and the child. In other words, parents and children may experience conflict less because they are interacting less (Laursen et al., 1998) and not necessary because they have a healthier relationship. Although few past studies have conceptualized levels of intergenerational conflict as an indicator of parent-child relationship, the present study examined intergenerational conflict as an indicator of the overall parent-child relationship in this study and analyzed whether levels of intergenerational conflict moderated the association between ethnic socialization and ethnic identity.

Summary.

In this section, the author presented different approaches for conceptualizing and measuring the three constructs that will be examined in this study: ethnic socialization, ethnic identity, and intergenerational conflict. Evidently, past studies have conceptualized and measured these constructs in many ways. One current trend within the literature suggests that the measure used to assess ethnic socialization should have two characteristics: it should separate ethnic socialization from racial socialization, and it should include multiple subscales to measure different aspects of ethnic socialization. In this study, ethnic socialization is viewed as a concept that is separate from racial socialization; and it is defined as the parenting practices related to teaching children about their own ethnic group. Furthermore, ethnic socialization is conceptualized as consisting of multiple dimensions. Therefore, the Adolescent Racial-Ethnic Socialization Scale (ARESS) (Brown & Krishnakumar, 2007) was used to measure ethnic socialization because it possessed both of these characteristics.
Additionally, the researcher worked from a developmental perspective to conceptualize and measure ethnic identity. Within the developmental framework, two current measures of ethnic identity have emerged: Umana-Taylor’s Ethnic Identity Scale (EIS) and Phinney’s Multiethnic Ethnic Identity Measure-Revised (MEIM-R). Both scales are equally valid tools for assessing adolescents’ ethnic identity. Also, both encompass subscales that measure continuous variables. For the current study, Phinney and Ong’s (2007a) MEIM-R was used.

Different approaches for conceptualizing and measuring intergenerational conflict were also presented. Evidently, there are challenges in creating an intergenerational conflict scale that is applicable across ethnic groups. For instance, most of the available intergenerational conflict scales were created specifically for Asian American families. Scales that have been used across ethnic groups have relied on measures that used either value discrepancies or differences in acculturation rates of parents and children as indicators of intergenerational conflicts. These scales do not directly measure intergenerational conflict. In reviewing past studies and key intergenerational scales, this study used the Asian American Family Conflict Scale-Likelihood (Lee et al., 2000); which has demonstrated adequate cross-cultural psychometric equivalency among Asian American, Latino American, and European American samples (Lee & Lui, 2001) and has reported reliable alpha coefficients among immigrant adolescents (Choi et al., 2008).

**The Current Study**

The current study consisted of three features: (1) the conceptualization and measure of ethnic socialization as a multidimensional construct; (2) the use of a moderator model based on a cultural-ecological perspective to explore how different components of ethnic socialization relate to ethnic identity within the context of adolescents’ perceived level of
intergenerational conflict; and (3) the consideration of gender patterns in the moderation model. Although previous studies have used multidimensional measures of ethnic socialization and moderator models framed within the cultural-ecological framework to explore the association between ethnic socialization and ethnic identity, both features have not been used within the same study. Furthermore, few studies have examined three-way interaction effects, analyzing whether adolescent gender interact with contextual factors (e.g., levels of intergenerational conflict) to inform the way in which ethnic socialization relates to ethnic identity.

The author of the current study conceptualizes ethnic socialization as a multidimensional construct and aims to use a measure that reflects this conceptualization. Some previous studies have relied on global measures of ethnic socialization, which capture the overall degree of ethnic socialization but do not take into account its different aspects. The use of global measures does not allow scholars to examine the differential association of each aspect of ethnic socialization with the same outcome measure. When studies use global measures of ethnic socialization, scholars assume that different types of ethnic socialization will have the same effect on children’s development. Because different aspects of ethnic socialization may relate differently to the same outcome, scholars are reconceptualizing ethnic socialization as a multidimensional construct that breaks the larger category of ethnic socialization into discrete subscales to match this perspective. Using multidimensional scales to assess ethnic socialization, scholars can evaluate how each aspect of ethnic socialization relates to ethnic identity. Therefore, this study used Brown and Krishnakumar’s (2007) Adolescent Ethnic Socialization Scale, which consists of five subscales: Cultural Embeddedness, Cultural History, Cultural Heritage, Cultural Values, and Ethnic Pride.

Additionally, current studies use moderator models rather than direct models to understand the association between ethnic socialization and ethnic identity. Direct models
examine how ethnic socialization relates to ethnic identity. In comparison, moderator models investigate the relation between the two variables within the context of a third variable. Scholars test this third variable as a potential moderator. An underlying assumption is that the inclusion of this third variable in the model will provide more information about the relation between the initial two variables.

Ecological theory conceptually informed this moderator approach by suggesting that the association between socialization processes, such as ethnic socialization and children’s developmental outcomes can be understood within the context of ecological factors. For instance, Darling and Steinberg’s Contextual Model of Parenting suggests that the nature of the parent-child relationship will moderate the association between parenting practices and child outcomes. Within the ethnic socialization literature, scholars such as Umana-Taylor and Supple have inferred the role of socialization goals in their models by assuming that parents engage in ethnic socialization behaviors because they want to promote a strong sense of ethnic pride in their children. The current study did not address the role of socialization goals, but examined the nature of the parent-child relationship as a context for development. In the current study, intergenerational conflict, or the level of conflict between the adolescent and his or her parent, was conceptualized as one indicator of the overall nature of the parent-child relationship.

Furthermore, the ecological perspectives suggest that children’s individual characteristics interact with contextual factors to inform the association between developmental processes and outcomes. Taking into consideration this aspect of the ecological model, the current study examined the interaction between adolescent gender (e.g., developing child’s individual characteristic) and levels of intergenerational conflict (e.g., contextual factors) and to inform the association between ethnic socialization and ethnic identity. In other words, this analysis provided consideration of gender patterns in the
moderation model by determining whether levels of intergenerational conflict moderate the association between ethnic socialization and ethnic identity differently for boys and girls.

**Research Questions and Hypotheses.** Three main research questions were proposed for this study. Although previous studies revealed that the broader category of ethnic socialization positively relates to ethnic identity, five different subscales of ethnic socialization were assessed independently in relation to ethnic identity. These three research questions were proposed for this study:

1. Do adolescents’ perceptions of intergenerational conflict moderate the associations between each of the five ethnic socialization subscales (Cultural Embeddedness, Cultural History, Cultural Heritage, Cultural Values, and Ethnic Pride) and ethnic identity?
2. Does gender play a role in how the moderator model occurs?
3. What is the best set of variables (out of the five ethnic socialization subscales, the intergenerational conflict variable, and the five cross-product terms) for predicting ethnic identity?

For the first research question, the study assessed whether intergenerational conflict moderated the association between each ethnic socialization subscale and ethnic identity. Adolescents who reported high levels of intergenerational conflict would be less likely to have a positive relationship with their parents and less likely to feel connected with them. In contrast, adolescents who reported low levels of intergenerational conflict with their parents would be more likely to have a positive relationship with their parents; and therefore, the association between ethnic socialization and ethnic identity would be much stronger. It was hypothesized that intergenerational conflict will emerge as a moderator between some ethnic socialization subscales and ethnic identity, but that this would not be true for all of the subscales. Levels of intergenerational conflict, therefore, would influence how much
adolescents can connect with their parents’ past, their perception of their parents’ ethnic socialization behaviors, and their willingness to adopt the values transmitted by their parents. In general, intergenerational conflict was predicted to be a moderator only in the models that included Cultural Embeddedness, Cultural Heritage, and Ethnic Pride. It was hypothesized that the direct relationship between Cultural Embeddedness, Cultural Heritage, and Ethnic Pride, on the one hand, and ethnic identity, on the other, would be stronger for adolescents who reported lower levels of intergenerational conflict than for adolescents who reported higher levels of intergenerational conflict.

The second research question considered gender patterns in the moderation model. The study examined whether intergenerational conflict moderated the association between ethnic socialization and ethnic identity differently for girls and boys. Conducting separate regression models separately to determine whether intergenerational conflict would moderate the association between association ethnic socialization and ethnic identity takes into consideration the role of adolescents’ gender in their own development. Because of the differential experiences of growing up as a Hmong boy or a girl and the different gender expectations Hmong families have, it was hypothesized that this three way interaction effect would be significant. Even though our study anticipated a significant interaction effect, the author was not sure whether the interaction effect would be significant for girls, for boys, or for both.

The third research question aimed to identify the model that would be the best predictor of ethnic identity. The study tested the different components of the comprehensive model that included all the variables (all the ethnic socialization subscales, the intergenerational conflict variable, and the five cross-product terms) to identify a submodel that adequately explained a significant amount of variance in ethnic identity. This submodel would include a set of variables that is identified to be the best predictor of ethnic identity.
Based on the previous hypotheses, it was hypothesized that although all of the five ethnic socialization subscales would be correlated, Cultural Embeddedness, Cultural Heritage, and Ethnic Pride would emerge as the set of variables that is best for predicting ethnic identity.

**Summary.** Framed within a cultural-ecological perspective, the current study used a multidimensional measure of ethnic socialization, a moderator model to assess the relation between each component of ethnic socialization and ethnic identity within the context of intergenerational conflict, and considered gender patterns in the moderator model. The study examined these associations within a group of Hmong adolescents and their immigrant and refugee parents.
Chapter 4. Methodology

Participants

The sample included 116 adolescents (78=female) and their parents. The median age for the adolescent participant was 16 years old with a range of 13 to 18 years old. Most students (85%) reported that they were born in the United States and a smaller percentage (14%) reported that they were born in a foreign country. For the students who indicated that they were born in a foreign country, 59% have been in the US for more than 7 years, 29% have been in the US for 5-6 years, and 12% have been in the US for 4 years or less.

More than 78% of the parents that participated in the study were mothers, 18% were fathers, and 3.2% were other caregivers. The median age for parents was 40 years old, with all indicating that they came to the United States either from Laos or from Thailand. Parents reported their educational level, with 77.7% of parents reporting that they never went to school, completed 8th grade, or completed 12th grade or a high school education. Approximately 20.6% of parents reported that they have some college level education, including receiving a 2-year, 4-year, or graduate degree. Two parents did not report their educational level. The mean length of time parents have lived in the United States was 19.55 years with a range of 2 to 33 years. Most of the parents (86%) reported that they either lived with their spouse or lived with their spouse and parents. Furthermore, 6% indicated that they lived by themselves and 8% reported that they lived with other relatives or in some other type of living arrangements. The mean number of children per household was 5.97 children with a range of 1 to 13 children. Refer to Table 1 for more descriptive statistics for each demographic variable.
Table 1. *Descriptive Statistics for Demographic Variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Variables by Adolescent and Parent Responses</th>
<th>Adolescent responses (percentage)</th>
<th>Parent responses (percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth country</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born in the US</td>
<td>85.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born in a foreign country</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>96.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship with child</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>78.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never went to school</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed 8th grade</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th grade or GED</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 year college</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 year college</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate degree (M.A., M.D. or Ph.D.)</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live by self</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live with others</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live with spouse</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of children</td>
<td>5.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average birth year</td>
<td>1994.35</td>
<td>1968.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Procedures

Two large Midwestern cities with a large number of Hmong families were targeted. In the first city, the researcher went door to door canvassing in two main zip code areas with a large number of Hmong and Southeast Asian American families, as identified in the census. The researcher approached parents and followed a recruitment script. Families who identified themselves as Hmong and included an adolescent between the ages of 13-18 were encouraged to participate in the study. Most parents displayed interest and were more than willing to complete the survey. Parents and adolescents completed the survey individually at their home and were asked to refer other families that might be interested in participating in the study.

In the second city, participants were recruited through a large non-profit organization serving Hmong American and other Southeast Asian American families. Generally staffed by individuals who fluently spoke Hmong, the organization provides social services to recent refugees and their families. Among the different programs available, the researcher was invited to speak at a youth leadership group and a mother-daughter support group. The youth leadership program serves youth age 15 to 21 and provides them with opportunities to build leadership skills. The program takes place after school once a week and includes youth from different parts of the city. An estimated 25 to 35 students attend the session each week. During the four-hour session, presenters spoke with the youth group and different recreational activities were available for the students. The mother-daughter support group provides an opportunity for mothers and daughters to socialize and connect with one another. This monthly event focuses on providing positive role models for the young female adolescent. During the initial contact, the researcher provided information about the research objectives and distributed consent forms to the adolescents for participating in the study. In the second week, the researcher distributed the adolescent questionnaire to all individuals
who returned their consent forms. The surveys were administered individually in a group session.

The research team, consisting of the principal researcher, program staff, and community member, distributed the parent survey. Some parents completed their questionnaires during “parent nights” and some parents completed their questionnaire at their homes. In some instances, parents were able to complete the survey by themselves with no assistance. Some parents needed clarification with specific survey items. Other parents required one person from the research team to read each item individually in English and to translate each item into Hmong. Parents were then instructed to mark the best response for the item.

The study sample is similar when compared to national Hmong census data, which is the population that the sample represents. However, in comparison to national Hmong data, the sample in this study is generally less educated and has a relatively larger average household size. According to secondary analysis of the 2010 Census data on the Hmong in the United States, 16% of Hmong individuals aged 25 and older received a bachelor’s degree or higher (Pfeifer et al., 2013); whereas, 12% of our parent respondents reported that they attained a 4-year degree or higher. However, the 2010 Census data reported that about 3.4% of Hmong adults received a graduate or professional degree (Pfeifer et al., 2013) which is relatively similar to the percent of parents (3.4%) in this study sample who self-reported that they earned a post-graduate degree. The average family size in the national census for Hmong families was 6.3 (Pfeifer et al., 2013), whereas, the average family size in this sample was greater than 6 considering that the average number of children reported in this study sample was 6.

Analyses were conducted to evaluate whether there were significant differences in the key study variables between the two samples. Part of the value of the ecological model is that
it acknowledges the different contextual factors that may impact how processes, such as ethnic socialization, may relate to developmental outcomes. With consideration of this specific feature of the ecological model, we examined whether the specific context of each location was an important variable to consider in this study. If the results indicated that there were significant differences among key study variables between the two samples, it is possible that the association between ethnic socialization and ethnic identity may be context specific and thus combining the two samples may mask this association. Rather, separate analysis for each sample may be necessary to capture the different associations. The analyses revealed that although the two samples differed on a few demographic variables, they appeared to be more similar than different on key study variables. Refer to Table 2 for a summary of the t-test analyses evaluating the two samples on each key study variable. Thus, this information provided us with the basis to combine the two samples into a single group for our main analyses.

Analyses were also conducted to determine whether there were significant gender differences among the key study variables. These analyses were conducted to determine whether there were gender differences among the key study variables. Ecological model argues that individual characteristics, such as adolescents’ gender, may interact with proximal process (e.g., ethnic socialization) to inform developmental outcomes (e.g., ethnic identity). If gender differences among the key study variables emerged, separate analysis for each gender would need to be conducted to examine whether associations between the study variables were evident between the two genders. Instead of examining individual ethnic socialization subscales, the analyses included all the ethnic socialization subscales into a total ethnic socialization score. For a more simple analysis, the analysis shifted to using total ethnic socialization score as opposed to individual ethnic socialization subscales. The analyses revealed that there were no gender differences in terms of ethnic identity.
exploration, ethnic identity commitment, intergenerational conflict, and parents’ total ethnic socialization score. However, girls were more likely to report higher levels of ethnic socialization than boys at a statistically significant level. Refer to Table 3 for a summary of the T-test analyses evaluating the key study variables by gender. Because of the gender difference in adolescents’ report of ethnic socialization, separate analyses examining whether intergenerational conflict moderated the association between ethnic socialization and ethnic identity was conducted for girls and for boys.
Table 2. *T*-tests Results Comparing Mean Scores Between the WI and MN Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean WI</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean MN</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents’ report of ethnic socialization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Embeddedness *</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>.548</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>.613</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>.765</td>
<td>.446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural History</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>.696</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>.597</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>.480</td>
<td>.632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Heritage</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>.606</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>.541</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>.751</td>
<td>.454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Values</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>.462</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>.571</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>.848</td>
<td>.398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Pride</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>.539</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>.599</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>.744</td>
<td>.458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prep for marriage</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>.552</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>.676</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>.231</td>
<td>.818</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Adolescents’ report of ethnic socialization |         |     |         |     |     |     |         |
| Cultural Embeddedness *       | 2.95    | .596| 3.12    | .605| 114 | -.1511| .134    |
| Cultural History              | 2.81    | .790| 2.96    | .746| 114 | -1.055| .294    |
| Cultural Heritage             | 2.73    | .611| 2.82    | .625| 114 | -.763 | .447    |
| Cultural Values               | 2.98    | .616| 3.15    | .596| 114 | -1.467| .145    |
| Ethnic Pride                  | 2.89    | .731| 2.91    | .770| 114 | -1.30 | .897    |
| Prep for marriage             | 3.48    | .618| 3.56    | .618| 114 | -.703 | .483    |
| Intergenerational conflict    | 3.00    | .831| 3.25    | .917| 114 | -1.540| .126    |
| Ethnic identity               | 3.79    | .583| 3.79    | .605| 114 | .000  | 1.00    |

*The Cultural Embeddedness subscale did not include the following two items from the parent survey: (1) “I have magazines or books that reflect my ethnic background in the home/My mom has magazines or books that reflect our ethnic background in the home” (2) “I read books to my son/daughter about our ethnic background/My mom reads books to me or me about our ethnic background.”
Table 3. *T*-test Comparing Key Study Variables by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Boys (N= 38) Mean Score</th>
<th>Girls (N=78) Mean Score</th>
<th><em>t</em></th>
<th>df</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic identity exploration</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>-1.626</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic identity commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>-.85</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergenerational conflict</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>-1.09</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents’ report of Ethnic socialization (Total)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>-1.93</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adolescents’ report of Ethnic Socialization (Total)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>*<em>-2.78</em></td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05
Measures

Four main types of variables were included in this study: (1) control variables, (2) independent variables, (3) dependent variables, and (4) moderator variables. This section describes each variable in more detailed and the measure used to assess each of the variables.

Demographic Variables.

Four different demographic questions were included in the parent questionnaire. Parents were asked to indicate their gender, birth country, relationship with the child participant, and family structure. Adolescents were asked to report their gender and birth country.

Control Variables. Two control variables were assessed in the questionnaire: mothers’ educational level and parents’ immigration status. Because past studies found that ethnic socialization practices varied by socioeconomic and immigration status (Caughey et al., 2002; Umana-Taylor & Yazedjian, 2006), parents’ educational level and immigrations status were used as control variables in the study’s analyses.

Parents’ educational level. Parents indicated their highest level of education by choosing one of the following six options: (1) never went to school, (2) 8th grade, (3) 12th grade (high school or GED), (4) 2 year college, (5) 4 year college, (6) Masters Degree, or Ph.D. (Law degree or Medical degree). Parents’ level of education was used as an indicator of the families’ socioeconomic status. Parents’ educational level was entered as an incremental variable (1-6) into the regression analysis. Parents were asked to select the best option that described their education level; “I don’t know” was not an option that was available for parents to choose from.
Parents’ immigration status. Additionally, mothers indicated the number of years they have been in the United States by specifying the year in which they arrived in the United States.

Independent Variable.

Parents’ perception of ethnic socialization. Parents’ perception of ethnic socialization was operationalized as the independent variable. This study included an adapted measure of the Adolescent Racial and Ethnic Socialization Scale (ARESS) (Brown & Krishnakumar, 2007). The ARESS is a racial-ethnic socialization scale that separates racial socialization and ethnic socialization into two main components and includes multiple subscales within each component. For this study, only the ethnic socialization component was analyzed. Brown and Krishnakumar’s (2007) ethnic socialization subscale included 26 total items and five subscales. Because this measure was established to measure ethnic socialization within African American families, several items were modified so that the items were more relevant to immigrant families within the current study. Participants rated each item on a 4-point scale using the following four choices: 1 = never, 2 = a few times, 3 = lots of times, 4 = always.

Within the component of ethnic socialization, there were 5 subscales: Cultural Embeddedness, Cultural History, Cultural Heritage, Cultural Values, and Ethnic Pride. The number of items used to assess each subscale and sample items for each of the subscales are provided below.

Cultural Embeddedness. One of the five items for the Cultural Embeddedness subscale was “I watch movies, shows, and/or programs that reflect our ethnic background.”
Cultural History. Cultural History involves four items. A sample item involved “I teach my child that knowing about our cultural history is important.”

Cultural Heritage. For the Cultural Heritage subscale, five items were included in the measure and “I teach my child to never forget my heritage” was one sample item.

Cultural Values. Four items were used to assess Cultural Values. One Cultural Values item included “I teach my child the importance of family”.

Ethnic Pride. Lastly, “I teach my child to have pride in his or her ethnic culture” was one of the five items for measuring Ethnic Pride.

An additional subscale, Preparation for Marriage, was added to these five subscales for the current study and a sample item is provided below.

Preparation for Marriage. Four items were included to assess Preparation for Marriage, including “I train my child to be a good future wife or husband.”

Cronbach’s alpha coefficient is one measure of internal consistency that is used to determine if the scale is reliable or that the intercorrelations between all the items for a particular scale measure a particular construct. High alpha coefficients indicate that the items together measure an underlying construct. A general rule of thumb that is used in social science research is that an alpha coefficient of .7 or higher is considered acceptable. For alpha coefficients lower than .7, it is questionable whether the items are reliable. Based on a sample of African American adolescents, the study reported adequate alpha reliability coefficients for each of the subscales (Brown & Krishnakumar, 2007). In their study, Brown and Krishnakumar (2007) reported an alpha coefficient of .66 for the Cultural Values subscale, .71 for Cultural Embeddedness, .89 for Cultural Heritage, .80 for Cultural History, and .89 for Ethnic Pride (Brown & Krishnakumar, 2007).

Because we used the same measure for a different sample, it is important to determine each ethnic socialization subscale’s alpha coefficients. It is possible that items are
reliable for one sample but not reliable for a different sample. For the Hmong sample, the calculated alpha reliabilities for the adapted parent measure in this current study were .824 for Cultural History, .750 for Cultural Heritage, .754 for Cultural Values, .841 for Ethnic pride, and .489 for the Cultural Embeddedness subscale. The calculated alpha coefficient for the Preparation for Marriage subscale was .914. The alpha coefficients for each ethnic socialization subscale are also available in Table 4. All the ethnic socialization subscales for the Hmong sample were acceptable with the exception of the Cultural Embeddedness subscale which had a relatively low alpha coefficient. Two items were removed from this subscale and the alpha coefficient was recalculated, resulting in an alpha coefficient of .564 for three items for the adjusted Cultural Embeddedness subscale. Although the alpha coefficient improved, it was still lower than the acceptable alpha coefficient threshold of .7. Refer to Table 5 for the mean and standard deviation of each subscale.
Table 4. *Alpha Reliability Coefficients for Each Variable*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Parents’ report of ethnic socialization</th>
<th>Adolescents’ report of ethnic socialization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural embeddedness (3 items)*</td>
<td>.564</td>
<td>.630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural history (4 items)</td>
<td>.824</td>
<td>.868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural heritage (5 items)</td>
<td>.750</td>
<td>.700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural values (4 items)</td>
<td>.754</td>
<td>.749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic pride (5 items)</td>
<td>.841</td>
<td>.859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation for marriage (4 items)</td>
<td>.914</td>
<td>.877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergenerational conflict (10 items)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic identity (6 items)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Cultural embeddedness subscale did not include the following two items from the parent survey: (1) “I have magazines or books that reflect my ethnic background in the home/My mom has magazines or books that reflect our ethnic background in the home” (2) “I read books to my son/daughter about our ethnic background/My mom reads books to me about our ethnic background.”*
Table 5. *Mean Standard Deviation for Each Variable*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Parents’ report of ethnic socialization</th>
<th>Adolescents’ report of ethnic socialization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Min</td>
<td>Max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic socialization subscales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Embeddedness*</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural History</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Heritage</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Values</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Pride</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prep for Marriage</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Identity (overall)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethic identity exploration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethic identity commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergenerational Conflict</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Cultural embeddedness subscale did not include the following two items from the parent survey: (1) “I have magazines or books that reflect my ethnic background in the home/My mom has magazines or books that reflect our ethnic background in the home” (2) “I read books to my son/daughter about our ethnic background/My mom read books to me about our ethnic background.”*
Dependent Variable

*Adolescents’ ethnic identity.* Adolescents’ ethnic identity was operationalized as the dependent variable in the current study. This study used the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure-Revised (MEIM-R) (Phinney & Ong, 2007b) to assess adolescents’ ethnic identity. This measure consists of two main subscales of commitment and exploration. Within each subscale, adolescents rated three different items on a five point scale, ranging from (1) strongly disagree to (5) strongly agree. “I feel a strong attachment towards my own ethnic group” is a sample item of the commitment subscale. For the exploration subscale, a sample item is “I have spent time trying to find out more about my ethnic group, such as its history, traditions, and customs.” The authors of this measure recommend using a total ethnic identity score by calculating the average of the six items to assess adolescents’ degree of ethnic identification (Phinney & Ong, 2007b) but studies have examined each of these subscales separately as well. A reported total alpha reliability coefficient for the entire scale was .81 based on a multi-ethnic immigrant adolescent sample (N = 93, mean age = 16) (Phinney & Ong, 2007b). For the current adolescent sample, the calculated alpha coefficient was .784. Refer to Table 5 for the mean and standard deviation for the ethnic identity variable.

Moderator Variable

*Adolescents’ perceptions of intergenerational conflict.* Adolescents’ perceptions of intergenerational conflict was operationalized as the moderator variable. The Asian American Family Conflict Scale (Lee et al. 2000) consists of two subscales: Likelihood and Seriousness. As recommended by the authors (Lee & Liu, 2001), only the Likelihood subscale was used as an indicator of intergenerational conflict because the Seriousness subscale has not been well developed. Completed by adolescents, the likelihood subscale measures the extent of intergenerational conflict between the adolescent and his or her parent.
Presenting different conflicts that typically occur between children and parents, the likelihood subscale consisted of ten items that were individually rated on a five point scale, ranging from (1) almost never to (5) almost always. “Your parents tell you what to do with your life, but you want to make your own decision” was a sample item. Using an ethnically diverse sample of college students, Lee and Liu (2001) reported alpha coefficients of .81 to .89 for the Likelihood subscale. An alpha coefficient of .86 was also determined for a sample of immigrant adolescents (Choi et al., 2008). For the Hmong American adolescents in this sample, the calculated alpha coefficient was .865. Refer to Table 5 for the mean and standard deviation for intergenerational conflict variable and Table 6 and Table 7 for the intercorrelations among the study variables.
Table 6. *Intercorrelations Among Parents' Report of Ethnic Socialization Subscales and Other Study Variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Years in US</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Parents ed level</td>
<td>.482*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Parent cultural embeddedness (3 items)</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>-.135</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Parent cultural history</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>-.045</td>
<td>.266*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Parent cultural heritage</td>
<td>.181</td>
<td>-.117</td>
<td>.346*</td>
<td>.653*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Parent cultural values</td>
<td>-.028</td>
<td>-.026</td>
<td>.285*</td>
<td>.421*</td>
<td>.551*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Parent ethnic pride</td>
<td>-.136</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.405*</td>
<td>.458*</td>
<td>.652*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Parent prep for marriage</td>
<td>.187*</td>
<td>-.345*</td>
<td>.213*</td>
<td>.264*</td>
<td>.317*</td>
<td>.410*</td>
<td>.448*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Adolescent intergenerational conflict</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>-.042</td>
<td>-.022</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>.283*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Ethnic Identity-Exploration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Ethnic Identity Commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Correlation is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed)

**Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Years in US</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Parents ed level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Adolescent cultural embeddedness (3 items)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.224*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Adolescent cultural history</td>
<td></td>
<td>.224*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Adolescent cultural heritage</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>-.088</td>
<td>.427*</td>
<td>.743*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Adolescent cultural values</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>-.049</td>
<td>.347*</td>
<td>.706*</td>
<td>.631*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Adolescent ethnic pride</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>-.049</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.546*</td>
<td>.550*</td>
<td>.564*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Adolescent prep for marriage</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>-.149</td>
<td>.220*</td>
<td>.469*</td>
<td>.356*</td>
<td>.488*</td>
<td>.372*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Adolescent intergenerational conflict</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>-.042</td>
<td>.185*</td>
<td>.224*</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>.220*</td>
<td>-.016</td>
<td>.357*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Ethnic identity-exploration</td>
<td>.190*</td>
<td>-.131</td>
<td>.200</td>
<td>.361**</td>
<td>.439**</td>
<td>.254*</td>
<td>.299**</td>
<td>.361**</td>
<td>.225*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Ethnic identity-commitment</td>
<td>.185</td>
<td>-.227*</td>
<td>.283*</td>
<td>.339**</td>
<td>.367**</td>
<td>.293**</td>
<td>.374**</td>
<td>.349**</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>.583**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Correlation is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed)
**Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed)
Chapter 5. Results

The following three research questions were posed for the current study:

1. Do adolescents’ perceptions of intergenerational conflict moderate the associations between each of the five ethnic socialization subscales (Cultural Embeddedness, Cultural History, Cultural Heritage, Cultural Values, and Ethnic Pride) and ethnic identity exploration and ethnic identity commitment?

2. Do adolescents’ perceptions of intergenerational conflict moderate the associations between ethnic socialization and ethnic identity exploration and ethnic identity commitment differently for boys and for girls?

3. What is the best set of variables (out of the five ethnic socialization subscales, and the intergenerational conflict variable) for predicting ethnic identity?

Apriori Analysis

A number of analyses were conducted prior to running the multiple regression analysis. First, three assumptions must be met when conducting multiple regressions: normality of the variables, homoscedasticity, and linearity between the independent variable and the dependent variable. Each assumption was evaluated using residual analysis and will be described and discussed in the following section. Second, issues of multicollinearity between the study variable is discussed.

Normality of the Variables. Normality of the variables involves determining whether the data is normally distributed by examining the shape of the data (Hair et al., 1995). To assess the normality of the variables, a normal probability plot was created and a residual plot was examined. In the probability plot, the normality assumption has been met if the line representing the observed data similarly follows the normal distribution (Hair et al., 1995). A residual is the difference between the observed value of a variable and the predicted
value of the same variable. Thus, the normal probability plot graphs the observed value of ethnic identity against the predicted value of ethnic identity. Standardized residuals falling within the +2 and -2 range indicate that the data generally follow a normal distribution, whereas, standardized residuals falling outside of this range indicate that outliers exist. If this occurs, these data points will be examined more thoroughly. Detecting normality distribution allows the researcher to detect outliers that may affect the accuracy of the results derived from the analysis (Hair et al., 1995).

**Homoscedasticity.** The assumption of homoscedasticity must also be met. Homoscedasticity determines whether the residuals are dispersed randomly throughout the range of the estimated dependent variable. To determine whether this assumption has been met, the standardized residuals of each ethnic socialization subscale were plotted on the x-axis against the standardized estimates of the dependent variable, ethnic identity, on the y-axis. If the residuals are evenly scattered on the entire range of the x-axis, then homoscedasticity has been met. It can be concluded that the variables have constant variance. If the residuals are clustered at different ends of the x-axis, homoscedasticity is violated and may be an indication that different linear regression lines are needed to illustrate how that particular ethnic socialization subscale relates to the higher end and the lower end of ethnic identity. The residual plots were also used to detect outliers that may influence the estimated equation (Hair et al., 1995).

**Linearity Between the Independent Variable and the Dependent Variable.** Regression analyses are most appropriate for estimating the association between independent and dependent variables with linear relations. If the relationship between the independent variable and dependent variable is nonlinear, a regression analysis may underestimate the relationship between the two variables. For instance, a curvilinear pattern between the independent variable and the dependent variable proposes problems for estimation when
using a linear equation. If the residuals are evenly dispersed around the x-axis, the assumption of linearity has been met and if the residuals are dispersed randomly on the plot or formed into curves, funnels, or other shapes, the linearity assumption has not been met between the six ethnic socialization subscales and ethnic identity exploration and ethnic identity commitment. When these three assumptions are confirmed, a regression analysis can be performed.

**Scatterplot analysis.** A scatter plot of the residuals for each regression model was created to determine whether the data met all the assumptions of normality, linearity, and homoscedasticity required for conducting a multiple regression analysis. If the residual scatterplot shows that the majority of residuals are at the center of the plot for each value of the predicted score, with some residuals trailing off symmetrically from the center, then it can be assumed that the data is normally distributed. The scatterplot of the residuals for each respective regression analysis is available in the Appendix. These scatterplots showed that the residuals centered around the standardized residual of 0, with symmetrical number of residuals trailing from the center. Also, standardized residuals falling within the +2 and -2 range for the regression standardized predicted value along the x-axis, indicating that the data set generally follows a normal distribution, whereas, standardized residuals falling outside of this range indicate that outliers exit may exist in the data set. Most of the standardized residuals fell within the +2 and -2 range for the standardized predicted value, indicating that the data generally followed a normal distribution. These two indications points to the conclusion that the data is normally distributed and that the data has met the assumption of normality for the multiple regression analysis.

The scatterplot was also analyzed to assess whether the assumption of linearity was met. If the residuals in the scatterplot are evenly scattered above and below the zero y-axis, then it can be assumed that the independent variables and dependent variables are linearly
related. The scatterplot of the residuals illustrated that the residuals were evenly scattered above and below the zero y-axis, indicating that the independent variables and the dependent variables were linearly related.

The same scatterplot of residuals was also used to determine whether the assumption of homoscedasticity was met. The data is considered to have met the homoscedasticity assumption if the residual scatterplot is the same width for all values of the predicted dependent variable; in other words, the residuals are approximately equal for all the predicted dependent scores. In the residual scatterplots, the pattern of the data indicated that there were not a perfect distribution of residuals, but they appeared to have met the homoscedasticity assumption for the regression analysis.

**Multicollinearity**

Before conducting the regression analyses, one issue important for consideration is collinearity, or the relative correlation among the independent variables (Hair et al., 1995). Collinearity among the predictor variables could result in biased estimation of regression statistics; if the independent variables are highly correlated, they share overlapping power in explaining the variance in the dependent variable. In other words, a high correlation between two variables may indicate that the inclusion of the second factor will not significantly improve the predictive power relative of the first factor. It is, therefore, best that the predictor variables are not highly correlated (Pedhazur, 1997). The first step is to examine the correlation matrix among the independent variables to consider whether there are high correlations among the predictor variables. The correlation matrices, found in Table 6 and Table 7, indicate that some correlations between intergenerational conflict and some ethnic socialization were statistically significant, however, the author also used diagnostic measures to detect collinearity as well.
Several diagnostic measures are available for detecting collinearity. Examining the tolerance value is one method proposed by Pedhazur (1997) and Hair et al. (1995) as an effective collinearity diagnostic tool. Tolerance is defined as “the amount of variability of the selected independent variable not explained by the other independent variables” (Hair et al., 1992, p. 48) and can range from 0 to 1. A low tolerance value means that there is a high correlation among the predictor variables and the information provided by these variables will be redundant; whereas, a high tolerance value signifies little or no correlation among the variables which will illustrate the unique contribution of each factor.

Tolerance values were computed; one for each variable in each regression model. The suggested cutoff tolerance value is .10, which also corresponds to a correlation of .95 (Hair et al., 1995, p. 127). Correlations with .90 or higher point to high levels of correlation (Hair et al., 1995, p. 127) and reveal issues of collinearity. If high collinearity among the variables is found, different options are available. One option is to eliminate a few of the variables that are highly correlated with the other variables. In the proposed study, if the specific ethnic socialization subscale and intergenerational conflict are highly correlated, one strategy is to use only one of the two variables as a predictor variable. Even though the two variables may be highly correlated, a second option is to include both variables as predictors anyways. This option will allow the study to examine how the variables together predict ethnic identity, but will not shed light on the unique contribution of each individual predictor.

When conducting regression to assess a moderator model, it is also important to standardized the variables (both independent and moderator variables) to reduce collinearity between variables in Model 2 and the cross-product term in Model 3. Standardizing the variables involves subtracting the observed score from the mean score (Frazier et al., 2004; Aiken & West, 1991); this difference becomes the centered score. After the independent and the moderator variables have been standardized, the transformed values for the ethnic
socialization subscale and intergenerational conflict will be multiplied and entered in Model 3 as the value for the cross-product term.

Tolerance values, which can range from 0 to 1, were calculated to determine whether there was any evidence of collinearity between the independent variables within each regression model. Tolerance values reflect the proportion of a variable’s variance not accounted for by the other independent variables in the regression. Small tolerance values indicate that the variables are redundant, whereas, tolerance values closer to one indicate no major issues of collinearity among the independent variables. The collinearity diagnostic was requested for each of the multiple regression models. When parents’ reports of ethnic socialization subscales were entered into the regression model, the collinearity values were within an acceptable range (i.e., .808 to .979). When adolescents’ reports of ethnic socialization subscales were entered independently into the regression model, the collinearity values were within an acceptable range (i.e., .725 to .981). All of the tolerance values were close to one, so that independent variables do not depend linearly on each other. Overall, the scatterplots analysis and the calculated tolerance values suggest that all the assumptions were met and there were no issues of collinearity even though the correlational matrices suggested statistically significant correlation between some ethnic socialization subscales and intergenerational conflict, so we proceeded with completing the regression analysis. The tolerance value for each variable for each respective regression model can be found in the Appendix Section (e.g, Appendix G to Appendix CC) in the column labeled “tolerance.”

**Research Question #1**

The first research question addressed whether intergenerational conflict is a significant moderator of the association between each ethnic socialization subscale and ethnic identity controlling for parents’ educational level and immigration status (i.e., years in the
U.S.). The regression analysis model included one ethnic socialization subscale, intergenerational conflict, and the cross-product term between ethnic socialization and intergenerational conflict as predictor variables of ethnic identity exploration and ethnic identity commitment.

After all the assumptions were met and no issues of collinearity were identified, a regression analysis was conducted. All the variables (the independent, the dependent, and the moderator) were continuous variables and were analyzed as such within the regression procedures. To assess whether intergenerational conflict significantly moderated the association between each ethnic socialization subscale and ethnic identity, three steps were taken. In the first step, we entered the control variables (parents’ educational level and years in the US) into Model 1. The second step involved entering the ethnic socialization subscale and the intergenerational conflict scores into Model 2. In the third step, we added the cross-product term into Model 3. These three steps can be summarized as the following:

Model 1: Control variables

1. Parents’ educational level
2. Years in US

Model 2: Independent variables

1. Individual ethnic socialization subscale
2. Intergenerational conflict score

Model 3: Cross-product term

1. Ethnic socialization subscale X Intergenerational conflict

To determine whether intergenerational conflict is a significant moderator, the R-square difference between Model 3 and Model 2 was used to determine whether the
interaction term added to the predictive power of Model 2 (Hair, et al., 1995; Frazier, et al., 2004). If the difference was statistically different from 0, we concluded that intergenerational conflict moderated the association between that particular ethnic socialization subscale and ethnic identity. If the R-square difference was not statistically different from 0, we concluded that intergenerational conflict did not moderate the association between that particular ethnic socialization and ethnic identity.

The goal of this research question was to determine the relation between each individual ethnic socialization subscale and ethnic identity; therefore, all the ethnic socialization subscales were not entered together. Rather, each subscale was entered independently in separate regression analysis. Parents’ educational level and years in the US were entered as control variables for each of the five regression analyses at the beginning of the analysis. Because the six different regression analyses were evaluated, the adjusted alpha level of .0083 (.05/6 = .0083) was used to determine whether the interaction term was significant.

In our first research question, we set out to determine whether intergenerational conflict moderated the association between each ethnic socialization subscale and the two components of ethnic identity: ethnic identity exploration and ethnic identity commitment. Results determined that intergenerational conflict did not emerged as a significant moderator in the association between any of the parental ethnic socialization subscales (e.g., cultural embeddedness, cultural history, cultural heritage, cultural values, ethnic pride, and preparation for marriage) and adolescents’ ethnic identity exploration or between each of the ethnic socialization subscales and ethnic identity commitment. When adolescents’ ethnic socialization subscales were entered into the regression models, intergenerational conflict again was not a significant moderator between any of the ethnic socialization subscales and
ethnic identity exploration and between any of the ethnic socialization subscales and ethnic identity commitment. A summary of the results of each analysis can be found in Table 8.
### Table 8. Summary of Regression Analysis for Parents’ Report and Adolescents’ Report of Ethnic Socialization to Predict Ethnic Identity Exploration and Ethnic Identity Commitment

Regression Analysis Summary: Parents’ report and Adolescents’ report of Ethnic Socialization to Predict Ethnic Identity Exploration and Ethnic Identity Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic socialization subscale model</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F-value</th>
<th>P-value</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F-value</th>
<th>P-value</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F-value</th>
<th>P-value</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F-value</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Embeddedness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>2.083</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>4.980</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>1.853</td>
<td>.162</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>3.154</td>
<td>.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>2.897</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>.463</td>
<td>.631</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>3.367</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.121</td>
<td>3.918</td>
<td>.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 3</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>1.260</td>
<td>.264</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>3.924</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>.716</td>
<td>.399</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.249</td>
<td>.619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>2.083</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>4.980</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>1.853</td>
<td>.162</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>3.154</td>
<td>.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>3.332</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>1.468</td>
<td>.235</td>
<td>.149</td>
<td>7.131</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>4.995</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 3</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>.344</td>
<td>.559</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>.179</td>
<td>.673</td>
<td>.179</td>
<td>3.747</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Heritage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>2.083</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>4.980</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>1.853</td>
<td>.162</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>3.154</td>
<td>.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>4.087</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.176</td>
<td>.233</td>
<td>13.647</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.174</td>
<td>7.527</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 3</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.777</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.415</td>
<td>.239</td>
<td>.784</td>
<td>.378</td>
<td>.181</td>
<td>.854</td>
<td>.357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>2.083</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>4.980</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>1.853</td>
<td>.162</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>3.154</td>
<td>.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>2.761</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.292</td>
<td>.747</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>4.600</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>4.967</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 3</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>1.150</td>
<td>.286</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.908</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>3.542</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.149</td>
<td>1.382</td>
<td>.242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Pride</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>2.083</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>4.980</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>1.853</td>
<td>.162</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>3.154</td>
<td>.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>3.141</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>1.655</td>
<td>.196</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td>7.436</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.200</td>
<td>9.484</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 3</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>.306</td>
<td>.582</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>.296</td>
<td>.588</td>
<td>.162</td>
<td>1.093</td>
<td>.298</td>
<td>.201</td>
<td>.174</td>
<td>.678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation for Marriage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>2.083</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>4.980</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>1.853</td>
<td>.162</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>3.154</td>
<td>.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>3.419</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>.344</td>
<td>.710</td>
<td>.154</td>
<td>7.505</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.152</td>
<td>5.993</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 3</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.898</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>.956</td>
<td>.330</td>
<td>.165</td>
<td>1.281</td>
<td>.260</td>
<td>.158</td>
<td>.701</td>
<td>.404</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question #2

The second research question investigated whether adolescents’ perceptions of intergenerational conflict moderates the associations between ethnic socialization as a total score and ethnic identity exploration and ethnic identity commitment separately for boys and girls. The t-tests, found in Table 3, revealed that girls were more likely to report higher levels of ethnic socialization than boys, but that there were no gender differences among ethnic identity exploration, ethnic identity commitment, or levels of intergenerational conflict. Because of the gender difference in the total ethnic socialization score, we ran separate analyses for boys and girls to determine whether intergenerational conflict moderated the association between ethnic socialization and ethnic identity exploration and between ethnic socialization and ethnic identity commitment. Instead of examining each ethnic socialization subscales separately, we shifted to using a total ethnic socialization score for a more straightforward analysis of gender.

Using parents’ report of the total ethnic socialization score as the independent variable to predict ethnic identity commitment, results indicated that intergenerational conflict was not a significant moderator for girls. This same relationship was also not significant for boys. Using adolescents’ report of the total ethnic socialization score as the independent variable to predict ethnic identity exploration, results indicated that intergenerational conflict was not a significant moderator for girls. However, for boys, intergenerational conflict emerged as a significant moderator between adolescents’ report of the total ethnic socialization and ethnic identity exploration. Results from the regression model using adolescents’ report of the total ethnic socialization can be found in Table 9. For adolescent boys with low levels of intergenerational conflict, higher adolescent reports of ethnic socialization were associated with lower levels of ethnic exploration. For adolescent
boys with high levels of intergenerational conflict, higher levels of ethnic socialization were associated with higher levels of ethnic exploration. The moderator effect is illustrated in Figure 8.
Table 9. Summary of Regression Models for Boys and Girls

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regression Analysis Summary: Parents’ Report and Adolescents’ Report of Ethnic Socialization to Predict Ethnic Identity Exploration and Ethnic Identity Commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic socialization subscale model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents’ Report of Total Ethnic Socialization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adolescents’ Report of Total Ethnic Socialization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethic Identity Exploration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Identity Commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 8. Moderator Effect of Intergenerational Conflict Between Adolescents' Report of Ethnic Socialization and Ethnic Identity Exploration
**Research Question #3**

For the third research question, a stepwise multiple regression was conducted to identify the best set of variables for predicting adolescents’ ethnic identity using parents’ educational level, immigration status, and all the ethnic socialization subscales. The interaction terms between each of the ethnic socialization subscales and intergenerational conflict were not included as variables because they did not emerge as significant predictors in any of the previous regression models. The minimal requirement for the variables to be entered into a regression equation was $p = .05$.

Parents’ report of Cultural Heritage and parents’ education level together were the strongest predictors of adolescents’ ethnic identity, explaining 9.3% of the variance. Results indicated that parents’ report of Cultural Heritage, entered in the first step, accounted for 5.3% of the variance in adolescents’ ethnic identity, $F(1, 114) = 6.341, p = .013$. Parents’ education level, entered in the second step, accounted for an additional 4% of variance in adolescent’s ethnic identity, $\Delta F(1, 113) = 4.995, p = .027$. Parents’ report of Cultural Heritage and parents’ education level together emerged as a model that was statistically significant, $R^2 = .093$, $F(2, 113) = 5.779, p = .004$, in explaining variability in adolescents’ overall ethnic identity. Refer to Table 10 for the relative $R^2$ of the stepwise regression.

Similar to results from the stepwise regression analysis using parents’ report of the ethnic socialization subscales, adolescents’ report of parental Cultural Heritage was the stronger predictor of overall ethic identity. Adolescents’ report of Cultural heritage accounted for 32.4% of the variance in ethnic identity, $F(1, 108) = 6.048, p = .000$. See Table 11 for the $R^2$ of this model.
Table 10. Stepwise Regression Summary with Parents' Report of Ethnic Socialization Subscales to Predict Adolescents' Overall Ethnic Identity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stepwise Regression Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 1: Cultural Heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 2: Cultural Heritage Parents’ ed level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11. Stepwise Regression Summary with Adolescents' Report of Ethnic Socialization Subscales to Predict Adolescents' Overall Ethnic Identity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stepwise Regression Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 1: Cultural Heritage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 6. Discussion

Introduction

Working from a cultural-ecological perspective, the current study examined how specific components of ethnic socialization relate to ethnic identity within the context of adolescents’ perceptions of intergenerational conflict. Developing an identity is particularly salient during adolescence; but for ethnic minority youth, it is also a critical period in which they start to explore what it means to be a member of an ethnic group (Phinney & Chavira, 1995). One goal that immigrant parents have for their children is that they will maintain and preserve their ethnic heritage while living in a culturally different context. Clearly, research suggests that having a strong sense of identity with one’s ethnic background is associated with a number of positive outcomes (Umana-Taylor, O’Donnell et al., 2013; Zeiders, Umana-Taylor, & Derlan, 2013). In addition, scholars have identified parents’ socialization practices, or parental efforts in teaching children about their ethnic heritage, as having a significant role in the development of adolescents’ ethnic identity (Umana-Taylor & Fine, 2004; Umana-Taylor, Bhanot, & Shin, 2006; Supple, Ghazarian, Frabutt, Plunkett, & Sands, 2006; Knight, Bernal, Garza, Cota, & Ocampo, 1993b; Phinney & Chavira, 1995).

Based on a cultural-ecological perspective, scholars have noted how parenting practices of ethnic minority parents differ from their European American counterparts and how they may be adaptive with respect to their experiences living in the United States and the specific socialization goals these parents have for their children (Garcia Coll et al., 1996). Ethnic socialization is often identified as a culturally relevant parenting strategy used by various ethnic minority groups to teach their children about what it means to be a member of their ethnic group (Rotheram & Phinney, 1987). With this in mind, this research worked from a cultural-ecological model to understand the ethnic socialization strategies of Hmong
American families. Though some studies use the cultural-ecological perspective to guide their research, their findings have often compared the parenting practices of the ethnic minority group with those of the European American population. By using this paradigm, researchers run the risk of characterizing the parenting practices of ethnic minority parents as deficient. In addition, interpretations of the findings generally reveal cultural shortfalls and do not take into consideration how these socialization strategies may be adaptive in cultural context. In this study, the researcher assumes that the normal socialization experiences of children can only be understood within their own cultural context.

In this study, there were four main findings. First, adolescents’ reports of ethnic socialization were better predictors of ethnic identity than parents’ reports of ethnic socialization. Second, intergenerational conflict did not emerge as a significant moderator between ethnic socialization and ethnic identity. Third, the associations between ethnic socialization, ethnic identity, and intergenerational conflict were different for girls and boys. Fourth, cultural heritage emerged as the best ethnic socialization subscale for predicting ethnic identity.

**Adolescents’ Reports of Ethnic Socialization**

Different types of ethnic socialization related to ethnic identity, especially when the adolescents’ perceptions were considered. When adolescents’ reports of ethnic socialization subscales were examined as independent variables in relation to ethnic identity, the study found main effects. The direct link between ethnic socialization and ethnic identity is consistent with past studies (Umana-Taylor & Fine, 2004; Umana-Taylor, Bhanot, & Shin, 2006; Supple, Ghazarian, Frabutt, Plunkett, & Sands, 2006; Knight, Bernal, Garza, Cota, & Ocampo, 1993b; Phinney & Chavira, 1995). This current finding advances our understanding of Hmong American youth, in that similar to other ethnic minority youth, high levels of
ethnic socialization is associated with a strong sense of ethnic identity. This provides us with promising evidence to suggest that parents' socialization efforts play a role in helping children to retain their ethnic culture. When refugee Hmong parents made the decision to escape political persecution, many were forced to face the daunting fear of raising children who may not understand who they are. Even though many Hmong children who were born in the United States may not display traditional cultural behaviors, they often grow up to have a strong sense of ethnic identity, know who they are, and are proud to be Hmong. In addition, Hmong parents’ socialization efforts continue to be a driving force in their children’s identity.

In this study, the researcher collected both adolescents’ and parents’ reports of ethnic socialization. Even though adolescents’ and parents’ reports of ethnic socialization were positively correlated, adolescents’ reports of ethnic socialization had a stronger association with adolescents’ ethnic identity. All six types of ethnic socialization, reported by adolescents, were related to ethnic identity exploration and commitment. In comparison, four types of ethnic socialization reported by parents were associated with ethnic exploration only. This finding is aligned with past studies that have examined both parents’ and adolescents’ reports of ethnic socialization. For example, Hughes, Hagelskamp, Way, and Foust (2009) found a positive association between adolescents’ and parents’ reports of cultural socialization but that only adolescents’ reports of ethnic socialization, rather than parents’ reports of ethnic socialization related to ethnic identity. The stronger association between adolescents’ reports of ethnic socialization and ethnic identity may be indicative of the importance of adolescents’ perception of their parents’ ethnic socialization rather than their parents’ actual ethnic socialization practices in informing their ethnic identity.
In addition, the ethnic socialization questionnaire completed by parents asked about their general ethnic socialization practices, with no instructions about completing the survey to reflect the ethnic socialization used with a specific child of the family. For example, one item asked “I teach my child the importance of family loyalty.” In a family in which there is more than one child, the parent may engage in this behavior but not just toward the adolescent who is completing the ethnic identity questionnaire. Hughes, Rodriguez, and colleagues (2006) argue that parents engage in differential ethnic-racial socialization practices to reflect their child’s age, experiences, and developmental abilities. Therefore, parents may be more likely to engage in specific components of ethnic socialization depending on parents’ perceptions of their children’s needs. If parents were able to complete the ethnic socialization measure pertaining to a targeted child within the family, different findings may emerge from the study, such as a stronger association between parents’ reports of ethnic socialization and adolescents’ ethnic identity.

The weak association between parents’ reports of ethnic socialization and adolescents’ ethnic identity was inconsistent with other studies. For example, a longitudinal study found mothers’ reports of ethnic socialization related to adolescents’ ethnic identity two years later (Umana-Taylor, O’Donnell, Knight, Roosa, Berkel, & Nair, 2013). However, the same study also found that associations between fathers’ reports of ethnic socialization and youth outcomes were moderated by contextual factors. The way in which fathers’ ethnic socialization related to adolescents’ ethnic identity depended on the ethnic composition of the child’s school. In a school in which there were only few same ethnic peers, fathers’ reports of ethnic socialization were positively related to adolescents’ ethnic identity. Similarly, the association between parents’ report of ethnic socialization and adolescents’ ethnic identity in this study may not have been captured because the relationship between the two variables may be moderated by contextual factors that were not assessed in the study.
Another possible explanation is that the stronger association between adolescents’ perception of ethnic socialization and ethnic identity may be due to the single source bias of the adolescents being the reporters for both measures. Error in the form of shared-method variance may be introduced when the independent variable and the dependent variable are self-reported data collected from the same individual (Steinberg et al., 1994; Podsakoff et al., 2003). Gathering the independent and dependent variables from the same reporter can lead to misleading conclusions.

**Intergenerational Conflict As a Moderator**

Contrary to the researcher’s expectations, intergenerational conflict did not act as a moderator between any of the ethnic socialization subscales and ethnic identity. The lack of associations was evident when considering linkages between parents’ and adolescents’ reports of ethnic socialization with ethnic identity. This finding suggests that there were similar associations between ethnic socialization and ethnic identity at low levels of intergenerational conflict and at high levels of intergenerational conflict.

The finding that intergenerational conflict did not act as a moderator is consistent with past studies. For instance, one study examining parental involvement, harsh parenting, and neighborhood risk as moderators between ethnic socialization and ethnic identity found that these contextual factors only moderated between ethnic socialization and ethnic identity affirmation, a third component of ethnic identity that was not measured in the current study. At high levels of parental involvement, low levels of harsh parenting, and low levels of perceived neighborhood risk, there was a positive relationship between ethnic socialization and affirmation. For ethnic identity exploration and ethnic identity resolution (ethnic identity commitment in this study), these variables (i.e., parental involvement, harsh parenting, and neighborhood risk) did not act as moderators (Supple, Ghazarian, et al., 2006). The authors
discussed the importance of understanding the association between ethnic socialization and ethnic identity affirmation within the broader context of the parent-adolescent relationship, but did not explain why the moderator effects were not evident for ethnic identity resolution (i.e., commitment) and ethnic identity exploration.

Moreover, intergenerational conflict may not have been the best variable to capture the quality of the parent-child relationship. Even though scholars have proposed that a positive parent-child relationship promotes the transmission of parents’ values to their children and nurtures children’s ethnic identity, intergenerational conflict may not have accurately reflected the multi-faceted nature of the parent-child relationship. Including other variables, such as parental warmth, involvement, and support and using multiple variables may be better ways to operationalize the quality of the parent-child relationship. Different findings may surface when studies use different variables other than intergenerational conflict to conceptualize the relationship adolescents have with their parents. As a way to achieve data triangulation, future studies should take into consideration the use of multiple indicators gathered with multiple methods (e.g., survey and observation) as a way to accurately characterize the parent-child relationship.

In addition, the way in which Hmong parents view intergenerational conflict may have further implications for the parent-child relationship, with parents either viewing it as a normal part of growing up or as a manifestation of the adolescents rejecting their ethnic heritage (Espiritu, 2009). Parents who view intergenerational conflict as a normal part of growing up may respond to their children in a more positive way. These parents believe that as children enter adolescence, they will have a stronger desire to make their own decisions and assert their own views. Working from this perspective, parents may be more likely to normalize parent-child conflicts as an ordinary part of this developmental period. In contrast, parents may perceive conflicts as a sign that their adolescent is rejecting their cultural
background. Or they may characterize children’s attempt to challenge authority as symptoms of becoming too Americanized. From this perspective, parents may be more likely to respond to their children in a negative manner. It was unclear which approach Hmong parents used in interpreting the level of conflicts they have with their children, which may add to the complexity of understanding intergenerational conflict as a context for ethnic socialization and ethnic identity for Hmong families.

On the other hand, the lack of moderator effects may suggest that parental messages prompt adolescents to explore their cultural values and to commit to an identity, regardless of the relationship quality. Despite the poor relationship adolescents have with their parents, as evidenced high intergenerational conflict, high levels of ethnic socialization may continue to have positive associations with adolescents’ development. Because of the important role parents have in children’s lives, the messages they convey in their ethnic socialization practices may still motivate and encourage adolescents to understand who they are. Also the meanings communicated within parents’ ethnic socialization may inspire adolescents to engage in internal self-reflection, question their identities, and broaden their cultural knowledge. Thus, parents’ ethnic-related messages may actually motivate them to seek particular experiences and engage in specific behaviors that support their ethnic identity development even in the face of having a challenging relationship with their parents. However, this is all based on speculation as few studies have examined the association between intergenerational conflict, ethnic socialization, and ethnic identity.

**Gender Patterns**

The study found gender patterns in the associations among intergenerational conflict, ethnic socialization, and ethnic identity. For girls, ethnic socialization was strongly associated with ethnic identity and its components (i.e., exploration and commitment). Also, high levels
of ethnic socialization were associated with intergenerational conflict, which was contrary to the author’s expectation.

The positive association between ethnic socialization and intergenerational conflict may reflect parents’ emphasis on the specific gender expectations as they engage in ethnic socialization. One study of Hmong youth highlighted that managing household chores, including cooking and caring for younger siblings, was a stressor for many adolescents (DuongTran et al., 1996). In addition, many Hmong parents with disrupted or minimal learning opportunities in their home country may see the educational system in the United States as the only pathway for social mobility for their children. As parents’ ethnic socialization practices focus on the high expectations they have for their daughters to juggle household responsibilities and excel academically, conflicts between parents and daughters may increase.

Immigrant parents’ have a tendency to monitor girls’ behavior closely and restrict dating, peers relationships, and extracurricular activities more so than with boys (Qin, 2009). Highly supportive parents may use these strategies to protect their daughters from what they view as the bad influences of the mainstream society so they can focus on schoolwork. On the other hand, adolescent girls may view parents’ controlling behaviors as attempts to undermine their sense of personal freedom. Having opposing perceptions of the same behaviors can lead to misunderstanding and miscommunication between the parent and daughter. The more these gender expectations are emphasized in parents’ ethnic socialization practices, the higher the level of intergenerational conflict that may be experienced by girls. Even though high levels of ethnic socialization may strain the parent-child relationship, parents’ ethnic socialization efforts are important for girls’ ethnic identity development, given the direct link between the two variables.
For boys, ethnic socialization was associated with overall ethnic identity commitment, but that the relationship between ethnic socialization and ethnic identity exploration was complicated and could be best understood within the context of intergenerational conflict. At high levels of intergenerational conflict, high levels of ethnic socialization were associated with high levels of ethnic identity exploration. At low levels of intergenerational conflict, there was no association between ethnic socialization and ethnic identity exploration. This moderated effect illustrates how the relationship between ethnic socialization and ethnic identity exploration depended on the boys’ reported levels of intergenerational conflict. The direction of the association was unexpected and inconsistent with past studies focusing on intergenerational conflict within immigrant families, which generally associate higher levels of family conflicts with negative youth adjustments (Juang, Syed, & Cookston, 2012; Park et al., 2013).

One possible interpretation of this finding is that the presence of intergenerational conflict between the parent and son may reflect a healthy, close, communicative relationship, which in turn, fosters positive outcomes (e.g., ethnic identity exploration) for the son. Findings from one study on Hmong college students provide some support for the association between intergenerational conflict and positive outcomes among Hmong American males. They found that Hmong American men who reported more family conflict were less likely to use tobacco and were more to finish their first year of college (Lee et al., 2009). Interestingly, this association was not found for Hmong American women. The high levels of conflict may reflect the investment parents put into their children, especially for sons who are expected to carry on the family name. Any indication of deviating from the path chose by parents for the child, provokes parents to direct their children back on the right path. Even though past studies indicate that intergenerational conflict is associated with negative outcomes, some studies have found adaptive outcomes for Hmong boys.
A review of research on family conflict within immigrant families revealed that high levels of intergenerational conflict are associated with negative adolescent outcomes, but a few studies have also found family conflict to be adaptive for some adolescents (Juang, Syed, Cookston, Wang, & Kim, 2012). Scholars have suggested that family conflict can improve family functioning in a number of ways, including the manner in which parents and children communicate. Family conflict may present opportunities for parents and adolescents to reflect on their relationship and challenge them to question their personal values and identities, which in turn, enhances their overall relationship. Qualitative studies reveal how some young adults, who experienced parent-child conflicts during their adolescent years, engage in reinterpretation of these conflicts and come away with a new understanding of their parents (Kang et al., 2010). The findings of these studies suggest that there might be some psychological benefits in engaging in conflicts with parents.

The positive association between intergenerational conflict and positive outcomes for Hmong boys may be understood in terms of social support. For example, Su, Lee, and Vang (2005) found that having a strong sense of social support buffered the effects of family conflict for Hmong college students. Even though these adolescents experienced high levels of conflicts with their parents, they may also have a stronger network of social support. Individuals in their social network may provide resources to help them cope effectively with the situation. The current study did not measure adolescents’ level of social support.

At low levels of intergenerational conflict, there was no association between ethnic socialization and ethnic identity exploration for boys. One hypothesis for explaining this finding is that, for these boys, low levels of intergenerational conflict may indicate some kind of dysfunctional family processes within the parent-child dyad. Rather than reflect a healthy communication pattern, parent-child relationship characterized by low levels of intergenerational conflict may indicate limited communications that boys have with their
parents or signify a relationship in which the parent and child rarely speak to one another. This helps to explain how low levels of intergenerational conflict may work against fostering a strong sense of ethnic identity. Because of the poor parent-child relationship, parents’ ethnic socialization efforts may not relate with adolescents’ ethnic identity development.

Another possible explanation is that these adolescents may be maladjusted and their psychological condition may influence their perception of the parent-adolescent relationship. One study of Chinese American adolescents found that, for maladjusted adolescents characterized as being anxious, depressed, and withdrawn, levels of acculturation-based conflict between parent and child decreased over time. They concluded that “poorer adjustment may sometimes foreshadow less conflict in the future” (Juang, Syed, Cookston, 2012). This particular group of Hmong boys may be at an increased risk of being maladjusted. They may feel unmotivated to engage in conflicts with their parents or interact with parents in a confrontational way that may be manifested in the low levels of intergenerational conflict reported by these adolescents.

Our finding that high levels of ethnic socialization were associated with lower levels of ethnic identity exploration within the context of low levels of intergenerational conflict, suggest that there may be potential drawbacks in low levels of intergenerational conflict, particularly for Hmong boys. At a developmental stage during which parents may be apprehensive with adolescents’ attempt to challenge authority and seek individualization, it may be that parents should be more concerned when they are not observing these expected behaviors in their adolescents. Rather than dismissing low levels of parent-child conflict, parents may need to explore whether there are underlying issues within their children, such as experiences of discrimination, encounters of psychological stress, or the absence of closeness with parents, which may impede their ability to disagree with parents.
On the other hand, some scholars propose that there is a curvilinear relationship between levels of parent-child conflicts and youth outcomes. For instance, one study found that experiencing moderate levels of conflict was associated with positive outcomes; whereas, high levels of conflict were associated with negative outcomes for youth (Adams & Laursen, 2007). This suggests an inverted U-shaped relationship between intergenerational conflict and youth outcomes, such that high levels and low levels of conflicts relate to negative outcomes. At low levels of conflict, parents and adolescents may have no communication. At high levels of conflict, there may be underlying issues of alienation or family stress that is contributing to the frequent conflicts. At these levels, parents may also display authoritarian behaviors in which parents are more likely to use coercive strategies. In contrast, moderate levels of conflict may be the best scenario for adolescents to develop adaptive outcomes. At moderate levels of conflicts, the parent-child relationship may be characterized as one in which parents encourage adolescents to form their own ideas and express their own perspectives. Parents and adolescents may disagree but there is mutual respect evident in the relationship.

To understand the relationship between ethnic socialization and ethnic identity for boys, fathers’ ethnic socialization should be considered. It is possible that fathers’ ethnic socialization is more salient in the development of adolescent Hmong boys’ ethnic identity. Fathers’ ethnic socialization patterns were not assessed in the current study. In a study on African American adolescents, the authors suggested that ethnic socialization messages from maternal and paternal caregivers had different associations with children’s development (Brown, Linver, Evans, & DeGennaro, 2009). It may be that sharing the same gender as one’s caregiver would facilitate a stronger association between ethnic socialization and ethnic identity for the adolescent. Some scholars suggest that girls are more likely to identify with their female caregivers and boys are more likely to identity with male caregivers (Davy, Fish,
Askew, & Robila, 2003). In this case, mothers’ ethnic socialization efforts may have a greater impact on their daughters’ ethnic identity but less of an impact on their sons’ ethnic identity. Despite the high levels of ethnic socialization from their maternal caregivers, it may be that taking paternal ethnic socialization patterns into consideration would contextualize why this particular group of male adolescents experienced low levels of ethnic identity exploration.

Moreover, the type of relationship that these male adolescents have with their fathers may have a role in the way ethnic socialization relates to their ethnic identity. In a context in which these male adolescents have a poor relationship with their fathers, mothers’ high levels of ethnic socialization may not necessary help them to develop a strong ethnic identity. One study found that fathers’ level of warmth and support was significantly related to adolescent boys’ but not girls’ ethnic identity exploration (Umana-Taylor & Guimond, 2010). They went on to explain that fathers’ supportive parenting behaviors may provide the foundation with which boys needed to explore who they are as ethnic minorities. The unique association between fathers’ support and boys’ ethnic identity exploration suggests that the relationship boys have with their fathers may have an influential role in the way Hmong boys form their ethnic identity. It is possible that this special feature of the father-son relationship combined with mothers’ high level of ethnic socialization would have optimal impact on Hmong boys’ identity formation.

The small number of boys included in the study limits conclusions about the gender patterns. Including a larger number of boys in the study may yield different results and allow the researcher to conduct follow-up analysis comparing boys with high intergenerational conflicts and boys with low intergenerational conflicts. Past studies suggest that ethnic minority men face many challenges in growing up. For instance, they are more likely to experience greater levels of discrimination (Kiang et al., 2012), face greater peer pressure to
conform to masculine expectations (Lee, 2004), and are often less academically successful (Kiang et al., 2012) than their ethnic minority female counterparts. Because of the unique experiences of growing up as ethnic minority males, more information is needed to understand the developmental challenges of growing up and the process by which they negotiate their ethnic identity.

More studies on gender patterns in the ethnic socialization and ethnic identity literature would also help alleviate confusion on the role of gender in the association between ethnic socialization and ethnic identity. Past studies have found conflicting findings, with some studies indicating potential gender differences (Hughes, Rodriguez, et al., 2006; Umana-Taylor & Guimond, 2010; Umana-Taylor, Gonzales-Backen, & Guimond, 2009) and other studies reporting similar patterns for girls and boys (Umana-Taylor, Zeiders, & Updegraff, 2013; Umana-Taylor, O’Donnell, Knight, Roosa, Berkel, & Nair, 2013) in associations between ethnic socialization and ethnic identity. In general, the current study’s finding provides support for the cultural-ecological approach in understanding normative development in immigrant youth (Garcia Coll et al., 1996). Our finding indicates the importance of considering both the quality of the parent-child relationship (i.e., levels of intergenerational conflict) and adolescents’ individual characteristics (i.e., gender) in understanding the association between ethnic socialization and ethnic identity.

**Best Model for Predicting Ethnic Identity**

Using the comprehensive model of all the parents’ and adolescents’ reports of ethnic socialization subscales, intergenerational conflict scores, parents’ educational level, and immigration status, the researcher set out to identify the best set of variables associated with adolescents’ ethnic identity. Of all the types of parental ethnic socialization, Cultural Heritage along with parents’ education level were associated with adolescents’ overall ethnic
identity. When all adolescents’ reports of types of ethnic socialization subscales were considered, Cultural Heritage was associated with ethnic identity.

Cultural Heritage, as an ethnic socialization strategy, refers to parents’ engaging in cultural celebrations and encouraging adolescents to participate in cultural activities. These types of cultural events may present opportunities for adolescents to interact with same ethnic peers, which then would help them to explore who they are and commit to an identity. Phinny, Romero, Nava, and Huang (2001) found social interactions with same ethnic peers supported adolescents’ ethnic identity development. Similarly, Kiang et al. (2010) found that adolescents who had more same-ethnic friends were more likely to have a higher level of ethnic identity belonging (i.e., commitment) and exploration. Opportunities to mingle with peer members who may also be in the process of exploring their own ethnic identity may help create a sense of shared experience among the adolescents and facilitate the experience of forming a solid ethnic identity. Adolescents with fewer opportunities to interact with ethnic group peers may have to exert more active efforts in developing a strong ethnic identity. Therefore, it can be speculated that interactions with ethnic group peers may support and ease the process by which adolescents develop their ethnic identity. However, it is the parent who essentially provides these possibilities to the child by encouraging him or her to engage in cultural activities.

However, Cultural Heritage, as a type of ethnic socialization may have emerged as the strongest subscale in relation to ethnic identity because of the overlap between the items used to measure each construct. For example, items from the Cultural Heritage subscale such as “I encourage my child to participate in cultural practices/My mom encourages me to participate in cultural practices” and “I encourage my child to go to cultural events/My mom encourages me to go to cultural events” may be connected with how adolescents responded to items on the ethnic identity subscale such as “I have often done things that will help me
understand my ethnic group” or “I have often talked to other people in order to learn about my ethnic group.” There is a possibility that parent-child discussion surrounding Hmong culture can be considered as both an ethnic socialization strategy and as a method by which adolescents explore and commit to an ethnic identity.

**Limitations and Future Studies**

There are several limitations to the current study. One limitation is that the results cannot be generalized to the overall Hmong American population. Even though the sample included participants from two different states, the sample was not completely representative of the larger US Hmong population. Replicating similar studies with samples from multiple regions and states, with different socioeconomic backgrounds, educational level, acculturation level, and years in the United States would improve the ability to generalize the results to the general Hmong American population.

Additionally, the inclusion of a more diverse Hmong American population would allow researchers to examine within-group variability. For instance, Umana-Taylor, Zeiders, and Updegraff (2013) examined the relationship between adolescents’ reports of ethnic socialization and their ethnic identity. They found different patterns between the two variables for mothers who were born in a foreign country and mothers who were in the United States. For foreign-born mothers, their ethnic socialization practices were driving youth’s ethnic identity a few years later. High levels of reported ethnic socialization were related to high levels of ethnic identity. For U.S.-born mothers and U.S.-born youth, adolescents’ high level of ethnic identification shaped parents’ ethnic socialization practices. Foreign born mothers may be more invested in cultural maintenance or have a stronger bond with their home country, which in turn would lead them to engage in higher levels of ethnic socialization and, therefore, to children’s higher levels of ethnic identification. In
comparison, U.S.-born mothers may engage in ethnic socialization as a response to interests and cues provided by children. As Hmong families continue to live in the United States and U.S.-born children start their own families, it is important to consider how U.S.-born parents’ ethnic socialization may differ from their foreign-born parents and the process by which changes relate to children’s outcomes. This finding indicates in some way that U.S.-born parents’ ethnic socialization may play a less critical role in their children’s ethnic identity and leads to speculation about whether ethnic socialization from other sources (i.e., peers, media, siblings, grandparents) have a more robust association with U.S.-born adolescents’ ethnic identity.

Another limitation of this study is that it relied on survey data that was collected at one point in time. This limited the researcher’s ability to fully understand the process by which adolescents form and develop their ethnic identity over time. Cross-sectional designs do not capture and monitor the interactive nature of variables over the course of adolescents’ development. In addition, with cross-sectional data, it is not possible to state that high levels of ethnic socialization cause a stronger sense of ethnic identity. It is possible that adolescents with a stronger sense of ethnic identity may actually influence parents to engage in higher levels of ethnic socialization. In correlational studies, the author is only able to suggest that the two variables are related and assess the strength of that association. The best way to discover how adolescents develop their ethnic identity is to use longitudinal data. Past longitudinal studies have found that mothers’ ethnic socialization predicted future levels of adolescents’ ethnic identity (Umana-Taylor & Guimond, 2010; Umana-Taylor, O’Donnell, Knight, Roosa, Berkel, & Nair, 2013; however, longitudinal studies on Southeast Asian youths are limited.

Another limitation of the study is the conceptualization of ethnic socialization as it applies to Hmong families. In this study, the researcher used the Adolescent Racial and
Ethnic Socialization Scale (ARESS) to assess ethnic socialization. This measure was among the few available multidimensional ethnic socialization assessment tools that clearly conceptualized ethnic socialization as a separate construct from racial socialization. Although there were positive attributes of the measure, this measure has only been validated among African American families. This is the first non-African American sample, to the author’s knowledge, to which the measure has been applied. As a result, some items had to be modified to make it more universal so that a non-African American sample would be able to relate to the items. Though the modification of the items was necessary, the process may have changed the psychometric properties of the measure in unexpected ways. A pilot test of the modified version of the ethnic socialization questionnaire would have been helpful in determining whether the measure is a valid and reliable measure of ethnic socialization for a Hmong American sample prior to the actual data collection for this study. For instance, two of the items related to having and reading printed materials (e.g., “My maternal/paternal caregiver has Black magazines like Essence, Ebony, and Jet in the home” and “My maternal/paternal caregiver reads books written by Black writers”) were modified for Hmong American families. The researcher replaced these two items with “My mom has magazines or books that reflect our ethnic background in the home” and “My mom reads books to me about our ethnic background.” The removal of these two items resulted in a higher alpha reliability score for the Cultural Embeddedness subscale, prompting the researchers to question the reliability and validity of the subscale for a Hmong American sample.

However, the two items removed were related to printed materials. This may suggest a few things. The low alpha reliability coefficient calculated for Cultural Embeddedness with these two items may reflect Hmong American families’ tendency to rely on oral communication rather than printed material as their primary mode of communicating about their ethnic culture (Koltyk, 1998). This may be particularly true for the study’s sample, as
the majority of the parents reported that they had never received formal schooling. Because of the small sample size, it was not possible to examine whether Hmong parents with higher levels of education were more likely to have an affinity for books and magazines related to their Hmong background.

Few studies exploring processes of racial socialization have included Asian or Southeast Asian Americans as study samples. Future studies examining the racial socialization patterns within Hmong families living in the United States would provide greater insights into how refugee and immigrant parents are preparing their children for dealing with racial and ethnic discriminatory experiences. Nevertheless, racial socialization and ethnic socialization processes do not operate in isolation but rather within the context of each other. Reflecting this perspective, few studies have examined both processes of racial socialization and ethnic socialization within the same family, which would improve scholars’ ability to compare the differential impact of each type of socialization and the interactive effect of the two types of socialization on youth outcomes.

**Conclusion**

Even though the number of studies on ethnic socialization within Asian American families is growing, these studies should clearly identify the particular subgroup of Asian Americans that is included in their sample. Each group of Asian Americans differs in terms of various contextual factors, including migration history, level of acculturation, socioeconomic status, and unique cultural stressors. These factors have been identified by the cultural-ecological perspectives as having a significant impact on parenting practices and, therefore, on child development (Garcia Coll & Magnuson, 2005). Breaking the larger Asian American sample into their respective subgroups will allow for theory building on specific Asian American subgroups. In light of this, theory building on the parenting practices of
Hmong American families will be difficult to accomplish if studies on Hmong American families group them into the larger group of Asian American families. At a time when there are few research studies available on Hmong American families, including a diverse sample Asian families in developmental studies would enhance and broaden our general understanding of child development, with specific knowledge on the intersection of race, ethnicity, culture, gender, socioeconomic status, and migration status on the impact of human growth and development.

This study provides an important contribution to the literature on ethnic socialization by addressing some of the shortcomings of previous research. Past research on ethnic socialization has focused primarily on African American and Latino American families (Hughes, 2003; Hughes, Rodriguez, et al., 2006; Umana-Taylor, O’Donnell, et al., 2013) and, to a lesser extent, on Asian families. The author built on this foundation to study ethnic socialization practices of Hmong American families, a cultural group from Southeast Asia. This study’s findings were consistent with the few available studies, which show that Hmong American families endorse a wide variety of ethnic socialization strategies (Tran & Lee, 2010; Moua & Lamborn, 2010). The author was also able to measure ethnic socialization from both the parents’ and adolescents’ perspectives; whereas, other studies usually assess ethnic socialization only from the adolescents’ or parents’ perspectives. In addition, the current study’s findings suggest that, as they relate to ethnic socialization and its relationship with ethnic identity, the adolescents’ perspectives may be more important than the parents’ perspectives.

Many studies have worked from a deficit perspective to understand the parenting practices of ethnic minority families and these perspectives are often mirrored in public policies and intervention programs. Some of these policies and programs currently reflect the assumption that the parenting patterns of ethnic minority families are ineffective. Another
assumption is that ethnic minority families must adopt the identified optimal parenting practices, which were informed by research on White, middle-class families, in order to raise successful and well-adjusted children. According to cultural-ecological models, optimal parenting practices will vary depending on cultural and contextual factors (Garcia Coll et al., 1996). As researchers continue to conduct studies from this perspective, administrators and staff members of intervention programs will need to understand how they can leverage ethnic minority families’ ethnic socialization strategies and other culturally responsive parenting strategies to promote the positive development of ethnic minority children. With a large percentage of the Hmong American population under the age of 18 (Pfeifer et al., 2013), it is important for scholars to inform and develop public policies and intervention strategies without undermining the strengths of these families.

Some past studies on Southeast Asian families have focused on the negative developmental outcomes of youth (e.g., delinquent behaviors, negative school adjustments, etc.), with few studies examining these families through a positive developmental psychology lens. Even though some Hmong youth face challenges, many immigrant adolescents are well-adjusted and resilient (Zeiders, Umana-Taylor, & Derlan, 2013). Positive outcomes such as ethnic identity have not been the focus of much research on Hmong youth, even though ethnic identity has been consistently linked to other positive outcomes (e.g., high self-esteem and high academic achievement) (Umana-Taylor et al., 2013) and viewed as a protective factor against perceived discriminatory treatment (Zeiders, Umana-Taylor, & Derlan, 2013) in studies of other ethnic minority groups. Evidently, there are few studies focusing on the positive developmental outcomes of Hmong youth in the literature. This gap presents opportunities for scholars interested in understanding Hmong families to contribute to the emerging literature. In this study, the author found links between ethnic socialization practices and ethnic identity exploration and commitment among Hmong American youth,
which provides some promising evidence that, similar to other ethnic minority youth, parents play an important role in the process of developing a strong sense of ethnic identity.
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Appendices

Appendix A. Modified ARESS Items for Parents

*Cultural Embeddedness*
1. I have magazines that reflect my ethnic background in the home
2. I watch movies, shows, and/or programs that reflect my ethnic background
3. I have art or artwork that reflects our ethnic background
4. I read books to my children about our ethnic background
5. I speak to my children in my native language

*Cultural History*
6. I teach my child about why I came to this country
7. I teach my child that knowing about our cultural history is important
8. I talk to my child about the cultural history of our ethnic background
9. I encourage my child to learn about the history of our people

*Cultural Heritage*
10. I teach my child to never forget his or her heritage
11. I encourage my child to participate in cultural practices
12. I encourage my child to go to cultural events
13. I encourage my child to watch movies that reflect our ethnic background
14. I do things to celebrate cultural holidays

*Cultural Values*
15. I teach my child the importance of family loyalty
16. I teach my child to respect authority figures like teachers, elders, and police
17. I teach my child that people with my ethnic background should give back to our ethnic community
18. I teach my child the importance of people with my ethnic background helping other people with my background

*Ethnic Pride*
19. I teach my child to never be ashamed of his or her skin color
20. I teach my child to have pride in his or her ethnic culture
21. I encourage my child to be proud of his or her background
22. I teach my child that his or her skin color is beautiful
23. I encourage my child to be proud of the accomplishments of our people

*Preparation for Marriage subscale*
2. I train my child to be a good future wife or husband
3. I think it is important for my child to learn how to care for his or her future wife or husband
4. I teach my child that there are certain things he/she needs to learn to be a good wife or husband
5. I talk often about why my child needs to learn to be a good wife or husband
Appendix B. Phinney and Ong’s Multigroup Ethnic Identity-Revised (MEIM-R)

1. I have spent time trying to find out more about my ethnic group, such as its history, traditions, and customs
2. I have a strong sense of belonging to my own ethnic group
3. I understand pretty well what my ethnic group memberships means to me
4. I have often done things that will help me understand my ethnic group
5. I have often talked to other people in order to learn about my ethnic group
6. I feel a strong attachment towards my own ethnic group
Appendix C. Asian American Family Conflicts Scale-Likelihood

1. Your parents tell you what to do with your life, but you want to make your own decisions.
2. Your parents tell you that a social life is not important at this age, but you think that it is.
3. You have done well in school, but your parents’ academic expectations always exceed your performance.
4. Your parents want you to sacrifice personal interests for the sake of the family, but you feel this is unfair.
5. Your parents always compare you to others, but you want them to accept you for being yourself.
6. Your parents argue that they show you love by housing, feeding, and educating you, but you wish they would show more physical and verbal signs of affection.
7. Your parents don’t want you to bring shame upon the family, but you feel that your parents are too concerned with saving face.
8. Your parents expect you to behave like a proper _____________male or female, but you feel your parents are being too traditional.
9. You want to state your opinion, but your parents consider it to be disrespectful to talk back.
10. Your parents demand that you always show respect for elders, but you believe in showing respect only if they deserve it.
Appendix D. Demographic Questions for Students

1. What is your gender?
   ○ Male ○ Female

2. What is your birth date? Fill in the month and year that you were born in the spaces below.
   ___________  ___________
   MONTH  YEAR

3. Indicate which of the following best describes where you were born:
   ○ I was born in the United States
   ○ I was not born in the United States. I was born in a different country.
     Please indicate the country: ________________

4. How long have you lived in the United States?
   ○ 1-2 years
   ○ 3-4 years
   ○ 5-6 years
   ○ 6-7 years
   ○ 7-10 years
   ○ I was born in the United States.

5. Select the one ethnic group that best describes you.
   ○ Southeast Asian, Southeast Asian-American, Hmong, Hmong-American, Laotian, Laotian-American, Vietnamese, or Vietnamese-American
     Please specify______________________________
   ○ East Asian, Chinese, Chinese-American, Japanese, Japanese-American, Korean, or Koreans-Americans
     Please specify____________________________
   ○ Hispanic, Hispanic-American, Latino, Latino-American, Mexican, Mexican-American, Latin, or Latin-American
     Please specify______________________________
   ○ African, African-American, or Black
     Please specify______________________________
   ○ European, European-American, or White
     Please specify______________________________
   ○ American Indian or Native American
     Please specify____________________________
   ○ Biracial, Multiracial, or Mixed
     Please specify____________________________
   ○ Other
     Please specify____________________________
Appendix E. Demographic Questions for Parents

1. What is your gender?
   ○ Male ○ Female

2. What is your birth date? Fill in the month and year that you were born in the spaces below.
   ______________________   ______________________
   MONTH                     YEAR

3. Indicate which of the following best describes where you were born:
   ○ I was born in the United States
   ○ I was not born in the United States. I was born in a different country.
     Please indicate the country: ______________________

4. How long have you lived in the United States?
   ○ 1-2 years
   ○ 3-4 years
   ○ 5-6 years
   ○ 6-7 years
   ○ 7-10 years
   ○ I was born in the United States.

5. If you were not born in the United States, from what country did you come to the United States? ______________________

6. What year did you arrived in the United States? ______________________

7. Who do you live with in addition to your children?
   ○ my husband
   ○ my husband and parents(s)
   ○ my husband and other relatives.
     Indicate who: ______________________
   ○ I live by myself without other adults
   ○ I live with my parent(s)
   ○ I live with other relatives.
     Indicate who: ______________________
   ○ I live with other people not listed above: ______________________
8. What is the highest level of education you finished?
   - Never went to school
   - 8th grade
   - 12th grade, high school, or GED
   - 2 year college
   - 4 year college
   - Masters degree
   - Law degree, Medical degree, or Ph.D.

9. Select the one ethnic group that best describes you.
   - Southeast Asian, Southeast Asian-American, Hmong, Hmong-American, Laotian, Laotian-American, Vietnamese, or Vietnamese-American
     Please specify__________________________
   - East Asian, Chinese, Chinese-Americans, Japanese, Japanese-Americans, Korean, or Koreans-American
     Please specify__________________________
   - Hispanic, Hispanic-American, Latino, Latino-American, Mexican, Mexican-American, Latin, or Latin-American
     Please specify__________________________
   - African, African-American, or Black
     Please specify__________________________
   - European, European-American, or White
     Please specify__________________________
   - American Indian or Native American
     Please specify__________________________
   - Biracial, Multiracial, or Mixed
     Please specify__________________________
   - Other
     Please specify__________________________
Appendix F. Original Items of the Adolescent Racial and Ethnic Socialization Scale (ARESS)

*Cultural Embeddedness*

1. My maternal/paternal caregiver has Black magazines like Essence, Ebony, Jet in the home
2. My maternal/paternal caregiver watches Black television shows
3. My maternal/paternal caregiver has Black art, sculptures, and pictures
4. My maternal/paternal caregiver reads books written by Black writers

*African American History*

5. My maternal/paternal caregiver teaches me about slavery in this country
6. My maternal/paternal caregiver teaches me that knowing about African history is important
7. My maternal/paternal caregiver teaches me that Black slavery is important to never forget
8. My maternal/paternal caregiver encourages me to learn about the history of Blacks

*African American Heritage*

9. My maternal/paternal caregiver teaches me to never forget my heritage
10. My maternal/paternal caregiver encourages me to go to black museums
11. My maternal/paternal caregiver encourages me to go to Black cultural events
12. My maternal/paternal caregiver encourages me to watch documentaries or movies on Black history
13. My maternal/paternal caregiver does things to celebrate Black history month

*African American Cultural Values*

14. My maternal/paternal caregiver teaches me the importance of family loyalty
15. My maternal/paternal caregiver teaches me to respect authority figures like teachers, elders, and police
16. My maternal/paternal caregiver teaches me that Blacks should give back to the Black community
17. My maternal/paternal caregiver teaches me the importance of Black people helping one another

*Ethnic Pride*

18. My maternal/paternal caregiver teaches me to never be ashamed of my skin color
19. My maternal/paternal caregiver teaches me to have pride in my Black culture
20. My maternal/paternal caregiver encourages me to be proud of my background
21. My maternal/paternal caregiver teaches me that my skin color is beautiful
22. My maternal/paternal caregiver encourages me to be proud of the accomplishments of blacks.
Appendix G. Regression Model Using Ethnic Pride, Intergenerational Conflict, and the Interaction of Ethnic Pride and Intergenerational Conflict to Predict Adolescents' Ethnic Identity Exploration and Ethnic Identity Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethnic Identity Exploration</td>
<td>Ethnic Identity Commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tolerance R² ΔF p-value</td>
<td>Tolerance R² ΔF p-value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent ed level</td>
<td>.036 2.083 .129</td>
<td>.033 1.853 .162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in US</td>
<td>.848 .848</td>
<td>.768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent ed level</td>
<td>.089 3.141 .047</td>
<td>.153 7.436 .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in US</td>
<td>.840 .817 .978</td>
<td>.761 .750 .993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Pride</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergenerational Conflict</td>
<td>.975</td>
<td>.976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent ed level</td>
<td>.091 .306 .582</td>
<td>.162 1.093 .298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in US</td>
<td>.828 .813 .976</td>
<td>.754 .750 .988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Pride</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergenerational Conflict</td>
<td>.962</td>
<td>.974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Pride X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergenerational Conflict</td>
<td>.968</td>
<td>.981</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix H. Plots for Parents’ Report of Ethnic Pride Predicting Adolescents’ Ethnic Identity Exploration and Ethnic Identity Commitment
Appendix I. Plots for Adolescents’ Report of Ethnic Pride Predicting Ethnic Identity Exploration and Ethnic Identity Commitment
Appendix J. Regression Model Using Cultural Values, Intergenerational Conflict, and the Interaction of Cultural Values and Intergenerational Conflict to Predict Adolescents’ Ethnic Identity Exploration and Ethnic Identity Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethnic Identity Exploration</td>
<td>Ethnic Identity Commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tolerance R² ΔF p-value</td>
<td>Tolerance R² ΔF p-value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent ed level</td>
<td>.036 2.083 .129 .082 4.980 .008</td>
<td>.033 1.853 .162 .056 3.154 .047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in US</td>
<td>.848</td>
<td>.768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent ed level</td>
<td>.083 2.761 .068 .087 .292 .747</td>
<td>.111 4.600 .012 .137 4.967 .009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in US</td>
<td>.846</td>
<td>.764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Values</td>
<td>.834</td>
<td>.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergenerational Conflict</td>
<td>.977</td>
<td>.950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent ed level</td>
<td>.092 1.150 .286 .087 .013 .908</td>
<td>.141 3.542 .063 .149 1.382 .242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in US</td>
<td>.845</td>
<td>.755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Values</td>
<td>.834</td>
<td>.744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergenerational Conflict</td>
<td>.912</td>
<td>.948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Values X Intergenerational Conflict</td>
<td>.950</td>
<td>.924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergenerational Conflict</td>
<td>.930</td>
<td>.978</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix L. Plots for Adolescents’ Report of Cultural Values Predicting Ethnic Identity Exploration and Ethnic Identity Commitment
Appendix M. Regression Model Using Cultural Heritage, Intergenerational Conflict, and the Interaction of Cultural Heritage and Intergenerational Conflict to Predict Adolescents’ Ethnic Identity Exploration and Ethnic Identity Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethnic Identity Exploration</td>
<td>Ethnic Identity Commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tolerance</td>
<td>$R^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent ed level</td>
<td>.848</td>
<td>.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in US</td>
<td>.848</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent ed level</td>
<td>.839</td>
<td>.103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in US</td>
<td>.818</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Heritage</td>
<td>.952</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergenerational Conflict</td>
<td>.973</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent ed level</td>
<td>.836</td>
<td>.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in US</td>
<td>.810</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Heritage</td>
<td>.924</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergenerational Conflict</td>
<td>.949</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Heritage X Intergenerational Conflict</td>
<td>.938</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix N. Plots for Parents’ Report of Cultural Heritage Predicting Adolescents’ Ethnic Identity Exploration and Commitment
Appendix O. Plots for Adolescents’ Report of Cultural Heritage Predicting Ethnic Identity Exploration and Ethnic Identity Commitment
Appendix P. Regression Model Using Cultural History, Intergenerational Conflict, and the Interaction of Cultural History and Intergenerational Conflict to Predict Adolescents’ Ethnic Identity Exploration and Ethnic Identity Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Parents’ Report of Cultural History</th>
<th>Adolescents’ Report of Cultural History</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethnic Identity Exploration</td>
<td>Tolerance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethnic Identity Commitment</td>
<td>Tolerance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>Parent ed level</td>
<td>.848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Years in US</td>
<td>.848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural History</td>
<td>.983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intergenerational Conflict</td>
<td>.966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>Parent ed level</td>
<td>.846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Years in US</td>
<td>.830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural History</td>
<td>.983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intergenerational Conflict</td>
<td>.966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td>Parent ed level</td>
<td>.837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Years in US</td>
<td>.808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural History</td>
<td>.983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intergenerational Conflict</td>
<td>.964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural History X Intergenerational Conflict</td>
<td>.970</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix Q. Plots for Parents’ Report of Cultural History Predicting Adolescents’ Ethnic Identity Exploration and Ethnic Identity Commitment
Appendix R. Plots for Adolescents’ Report of Cultural History Predicting Ethnic Identity Exploration and Ethnic Identity Commitment
Appendix S. Regression Model Using Cultural Embeddedness, Intergenerational Conflict, and the Interaction of Cultural Embeddedness and Intergenerational Conflict to Predict Adolescents’ Ethnic Identity Exploration and Ethnic Identity Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethnic Identity Exploration</td>
<td>Ethnic Identity Commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tolerance</td>
<td>R²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent ed level</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>2.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in US</td>
<td>.848</td>
<td>.848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent ed level</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>2.897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in US</td>
<td>.833</td>
<td>.834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Embeddedness</td>
<td>.979</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergenerational Conflict</td>
<td>.974</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in US</td>
<td>.824</td>
<td>.834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Embeddedness</td>
<td>.974</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergenerational Conflict</td>
<td>.971</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Embeddedness X</td>
<td>.977</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergenerational Conflict</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix T. Plots for Parents’ Report of Cultural Embeddedness Predicting Adolescents’ Ethnic Identity Exploration and Ethnic Identity Commitment
Appendix U. Plots for Adolescents’ Report of Cultural Embeddedness Predicting Ethnic Identity Exploration and Ethnic Identity Commitment
Appendix V. Regression Model Using Preparation for marriage, Intergenerational Conflict, and the Interaction of Preparation for marriage and Intergenerational Conflict to Predict Adolescents’ Ethnic Identity Exploration and Ethnic Identity Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Parents’ report of Preparation for Marriage</th>
<th>Adolescents’ report of Preparation for Marriage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EthnIdol_Exp</td>
<td>EthnIdol_Commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tolerance</td>
<td>R²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>Parent ed level</td>
<td>.848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Years in US</td>
<td>.848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>Parent ed level</td>
<td>.727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Years in US</td>
<td>.835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prep for Marriage</td>
<td>.773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intergenerational Conflict</td>
<td>.907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td>Parent ed level</td>
<td>.716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Years in US</td>
<td>.832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prep for marriage</td>
<td>.717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intergenerational Conflict</td>
<td>.904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prep for marriage X Intergenerational Conflict</td>
<td>.927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prep for marriage X Intergenerational Conflict</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix W. Plots for Parents’ Report of Preparation for Marriage Predicting Adolescents’ Ethnic Identity Exploration and Ethnic Identity Commitment
Appendix X. Plots for Adolescents’ Report of Preparation for Marriage Predicting Ethnic Identity Exploration and Ethnic Identity Commitment
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