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ABSTRACT

The current study is an assessment of whether a language acculturation discrepancy (LAD) within families is most predictive of emotional and behavioral problems for Latina/o youth when relevant variables are controlled. A sample of predominantly Mexican American parent-child dyads was recruited to complete a language-based measure of acculturation and parent participants completed an assessment of their child’s emotional and behavioral functioning. Results indicated a total difference value between parent-child levels of language acculturation to be most predictive of the outcome. Additionally, the child’s level of language acculturation, independent of that of the parent, was also found to account for a significant amount of variance. Results indicate support for the acculturation gap-distress hypothesis based on discrepancies in language use and proficiency. Limitations of the findings and directions for future research are also discussed.
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Chapter One

Introduction

In working with the Latina/o population, there are various combinations of language most frequently spoken between child and caregiver. This includes everything from monolingual (Spanish-speaking only) parent and child, bilingual parent and child, to monolingual (English-speaking only) parent and child. Of primary interest in this study are discrepancies in levels of language acculturation between the child and his or her caregivers (e.g., bilingual or English-speaking child living with monolingual, Spanish-speaking parents or caregivers).

Bilingualism is a growing phenomenon worldwide, commonly occurring within the U.S. as well. According to the U.S. Census Bureau (2006), 19.7% of the total population within the U.S. over the age of five reported to speak a language other than English. Within this group, over 24 million reported they spoke English “less than very well” (U.S. Census Bureau, 2006). It was reported that in the state of Colorado, 17.2% of the population over the age of five reported speaking a language other than English, of which over 350,000 reported speaking English “less than very well” (U.S. Census Bureau, 2006). According to this same source, within Colorado and across the entire United States, Spanish-speakers accounted for the largest group of those speaking a language other than English.

Acculturation is typically conceptualized on a continuum from full endorsement of the language, values, norms, interest, and behavioral patterns of the traditional culture
to full adoption of the language, values, interest, and behavioral patterns of the mainstream American culture (Pasch, Deardorff, Tschann, Flores, Penilla, & Pantoja, 2006). The current study focuses on a particular aspect of acculturation, that being language. Specifically, one’s proficiency and use of English or Spanish, and the meaning derived from differences occurring within families on these acculturation dimensions was of interest. The subsequent subsections of this chapter will further illustrate the research that has been conducted with the Latina/o population as it relates to language acculturation discrepancy within families as a risk factor for emotional and behavioral disorders. The current study seeks to contribute to the existing research that has been conducted on these factors, as well as add new insight into how discrepancies in language acculturation between parent and child may be a predictor of emotional and behavioral problems in Latina/o youth.

*The Acculturation Gap-Distress Hypothesis*

As noted, acculturation is generally understood to be the degree of adherence to the culture of origin, as well as the degree of endorsement toward the host culture and one important aspect of this within families is that adolescents tend to acculturate more and faster than their parents (Pasch et al., 2006). Language acculturation has been described as an aspect of behavioral acculturation which typically occurs immediately after immigrants arrive in the new country (Birman & Poff, 2010). This occurs as families engage in the process of communicating in the new language and adapting to behavioral norms and expectations in the new society (Birman & Poff, 2010). The way language acculturation is measured can vary, as will be shown in the description of studies in subsequent chapters. However, support has been demonstrated for a
multidimensional approach to assessing distinct dimensions of acculturation (Birman & Trickett, 2001).

The work of Szapocznik is widely regarded in the extant literature as an explanation for unmatched levels of parent and child acculturation. Children commonly acculturate faster than adults creating an acculturation gap between generations that appears to precipitate family stress (Szapocznik & Kurtines, 1980). Szapocznik, Santisteban, Kurtines, Ferez-Vidai and Hervis (1984) stated that one contributing source of behavior disorders and family disruption found in Cuban immigrant families was the development of intergenerational differences in behavioral acculturation. It has been hypothesized that heightened levels of parent-child conflict would emerge due to discrepancies in values, interests, and language competence between immigrant parents and their children (Szapocznik & Kurtines, 1993). The acculturation gap-distress hypothesis has been described as the clash of values and preferences arising from intergenerational acculturation gaps that lead to family conflict, which in turn result in youth maladjustment (Lau et al., 2005). Vega, Khoury, Zimmerman, Gil, and Warheit (1995) found that the failure to resolve these differences can result in youth emotional and behavioral problems (e.g., depression, anxiety, ADHD, oppositional defiant disorder) as measured by the Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL).

Differences between parents and youth in their degrees of acculturation can create acculturation gaps that increase stress in a family, which then can disrupt effective parenting and healthy youth adjustment (Martinez, 2006). This acculturation gap is highly dependent on years of U.S. residency for immigrant Latina/o families, and the acculturation gap tends to increase with greater exposure to U.S. culture (Martinez,
2006). This process has been referred to as differential acculturation and has been theoretically linked to adolescent problematic behavior (Szapocznik, Kurtines, & Fernandez, 1980).

According to Lau et al. (2005), a match between parent and child in acculturation would be associated with a low risk of family conflict and associated youth problems. Conversely, as these authors explained, mismatches in acculturation levels would result in conflict and conduct problems, especially when the child is more aligned with the host culture than the parent. Further, according to Lau et al. (2005), the acculturation gap-distress hypothesis does not make clear the importance of intergenerational gaps with respect to adherence to mainstream culture versus gaps in adherence to native culture.

Status of the Literature: Impact of the Acculturation Process

Other factors that have been described in the literature as placing higher levels of stress on Latina/o adolescents and families are related to the process of migrating to the U.S. (Cavazos-Rehg, Zayas, Spitznagel, 2007). Families dealing with the after effects of immigration are the most likely to experience role reversals (Martinez, McClure, & Eddy, 2009). Children adapt more readily to the new environment due to their immersion into the educational system and contact with non-Latina/o, English-speaking peers (Greenberg-Garrison, Roy & Azar, 1999). As a result of their rapid acculturation and grasp of the English language, children are often called upon by parents to assume adult roles and responsibilities, including serving as interpreter, negotiating with services providers, and handling the family’s finances (Greenberg-Garrison et al., 1999). This blurring of boundaries leads to increased stress for children and apparent loss of power for parents, which is likely to be a source of poor family functioning. In a study on the
impact of cultural and familial variables on behavioral and emotional problems in Latina/o children, Weiss, Goebel, Page, Wilson, and Warda (1999) found that ethnic identity or parent cultural orientation were not found to be factors associated with emotional and behavioral disorders in adolescents (Weiss et al., 1999). These same authors indicated that immigration related to financial difficulty (income) was also not found to be a predictor of emotional and behavioral disorders. However, parent immigration status, those not born in the U.S., was found to be a factor associated with psychological difficulties (Weiss et al., 1999).

Romero and Roberts (2003) found instances of stress as they relate to language in both immigrant and U.S. born adolescents of Mexican descent. However, the way in which language might serve as a stressor is a question warranting further investigation. For example, Romero and Roberts (2003) argued that being monolingual may be stressful for youths living in a bilingual world. This could be the case for those that are English-speaking only or Spanish-speaking only. Therefore, these authors posited that bilingual youths are far better adapted to living in the bilingual environment. Findings indicated that youths of Mexican descent experienced stress resulting from stressors unique to their dual cultural and linguistic contexts, including more depressive symptoms, even after demographics and levels of self-esteem were accounted for (Romero & Roberts, 2003).

Romero and Roberts (2003) indicated the purpose of their study was to assess stress that may result from intergenerational acculturation gaps, monolingual stressors, and discrimination. Their findings suggested that these stressors were associated with more depressive symptoms for youths of Mexican descent. It was recommended that future research must include measures on the bicultural context of coping to improve our
understanding of the positive factors that result from a bicultural context (Romero & Roberts, 2003). A better understanding of the bicultural/bilingual environment of Latina/o youths and the complexities of predictors of mental health in Latina/o populations can be developed from research questions identifying culture-specific coping methods and bicultural stressors (Romero & Roberts, 2003). Language acculturation discrepancy is one component of a bilingual environment that is worthy of further investigation.

*The Role of Language for Latina/o Families in the United States*

In examining the Latina/o population within the United States, it is important to consider the implications of language use. For example, Falicov (1998) explains that as immigrants – or the “American” descendants of immigrants – remain in this country, they may develop fluency in English, and with it, new cognitive structures for articulating ideas. This occurs regardless of the length of time one’s family has been in the U.S. Language is believed to be far more than a means of communication (Santiago-Rivera & Altarriba, 2002). It extends beyond one’s level of fluency or competency and represents memory, affect, and interpersonal experiences (Biever et al., 2002; Falicov, 1998).

While bilingual competence and alternating between languages represents an invaluable resource for adaptation (Sciarra & Ponterotto, 1991), the use of both languages can present challenges in adjustment and family conflict (Santiago-Rivera & Altarriba, 2002). Furthermore, bilingual individuals may experience a different sense of self due to varying levels of acculturation and language spoken (Valdez, 2000). According to Falicov (1998), family members often differ widely in language proficiency and in their positive or negative regard for Spanish or English. Those differences sometimes
compound and symbolize loyalty conflicts between past and present, or between polarized stances on the decision to remain, or to return to the homeland (Falicov, 1998). The potential impact of language on individuals within the same family can compound other stressors and challenges often faced by Latina/os.

It is unclear as to the role that language retention, proficiency and use (in English or Spanish) plays in perpetuating decreases in adjustment and socioemotional difficulties for Latina/os living in the U.S. (Lau et al., 2005). Little is known about whether or not bilingual Latina/os living in the United States are at a higher risk of maladjustment (Martinez, 2006). Additional research is needed to specifically explore if Latina/os living in the United States are at a greater risk for decreases in well-being based on the language acculturation discrepancy between parents and children.

**Parent-Child Interaction with Latina/o Families**

Although there is often times disagreement and separation in the relationships between adolescents and parents, there is more of a clash of values between immigrant parents and their teenage children. Such a conflict manifests itself in many areas including attitudes toward sexuality, gender definitions, interpretations of hierarchies, standards for curfew, alcohol use, and dating (Falicov, 1998). The varying levels of acculturation for Latina/o youth and their parents is an area that has received little attention. For example, the study by Weiss et al. (1999) offers insight into differing levels of acculturation and the accompanying degrees of stress for parents and their children. These authors found children to have higher vulnerability to mental health problems when their families faced challenges associated with acculturation. Szapocznik, Kurtines, Santisteban, and Rio (1990) found with clinic-referred Cuban American
families, the hallmark of intergenerational acculturative conflict is adolescents’ overt rejection of parental authority coupled with striving for autonomy and individualism. Furthermore, parents may attempt to regain control over their children and restrict their acculturative transformation, but these efforts are often unsuccessful, resulting in adolescents’ loss of emotional support from their family and parent-child alienation from each other (Szapocznik et al., 1990).

There is evidence in the extant literature that youth are frequently encouraged to become more “Americanized” by their parents as a means of helping the parents, and the family as a whole, navigate living in the U.S. The mediating role played by children who speak the new language and understand the new society better than their parents is a common occurrence (Martinez et al., 2009). The youth’s growth in acculturation and proficiency in English can provide benefits to the parents. In such cases, youth serve as representatives for their parents in the larger, dominant culture which may have positive or negative implications for the family (Martinez et al., 2009). While some Latina/o adolescents strive to maintain their culture of origin, there have been empirical and theoretical indications that adolescents also often wish to reject, or at least not identify with their parents’ generation, culture, and immigration status, which can often create tension (Cavazos-Rehg et al., 2007; Falicov, 1998; Martinez, 2006; Szapocznik & Kurtines, 1993).

Latina/o adolescents often face greater responsibilities toward parents and younger siblings as compared to their non-Latina/o white counterparts (Falicov, 1998; Romero & Roberts, 2003). Migration often complicates this situation even further (Cavazos-Rehg et al., 2007). Parents who might otherwise work out a gradual separation
from their teens find the task especially difficult because of their dependency on the older child to act as translator of language and culture (Falicov, 1998; Martinez et al., 2009). Students with high levels of social and environmental protective factors (e.g., supportive parents, friends, and participation in school activities) were found to report higher levels of academic success than students with similar risk factors and lower levels of such supports (Perez, Espinoza, Ramos, & Cortes, 2009). Such findings indicate support for why some parents are supportive of the acculturation gap (Villanueva & Buriel, 2010). Addressing what specific variables, such as those related to language acculturation, predict low levels of risk for emotional and behavioral problems in adolescents is something that needs to be explored further (Perez et al., 2009).

*Latina/o Families and Service Utilization*

The impact of language and help-seeking behaviors for mental healthcare within the Latina/o population is another area that has been fairly well-documented in the medical (psychiatric) literature (Atdjian & Vega, 2005; Laraque & Szilagyi, 2009). Language barriers have been found to be a source of the disparities in mental health treatment, with Latina/o populations utilizing services at a lower rate (Lopez et al., 2008). Culture issues and limited language proficiencies can profoundly affect Latina/o children’s health and quality of care by limiting access to institutional and healthcare systems (Flores et al., 2002). Further, language problems (i.e., limited English proficiency of the parent) can have a significant impact on multiple aspects of the health care of Latina/o children, including access to services, overall health status, use of services (e.g., medical, dental, behavioral health, case management), and health (including mental health) outcomes (Flores et al., 2002). A previous study conducted at a
pediatric primary care clinic indicated Latina/o parents considered language barriers of the parent as the single greatest barrier to health care access for their children (Flores, Abreu, Oliver, & Kastner, 1998). Such findings offer evidence of the importance of developing a better understanding of the impact of lower levels of English language acculturation within families.

The Impact of Language

Language, in terms of frequency of use and preference, has also been documented to have impact in other areas for Latina/o youth and their families. The importance of school-based mental health and increasing parental involvement in school related programs are areas that have received attention in the literature. A family’s preferred language (English or Spanish) can be a predictor of family participation in school-based services (Dillman-Carpentier, Mauricio, Gonzales, Millsap, Meza, Dumka, Germán, & Genalo, 2007). In assessing rates of enrollment in a family focused prevention program, Dillman-Carpentier et al. (2007) found that family language preference emerged as a significant predictor of participation in the program, with Spanish-speakers enrolling at higher rates than those electing to participate in English. In addition to initial enrollment, language preference also predicted higher rates of ongoing participation in the program for Spanish-speakers (Dillman-Carpentier et al., 2007). These authors utilized the Bidimensional Acculturation Scale for Hispanics (BAS) (Marín & Gamba, 1996) to measure family language preference, claiming language use (in both English and Spanish) is the single best marker of acculturation status. In this study, family language preference was a grouping variable that provided a family level index of acculturation. In other words, one score on acculturation was derived for the entire family, as opposed to
individual acculturation scores of family members, or a parent acculturation score and child acculturation score. Therefore, while this score does not assess the acculturation gap, these results imply that the language most frequently used (English or Spanish) is an important variable in engaging Latina/o families in mental health services.

Regardless of addressing mental health needs, there appears to be a benefit to enhancing parental involvement with schools as a means to improve the academic outcomes of Latina/o youth. Spanish-speaking Latina/o families are less likely than White, English-speaking non-Latina/os to seek help from agencies and professionals, including schools (Greenberg-Garrison et al., 1999). This relationship reportedly persists even when controlling for SES and insurance coverage. This finding leads one to consider the role that language may play in the degree of parental involvement in schools. However, little is known about how a parent’s frequency of language use (e.g., whether or how often they speak English) affects their involvement with school systems (Dillman-Carpentier et al., 2007). Spanish-speaking parents of bilingual kids may contribute to their children’s problems because of their reluctance to interact with the school systems, due in part to the school’s lack of an appropriate means to communicate with them (Dillman-Carpentier et al., 2007; Garrison et al., 1999).

In addition to the barriers described above, numerous cultural considerations need to be addressed in order to explain parental reluctance to engage in school and other services for their children and how language may be related. Incompatibilities between home and school in primary languages, cognitive and relational styles, and values may cause confusion and conflicts for Latina/o children who live within two sets of cultural codes (Falicov, 1998). Parents are therefore forced to deal with these cultural clashes
whenever their interactions with children involve school issues (Falicov, 1998). The relationship between frequency of language use and the cultural and academic consequences described above need to be better understood. It is also important to recognize the contribution to the problem made by schools, healthcare systems, and other institutions. That is to say, little is done on the part of institutional systems to provide culturally competent services that better address the needs of families that primarily adhere to speaking Spanish (Dillman-Carpentier et al., 2007; Flores et al., 2002).

Therefore, the impact of incompatible language use between parent and child as it may affect family interactions and adjustment problems inside the home, as well as in contact with external systems, warrants further investigation (Dillman-Carpentier et al., 2007; Flores et al., 2002; Perez et al., 2009).

Older children in Latina/o families are the most likely to find themselves in the confusing role of parent to their parents, as well as, parent to their siblings (Falicov, 1998; Martinez et al., 2009). The positive and negative implications of placing children in these roles will be discussed in Chapter Two. While it appears there are some positive implications for what is described in the literature as language brokering, there is evidence this involves placing youth in situations that are not developmentally appropriate (Love & Buriel, 2007; Martinez et al., 2009). While placing children in the potentially stressful role of translator (i.e., Language Brokering) is not the only question concern in the current study, the previously described literature offers insight into potentially stressful situations faced by bilingual youth. This is an example of how being caught in the middle of the acculturation gap, or having discrepant levels of language
acculturation, may serve as a source of stress leading to subsequent emotional and behavior problems for bilingual youth.

Statement of Purpose

The main purpose of this study is to investigate whether language acculturation discrepancy among parents and adolescents predicts higher rates of emotional and behavioral disorders in Latina/o youth. Among the myriad of cultural and demographic variables that have been examined in the scientific literature, an analysis of the actual levels of language acculturation discrepancy within families as a predictor of emotional and behavioral problems is an area that is limited in the extant literature.

As will be shown in the review of the literature in Chapter Two, the means of measuring acculturation is often determined by the frequency of language use. Some studies offer analysis on differing levels of acculturation between groups (e.g., between families or ethnic groups), yet do not offer insight into discrepant levels of acculturation within families (e.g., between parent and child). Other studies utilize more comprehensive measures of acculturation that go beyond frequency of language used. Often, studies using such measures include an examination of discrepant levels of acculturation between parents and youth. However, even when frequency of language use is included in these more comprehensive measures of acculturation, the direct analysis of language variables is not provided in the results or discussion of the study. In other words, among the studies offering insight into the differing levels of acculturation between parents and children, the degree to which this language acculturation discrepancy (LAD) accounts for such differences has not been analyzed. Therefore, it
has yet to be determined whether or not language acculturation discrepancy is a risk factor for (i.e., predictive of) such problematic emotional and behavioral functioning.

**Research Questions and Hypothesis**

Table 1 states the hypotheses and primary research questions, the measures to be used, and how the data will be analyzed. The hypotheses for the current study include a prediction that there will be a positive relationship (correlation) between a high degree of language acculturation discrepancy (LAD) between parents and their children (as measured by the BAS) with higher scores of emotional and behavioral problems, as measured by the CBCL, in Latina/o youth participants. It is also hypothesized that a high language brokering environment (as measured by the LB question on the demographic questionnaire) will have a positive relationship with higher scores of total emotional problems for Latina/o youth participants. Finally, it is hypothesized that the presence of language acculturation discrepancy (LAD), as measured by the value of the difference in language acculturation between the parent/caregiver and child participant, will be the most predictive variable of total emotional problems, as measured by the CBCL parent report, in Latina/o youth participants when additional variables are controlled. Additionally, when the parent-child dyad’s placement in the LAD interaction model is considered instead of the LAD total difference score, it will also be significantly predictive of total emotional and behavioral problems.
Table 1
Hypotheses and Research Questions for the Study*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Questions</th>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Measures to be Used</th>
<th>Statistical Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Is there a relationship between LAD and the Latina/o adolescents’ total problems subscale scores?</td>
<td>A significant positive relationship will exist between adolescents’ total problems scores and LAD.</td>
<td>1) CBCL Parent Report, Total Problems subscale 2) BAS – total score difference between parent/caregiver and child.</td>
<td>Pearson Product Moment correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Is there a relationship between language brokering and total problems in Latina/o adolescents?</td>
<td>A positive relationship will exist between a language brokering environment and total emotional problems.</td>
<td>1) CBCL Parent Report, Total Problems subscale 2) Demographics question #11.</td>
<td>Pearson Product Moment correlation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3. Can total problems in Latina/o adolescents be predicted by specific parent and child predictor variables? | a. The LAD total difference will account for the highest degree of variance of the total problems composite subscale.  

   b. Placement in the LAD interaction model will also account for the highest degree of variance of the total problems composite subscale when LAD total difference is not included in the model. | 1) CBCL Parent report, Total Problems subscale 2) Demographic variables: child length of time in the U.S., gender of child, the specific language acculturation score of the child, the language brokering score of the child. 3) BAS the value of the total difference in language acculturation between the parent and child. | Hierarchical Regression Analysis |

*See Chapter Three for a detailed description of measures and how they are used.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acculturation</td>
<td>A process of cultural transformation initiated by contacts between different cultures. The overall process of cultural involvement encompassing two subcomponents: a) the extent to which acculturating individual or group retains culture-of-origin involvement and b) the extent to which host culture involvement is established.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acculturation Gap Distress</td>
<td>The clash of values and preference arising from intergenerational acculturation gaps that leads to family conflict, which in turn results in youth maladjustment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assimilation</td>
<td>Where an ethnic group loses distinctiveness and becomes absorbed into a majority culture. The degree to which a person develops an association of host culture involvement, typically referring to high levels of host culture involvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biculturalism</td>
<td>Near native-like knowledge of two cultures; includes the ability to respond effectively to the different demands of these two cultures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingualism</td>
<td>Being able to communicate effectively in two or more languages, with more or less the same degree of proficiency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enculturation</td>
<td>The process by which an individual learns the traditional content of a culture-of-origin and assimilates its practices and values. The degree to which a person maintains association with culture-of-origin, typically referring to high levels of culture-of-origin involvement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2, continued  
Definition of Terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language Acculturation</td>
<td>The degree to which a person continues to utilize their culture-of-origin language as well as the acquisition and utilization of the language of the host culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrepancy (LAD)</td>
<td>Differences in language competencies between immigrant parents and their children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Broker</td>
<td>The role of intermediary between the cultural and linguistic divides that separate one’s family from the host culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Brokering</td>
<td>The process of assisting and translating/interpreting for others in complex situations. <em>Language brokers</em> are typically the children in families that have acquired language proficiency in English and have acculturated to host culture norms more quickly than their parents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latina/o</td>
<td>Refers to people originating from, or having a heritage related to, Latin America – including Central America, South America, and the Caribbean – in recognition of the fact that this set of people is actually a superset of many nationalities. It is a term most commonly used within the United States to unite this ethnically and culturally diverse population.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nativity</td>
<td>Place of birth. The association between U.S. cultural involvement and negative outcomes is commonly related to nativity, length of time in the U.S., and English language facility and use.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Mio, Trimble, Arredondo, Cheatham & Sue, 1999)
Summary

Chapter One presented an introduction to the importance of studying the Latina/o population and provided an overview of the acculturation process. Specifically, the chapter provided a description of the Acculturation Gap-Distress Hypothesis, which has been theoretically and empirically linked to difficulties in adjustment within Latina/o families when youth adhere more strongly and at a faster rate to the dominant culture than their parents. The chapter also highlighted some of the specific difficulties that occur for some Latina/os as part of the acculturation process, namely as it relates to typical parent-child interactions within Latina/o families and the challenges in service utilization (largely due to lack of accommodations made by schools and service providers). Finally, the chapter provided an overview of the importance that language (in terms of use and proficiency) can have for families engaged in the acculturation process. The chapter concluded by stating the research questions and hypotheses, as well as providing definitions of terms that will be frequently used throughout the remainder of the study.
Chapter Two

Literature Review

Introduction

Chapter two provides a review of literature related to several aspects of acculturation and language issues within the Latina/o population. Included in this section is a discussion of the population, the acculturation process, and information related to the trends of mental health issues for this population in the United States.

Bialystok (2007), in a commentary on language acquisition and bilingualism and their consequences for a multilingual society wrote, “Language is the key interface between our social and cognitive worlds” (p. 393). The author offered a theoretical commentary that children growing up in bilingual environments are likely to have far different experiences than those growing up using only one language. Additionally, these differences may have a deep and long lasting impact on children’s social, cognitive, and linguistic development (Bialystok, 2007). Understanding the effects of a bicultural/bilingual environment of Latina/o youths, including how differing language environments affect children’s adjustment, requires a deep examination of social and cognitive experiences one encounters (Bialystok, 2007; Romero & Roberts, 2003).

The aim of this literature review is to highlight some of the existing theoretical and empirical research relevant in understanding the contextual factors of English language acculturation experienced by Latina/o youth in the United States today. A description of the Latina/o population in the United States initiates the discussion on the
role of English language acculturation within this group. A description of the roles played by bilingual (Spanish and English) adolescents, namely language brokering, in which children serve as translators to aid in their family’s navigation of living in the dominant culture, is included.

The Latina/o Population in the United States

The terms Latina/o and Hispanic encompass individuals living in the United States with ancestry from Mexico, Puerto Rico, Cuba, El Salvador, the Dominican Republic, and other Latin American countries (Sue & Sue, 1977). Latina/os in the United States are a varied, heterogeneous population of immigrants from many different countries, settings, and cultures (Falicov, 1998). According to the U.S. Census Bureau (2009), “The terms ‘Hispanic’ or ‘Latino’ refer to persons who trace their origin or descent to Mexico, Puerto Rico, Cuba, and the Spanish-speaking countries of Central and South America. Origin can be considered as the heritage, nationality group, lineage, or country of the person or the person's parents or ancestors before their arrival in the United States. People who identify their origin as Hispanic or Latino may be of any race” (U.S. Census Bureau, 2009).

An explanation of the difference between the terms “Hispanic” and “Latino” is worth noting. Santiago-Rivera and Altarriba (2002) stated that the term Hispanic was used to categorize a group of people by their common Language – Spanish. Additionally, while the term Hispanic appears in most counseling and psychotherapy literature, the term Latino, according to these authors, has been increasing because it “represents a political consciousness and a sense of ethnic pride, particularly among those residing in the United States” (p. 30). Falicov (1998) further explains that politically correct-minded
groups prefer “Latino” because it reaffirms their native, pre-Hispanic identity. While Spanish is a language derived from Latin that was first spoken in the Americas by the Spanish Conquerors, “Latino” is a more democratic alternative to “Hispanic” because Hispanic is a term strongly supported by politically conservative groups that regard their Spanish European ancestry superior to the “conquered” indigenous groups of the Americas (Santiago-Rivera & Altarriba, 2002). For these reasons, unless directly referencing literature using the term Hispanic, the term Latina/o will be used in this paper to reference people living in the United States whose ancestors are immigrants from Latin American countries, and/or to reference those that are immigrants themselves.

It has been well documented this population is one of the fastest growing in the United States. According to recent data from the U.S. Census Bureau (2009), the Hispanic/Latina/o population in the United States in the year 2000 was approximately 35.3 million and was projected to be 47.8 million in 2010, raising the total percent of the population from 12.5 to a projected 15.5 in each year respectively. It is estimated that Mexican-Americans account for two-thirds of this population. Reportedly, between 2000 and 2006 Hispanics/Latina/os accounted for one half of the nation’s growth. Between these years the Hispanic/Latina/o growth rate of 24.3% was more than three times the growth rate of the total population (U.S. Census Bureau, 2009).

The Latina/o population in the United States is an extremely heterogeneous group. There is a myriad of subcultures (Cuban, Dominican, Mexican, Puerto Rican, Salvadoran, etc.) distinct migration patterns, geographic settlement areas, customs, practices, and beliefs. Additionally, different words, phrases, accents and slang can vary widely among those groups who consider Spanish their primary language. At the same time however,
the core of the Spanish language is a common cultural characteristic that unifies this diverse population of people (Falicov, 1998; Santiago-Rivera & Altarriba, 2002; Sciarra & Ponterotto, 1991). Additionally, Spanish is a means for maintaining cultural traditions and remains the dominant language spoken in most Cuban, Puerto Rican, and Mexican American homes in the United Stated (Falicov 1998; Santiago-Rivera & Altarriba 2002). These authors agree that the reason for the popularity in usage of the Spanish language occurs because the majority of individuals from other Spanish-speaking countries migrate to Latina/o communities and continue to engage in many cultural traditions. Therefore, it is reasonable to expect that Latina/o children living in the United States frequently grow up in a bilingual environment, especially in more recently immigrated families.

**Acculturation, Ethnic Identity, and Language**

Acculturation, ethnic identity, and other cultural implications have been shown to be an important determinant of internalizing and externalizing emotional and behavioral disorders among Latina/o youth (Cabassa & Zayas, 2007; Romero & Roberts, 2003; Vega, Gil, & Zimmerman, 1993). According to Marín and Marín (1991), acculturation has been operationalized as language use, which accounts for the greatest portion of variance in acculturation scales (Epstein, Doyle, & Botvin, 2003), is a valid measure, and has a low misclassification rate (Marín & Marín, 1991). Use of the heritage language for immigrant families is necessary for communication, but it is also a symbol of their ethnic identity (Kim & Chao, 2009). Language can be considered a measure of ethnic identity because it distinguishes group membership and provides a means of transmitting cultural heritage (Kim & Chao, 2009).
Acculturation Strain

Acculturation refers to changes in behavior, attitudes, norms and values after exposure to a new culture (Epstein, Doyle, Botvin, 2003). Guilamo-Ramos, Jaccard, Johansson, and Turrisi (2004) described some of the theoretical underpinnings of stress experienced during the process of acculturation. These authors stated, “Acculturation strain theory emphasizes the importance of stressful situations related to adaptation to a host culture. The development of problem behaviors... is a result of stress-inducing factors that increase an individual’s vulnerability to problem behaviors” (p 136).

Specifically, recent immigrants to the United States may experience difficulties related to language barriers. At the same time, Latina/os living in the U.S. for longer periods may be likely to experience greater levels of racial and ethnic discrimination and may occupy a low social status within the host culture (Guilamo-Ramos et al., 2004). The stress caused by acculturation has the strong potential to impact an individual’s wellbeing and ability to function at a level they are accustomed to. Guilamo-Ramos et al. (2004) stated, “The cumulative effects of these stress-inducing factors are thought to lead to the development of problem behaviors” (p 136). Further, it has been shown that when the acculturation process is not buffered by personal resources, higher levels of stress are likely to be experienced (Perez et al., 2009; Vega et al., 1993).

Acculturation, as Measured by Language

Smokowski, David-Ferdon, and Stroupe (2009) provided a comprehensive review of acculturation related variables that influence adolescent interpersonal and self-directed violence within the Latina/o population. These authors provided an overview of acculturation, indicating there are unidirectional trends that result from interactions
between dominant and non-dominant groups. This includes the non-dominant group taking on the language, laws, religions, norms, and behaviors of the dominant group. Although these authors have created a working definition, they also suggested there is no universally accepted definition of acculturation (Smokowski et al., 2009). Their article is a meta-review of articles that measured acculturation in a variety of ways including, language use, generation status, acculturation stress, and ethnic identity. This subsection of the chapter reviews the studies that have utilized language related variables as indicators of acculturation.

In a study of 175 Mexican-origin families examining the relationship between the linguistic acculturation of mothers and adolescents with a variety of family mediators and adolescent mental health outcomes, Gonzales, Deardorff, Formoso, Barr, and Barrera (2006) utilized adolescent, maternal, and family linguistic acculturation as a measure of acculturation in order to explain the family mediators of adolescent mental health. These authors stated that although many cultural dimensions are expected to change as individuals acculturate, their study was conducted with a data set that only included a language-based measure of acculturation (Gonzales et al., 2006). Despite this narrow assessment, English language use is viewed as the single best marker of acculturative status (Marín & Gamba, 1996) and “has been used almost exclusively in the prior research that established the acculturation-problem behavior link” (Gonzales et al., 2006, p. 319). In the Gonzales et al. (2006) study, acculturation was represented as a latent construct based on adolescent and mother self-reports of linguistic acculturation using four items from a 20-item acculturation scale (Cuéllar, Harris, & Jasso, 1980). The items included: what language do you speak, what language do you prefer, what language do
you read better, and what language do you write better? The behavior measure utilized in this study was the Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL) and the Youth Self Report (YSR; Achenbach, 1991).

Results of the Gonzales et al. (2006) study were mixed in describing this language-based measure of acculturation and mental health outcomes. Latina/o youth acculturation (as measured by the four language questions indicated above) was found to be positively related to adolescent reported conduct problems but was unrelated to the mother report of conduct problems. Additionally, maternal acculturation was found to be positively related to adolescent and mother reported conduct problems in the adolescent. The direct relationship between family acculturation (as indicated by a correlation between mother and adolescent self-reported acculturation), and adolescent or mother reported conduct problems, was not found to be significant. Of important note, a discrepancy between parent and adolescent acculturation levels (as measured by language) was not a factor analyzed by these authors.

Gonzales et al. (2006) reported that family conflict was an important mediator, and linked family acculturation to increased youth externalizing symptoms. While the direct relationship between family linguistic acculturation and adolescent conduct problems was not significant, linguistic acculturation was associated with heightened family conflict, which in turn, was related to increased adolescent conduct problems. The authors also suggested that results of the study offers evidence that acculturation is related to adolescent depression, but the effects are complex and worthy of further examination (Gonzales et al., 2006). They concluded that more acculturated families
may have greater acceptance of conflicts as they gradually adopt mainstream norms (Gonzales et al., 2006).

In another study that utilized language use as the sole measure of acculturation Yu, Huang, Schwalberg, Overpeck, and Kogan (2003) examined the association of language spoken at home with the health, psychosocial, school, and parental risk factors of adolescents of various racial/ethnic groups. These authors used acculturation, as measured by the language spoken in the home environment (exclusively or mostly English, exclusively or mostly another language, or a mixture of the two) as the independent variable in this study. Respondents answered the question, “What languages do your parents or other people who are raising you speak at home?” The participants were classified in three groups based on the language they reported being spoken at home: “English”; “a language other than English,”; and “English and another language about equally,”.

Yu et al. (2003) reported that results demonstrated the complex relationships among immigration, race/ethnicity, and linguistic assimilation (unidirectional adaptation to English). They found that adolescents of all racial and ethnic groups from a non-English speaking home environment are at higher risk of a range of psychosocial and parental risk factors than the majority population of non-Hispanic white English-speakers (Yu et al., 2003). Further, they reported that adolescents who speak other languages at home exclusively, or in combination with English, are particularly likely to report feelings of vulnerability, exclusion, and lack of confidence. In addition, Yu et al. (2003) found that many groups of nonwhite youth, regardless of language, and white adolescents who do not speak English at home were at significantly higher risk for being bullied.
because of their race or religion. However, they reported that for most racial/ethnic
groups, these risks were more pronounced for those who spoke another language
exclusively (Yu et al., 2003). More specifically, relative to English-only speaking
Hispanic peers, Hispanic youth who spoke another language at home were significantly
more likely to be bullied (Yu et al., 2003). It should be noted, a limitation of this study
was that language acculturation was measured with one question asking whether the
language spoken in the home was exclusively or mostly English, exclusively or mostly
another language, or a mixture of the two. Assessing language acculturation in this
manner is indicative of limited validity in measurement of the construct.

Other studies have underscored the importance of English or Spanish language
use as a measure in examining Latina/o adolescents’ risk for emotional and behavioral
problems. For example, Brown and Benedict (2004) sampled 230, 9<sup>th</sup> - 12<sup>th</sup> graders, 52%
of whom reported speaking Spanish at home and 48% reported speaking English at home.
Again in this study, as self-report of language spoken in the home was the primary
measure of acculturation and participants were placed in one of three categories (English
only, Spanish only, both) based only on one question. These authors found that Spanish-
speaking youth were significantly more fearful of weapon-associated victimization than
English-speaking peers. In this study, language spoken at home was the only
demographic variable found to have a significant impact on fear of being shot and fear of
being stabbed though the strength of their conceptualization and measurement of
language use can be called into question (Brown & Benedict, 2004).

In a study of acculturation, ethnic identity, and dating violence among Latina/o
ninth-grade students, researchers found that greater acculturation may be associated with
greater prevalence of dating violence and victimization among females (Sanderson, Coker, Roberts, Tortolero, & Reininger, 2004). More specifically, English-speaking only females were significantly more likely to experience dating violence than peers speaking both English and Spanish at home. Similarly, Spanish-speaking only females were significantly less likely to experience dating violence than peers who were bilingual at home (Sanderson et al., 2004). In this study findings indicate that bilingualism in Latina/o youth may be a protective factor against violence.

A study by Vega et al. (1995) utilized language conflict as a key indicator of acculturation and found that among foreign born Hispanic youth, those with higher language conflicts had significantly higher CBCL rated problematic behaviors. Furthermore, among U.S. born Hispanic youth, those with higher language conflicts (e.g., “How often has it been hard to get along with others because you don’t speak English well?”), perceived discrimination, and perception of a closed society had significantly higher ratings on a teacher report form of problematic behavior.

_Evidence of Distress Associated with Acculturation Gaps_

The previous studies underscore how acculturation, as measured by language use, may impact youth’s level of emotional and behavioral problems. Of interest in the current study is whether language acculturation discrepancy between parents and children is linked to problematic behavior in Latina/o youth. As evidenced by the previous studies, acculturation is often measured by language use. However, the language variables in studies outlined above as an indicator of acculturation have not been supported as a strong measurement given then limited scope in how language was assessed (e.g., typically only one to four questions total related to use or preference).
Other studies that use more substantive measures of acculturation offer insight into discrepancies in parent and child acculturation levels, whereas the previous studies utilizing language variables did not assess such differences within families. This subsection discusses the studies that assessed acculturation differences within families.

Latina/o youth are faced with the difficult task of having to strike a balance between mainstream American culture and the native cultural traditions of their heritage country (Guilamo-Ramos et al., 2004). This could include countries they grew up in, immigrated from, or the countries from which their parents immigrated from. Even for those born in the United States, adolescents are frequently confronted with issues of accommodating multiple sets of cultural values and influences as conveyed by the broader social, familial, neighborhood, and regional contexts in which they reside (Guilamo-Ramos et al., 2004).

Martinez and his colleagues (2009) further described the interacting spheres of influence on youth development. These include exosystems or, contexts in which the adolescent does not directly participate but that impact important members of the adolescent’s life (e.g., immigration and occupation stress variables). Martinez et al. (2009) further described mesosystems, contexts involving important members of social worlds in which the youth directly engages (e.g., marital stress, parental depression variables). A third system in which bilingual adolescents must navigate according to Martinez et al. (2009) are microsystems or, contexts in which the adolescent directly participates (e.g., youth homework variables and likelihood of substance use). It is likely that bilingual adolescents and their family members feel varying levels of stress from their involvement in these systems at different times throughout their lives.
A study by Schofield, Parke, Kim, and Coltrane (2008) examined the degree to which disparities in parent and child acculturation are linked to both family and child adjustment. All participants in this study were either first or second generation immigrants. These authors utilized the Acculturative Rating Scale for Mexican Americans-II (ARMSA-II; Cuéllar, Arnold, & Maldonado, 1995) and the Short Acculturation Scale for Hispanic Youth (SASH-Y; Barona & Miller, 1994) at two points, when the child participants were in 5th and 7th grade. The ARMSA-II is a comprehensive measure of acculturation encompassing multiple variables beyond language preference (Schofield et al., 2008) and yields two subscales: Anglo orientation and Mexican orientation (Cuéllar et al., 1995). The SASH-Y is a 12-item measure capturing multiple aspects of acculturation, though eight questions are language-based.

These researchers found that child participants’ acculturation gaps (differing levels of acculturation) with fathers were related to later father-child conflict as well as internalizing and externalizing outcomes, as measured by the Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL; Achenbach, Edelbrock & Howell, 1987). Further, Schofield et al. (2008) found that many of the associations between father-child acculturation gaps and outcomes were moderated by the child’s report of the relationship quality between the child and his or her father. Father-child acculturation gaps were associated with negative outcomes only when children reported a poor relationship with their father (as measured by a three item scale completed by the child). Such results offer some evidence supporting the acculturation gap distress hypothesis. It should be noted, these authors indicated a limitation of their study was the measure of the child’s level of acculturation was one-dimensional in nature and did not provide a more detailed picture of which aspects of
acculturation are most salient with regard to parent-child gaps (Schofield et al., 2008).

Further explanation of how to account for the varying typed of parent-child gaps is
presented later in this chapter.

Another study by Martinez (2006) examined the effects of differential family
acculturation on Latina/o adolescent substance abuse. Substance abuse is an example of
problematic externalizing behavior as captured by the dependent measure (CBCL) in the
current study. Results of this study indicated that a greater level of differential
acculturation between parents and youth was associated with greater likelihood of future
youth substance use. This relationship was mediated by family stress processes and
effective parenting practices. Furthermore, Martinez (2006) found that differential
acculturation was related to increases in family stress and decreases in effective parenting
practices, which was related to increases in future substance-use likelihood among
Latina/o youth. Interestingly, this study also found that greater acculturation gaps had an
independent effect on decreasing parenting effectiveness, even when accounting for the
effects of family/cultural stress. As suggested by Martinez (2006), there is a need to
identify factors, other than acute stress, which link acculturation processes to parenting
practices. According to this study, differential family acculturation often interferes with
effective communication and problem solving among all family members, and family
communication and problem solving have been shown to strongly covary with specific
parenting practices (Martinez, 2006). This author suggests future studies need to explore
this link, offering support for language acculturation discrepancy as it relates to family
communication to be worthy of further examination.
A study by Lau et al. (2005) tested the acculturation gap-distress hypothesis by examining whether parent adolescent acculturation gaps were associated with greater conflict and youth conduct problems among 260 high-risk Mexican American families. These authors operationalized acculturation gaps by mismatches in acculturation style, and parent-youth discrepancies in acculturation toward mainstream and heritage cultures. The Pan-Acculturation Scale (PAN; Cuellar, Harris, & Jasso, 1980), a measure based on a bidimensional model of acculturation that captures preferences in language use, values and beliefs, social environment, ethnic identity, and cultural traditions was used. Results from this study indicated that parent-youth discrepancies in acculturation toward mainstream and heritage cultures were not related to increased conflict or youth conduct problems (Lau et al., 2005). Furthermore, conduct problems were no higher in families in which the adolescent was more aligned with mainstream culture than the parent. Therefore, these results call into question the assumption that more rapid acculturation of adolescents to American culture may lead to distress.

The limitations of the Lau et al. (2005) study are worth mentioning. For one, the sample in this study reflected a specific group of only Mexican American families, thus limiting the generalizability of their results to the larger Latina/o population. Additionally, their sample represented immigrant families, yet the majority of youth (86.2%) were U.S. born and not immigrants, and many of the parents were also U.S. born. While 61.9% of the parents in this study were foreign-born immigrants, the average length of residence in the U.S. was 23.0 years (SD = 9.70). These numbers could potentially indicate lack of variance in levels of acculturation to begin with, especially in terms of language fluency as it is likely that both the parents and youth were more fluent
in English and used more English after being in the U.S. for longer periods of time. These authors stated, “Our conclusions must be tempered because it may be that the acculturation gap-distress link operates to a greater extent in recent immigrant population or in other ethnic groups” (Lau et al., 2005, p 373). Further, acculturation gaps may be differentially related to youth distress as a function of race or ethnicity, socioeconomic status, family education level, or generational status (Lau et al., 2005) as the immediate impact of immigration for some families is far less applicable to third generation Latina/os in the U.S. (Cavazos-Rehg et al., 2007; Kim & Chao, 2009). These authors did not include frequency of language use in either the parent or child as part of the analysis of their results.

A study by Dinh, Roosa, Tein, and Lopez (2002) investigated the relationship between acculturation and problem behavior proneness in a Hispanic youth sample. The findings from this study suggested that family context variables are especially important in studies with Hispanic children and adolescents because of intergenerational conflict between parents and children in which children acculturate at a faster rate than their parents (Dinh et al., 2002; Szapocznik & Kurtines, 1980). According to Dinh et al. (2002), one component of this intergenerational conflict is potential communication problems relating to the parents’ difficulty in learning the new language and their children’s difficulty in maintaining their native language. Further, this communication barrier between parents and children may negatively affect the quality of parent-child interactions and relationships, including the degree of parental involvement and monitoring, and lead to negative outcomes for both parents and children (Tseng & Fuligni, 2000; Vega et al, 2005). Results of the study by Dinh et al. (2002) indicated
more acculturated children and adolescents reported less parental involvement, which was found to be related to problem behavior proneness.

Dinh et al. (2002) stated their findings suggested that the acculturation process, particularly the language conflict aspect of acculturation, may present considerable stresses for Hispanic families and that Hispanic youth may have to confront challenges beyond those typically associated with the adolescent period. This may include navigating between two cultures and finding ways to culturally and linguistically connect with both parents and peers (Dinh et al., 2002). According to Dinh et al. (2002), since the acculturation process entails multiple dimensions, it may be important for future research to inspect particular aspects of acculturation. These researchers stated, “Future studies on language use may take it a step further by examining the processes of maintenance and adoption of the native language and new language and the factors that may facilitate or hinder these processes. This may provide a more informative assessment of the impact of linguistic changes as a result of immigration to a new culture on interpersonal communication and relationships and on psychosocial adjustment” (p. 306).

Risk Factors Associated with Acculturation

Weiss et al. (1999) analyzed the impact of factors within the cultural and familial context on behavioral and emotional problems of preschool Latina/o children. The researchers looked at financial, cultural, and family variables in order to gain a better understanding of the vulnerability to mental health problems faced by Latina/o children ages two and three years old. These authors concluded that the challenges faced by the families of these children, especially those associated with acculturation and poverty were what increased the child’s vulnerability to behavioral and emotional problems
(Weiss et al., 1999) as measured by The Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL; Achenbach et al., 1987).

More specifically, Weiss et al. (1999) studied the degree to which a family’s financial status, cultural heritage, degree of acculturation and family functioning predicted mental health problems among participants. The parent and child participants in this study were bilingual in English and Spanish. Results indicated that the factor accounting for the largest variance of predicted behavioral and emotional disorders was parent immigration status. Children whose parents were not born in the U.S. were more likely to have problems. This predictor was especially salient for externalizing problems such as aggressive behavior.

The predictor accounting for the second highest amount of variance in this study was the family’s use of internal coping strategies. Family coping style predicted internalizing problems for children (e.g., symptoms of withdrawal, depression and anxiety). A third predictor of emotional and behavioral problems was family dissatisfaction. The more dissatisfied a parent was with the family’s interactions, the more likely it was that the child would have problems. The latter predictor presented here is related to one of the main research questions in this study.

It is noteworthy that degree of parent acculturation was not found to influence children’s problems (Weiss et al., 1999). Since the sample was bilingual, the absence of an acculturation effect might have been explained by limited variance in acculturation scores. Additionally, while immigration (as defined by parents not being born in the U.S.) accounted for the largest variance of emotional and behavioral problems, the findings did not suggest that immigration factors such as ethnic identity or the degree to
which parents held a particular cultural orientation impacted outcomes. These authors found that immigration status may implicate the degree of acculturative stress experienced by a family (in terms of perceived loss felt toward heritage country or discrimination encountered in the U.S.) as a variable that leads to emotional and behavioral difficulties in children.

Cavazos-Rehg et al. (2007) examined the impact of legal status on emotional well-being and the subjective health status of Latina/o immigrants. This study offered insight into many of the stresses that undocumented members of this group experience including, but not limited to, worries about their legal status and preoccupation with disclosure and deportation. It is believed that such concerns can heighten the risk for emotional distress, thus impairing the quality of health. Among the participants in their study, 39% expressed concern with seeking services for fear of deportation (Cavazos-Rehg et al., 2007). Further, upon administering measures of emotional distress, Latina/o immigrant stress and subjective health status, it was found that Latina/o immigrants with concerns about deportation are at heightened risk of experiencing negative emotional and physical health states (particularly anger), as well as stress related to extra-familial factors. Included, are challenges related to economic and occupational issues. For example, results of this study indicated Latina/o immigrants concerned about deportation reported more stress associated with such difficulties as being forced to accept low paying jobs, difficulties finding desired employment, and challenges with getting promotions or salary raises than unconcerned Latina/o immigrants. Such findings are not unexpected as one’s inability to proactively confront these concerns raises their sense of helplessness and leads to feelings of frustration and anger (Cavazos-Rehg et al., 2007).
In a study examining the relationship between linguistic acculturation and poly-substance use among Hispanic adolescents, Epstein et al. (2003) highlight some of the risk factors at play for this population. In their study, Hispanic seventh and eighth graders completed questionnaires with items related to drug use (cigarette smoking, alcohol use, and marijuana use), linguistic acculturation (language use with parents), and psychological distress. A significant association was found between linguistic acculturation and poly-drug use (Epstein et al., 2003).

It was also found that students who spoke English with their parents reported higher poly-drug use than adolescents who spoke Spanish with their parents (Epstein et al., 2003). Additionally, adolescents who spoke both English and Spanish with their parents (bilingual) reported they engaged in greater poly-drug use than those who spoke Spanish only with their parents. Linguistic acculturation was significantly associated with peer drinking with bilingual participants reporting that a greater number of their peers drank than did either English only or Spanish only speaking peers (Epstein et al., 2003). Such findings call into question whether those that navigate in a bilingual environment are faced with more stressors. It should be noted that this study focused only on linguistic acculturation with drug use rather than other factors of acculturation that may predict drug use. According to these authors and others, further research needs to assess whether aspects of acculturation, including language use, are related to adolescents’ drug use and other emotional and behavior disorders (Epstein et al., 2003; Romero & Roberts, 2003). Again, the amount of substance use will not be captured in the current study. However, drug and alcohol use is included in the dependent measure.
of this study as such activities are examples of externalizing problematic behavior (which
is reflected in the composite total problems subscale of the outcome measure).

It was hypothesized in Epstein et al. (2003) that bicultural Hispanics may be
confused about how to behave, and given more than the usual conflicts to cope with, they
may succumb to peer pressure to drink or use other drugs. It is possible, according to
these authors, biculturalism increases stress and experimenting with alcohol frequently
serves as a means of coping. As alcohol and substance abuse is becoming more of a
concern, it is imperative to develop a better understanding of the predictors of
problematic behaviors (e.g., substance use) and other risk factors for this population
(Perez et al., 2009). Understanding the literature on risky behaviors is relevant to this
current study as problematic behaviors in adolescents will be measured.

Guilamo-Ramos et al. (2004) examined the relationship between acculturation-
related variables and binge drinking behavior among nationally representative samples of
Mexican American, Cuban American, and Puerto Rican youth. This study explored
length of residence in the United States, type of language spoken in the home (Spanish
vs. English), and binge drinking among these different subgroups. The first notable result
found was that acculturation-based variables were not significantly associated with the
likelihood of binge drinking for youths with no prior history of alcohol consumption (two
or more alcoholic drinks consumed in a lifetime). Importantly, Latina/o adolescents with
no history of previous alcohol use seemed to be largely unaffected by either greater
exposure to U.S. culture or a significant transition to adoption of U.S. culture as reflected
by language use.
In contrast, results from Guilamo-Ramos et al. (2004) indicated acculturation variables did appear to be relevant for Latina/o youth who have a previous history of experimentation with alcohol. Additionally, the dynamics differed for recent immigrants as opposed to those who had lived in the United States for most of their lives. For recent immigrants, adolescents from Spanish-speaking homes were more likely to exhibit binge drinking than those from English-speaking homes. However, this trend was reversed for Latina/o adolescents who were either born in the United States or who had lived most of their lives in the U.S. These results can be interpreted in terms of acculturative stress. The higher rates of binge drinking in youth from Spanish-speaking families who have recently immigrated to the United States may be due to the initial stresses and strains of adapting to a new host culture (Guilamo-Ramos et al., 2004). These authors utilized the length of time the youth had been living in the U.S. and the youths answer to, “What language is usually spoken in your home?” in order to construct what they described as the acculturation-related variables (Guilamo-Ramos et al., 2004). The current study builds upon this literature by including child length of time in the U.S. as one of the independent variables included in the analysis, as well as utilizing a much broader and profound measure of language proficiency and use.

Romero and Roberts (2003) also described some of the stressors within a bicultural context for adolescents of Mexican descent. This study found that middle school students of Mexican heritage reported their perceived stress from intergenerational acculturation gaps, within-group discrimination, out-group discrimination, and monolingual stress. In this study, while immigrant youth reported a higher number of total stressors, U.S. born youth reported more stress from needing better Spanish.
Additionally, youth born in the United States reported more stress related to the impact of their parents’ culture. Immigrant youth reported more stress from needing better English in school (Romero & Roberts, 2003). In both instances, results indicate important implications related to language and family. Furthermore, higher stress was associated with more depressive symptoms for both U.S. born and immigrant youth. It is clear that bilingual children are placed in very influential roles in families, which are not always developmentally appropriate (Tse, 1995).

Language Brokering: Children in the Role of Translator

Language brokering can be defined as the role played by children who translate the English language and interpret cultural practices for their parents and other family members who do not speak English (Martinez et al., 2009). Martinez et al. (2009) describe this term as reflecting the abilities of children, usually of immigrants, to build their own social and linguistic knowledge and to be able to utilize such skills in a bilingual and bicultural environment. Children in these families serve as mediators between the cultural and linguistic disparities that separate their families from the dominant culture (Martinez et al., 2009). The children referred to as “language brokers” assist their parents by translating and interpreting, often in complex situations which may be beyond their level of developmental maturity. These children are responsible for facilitating their family’s access to valuable services, information, and resources such as healthcare, school and economic systems (Martinez, et al., 2009). Therefore, language brokering is significantly more than just translating the language used, there is also a large component of interpretation involved in language brokering. Tse (1995) described, “people who broker, unlike formal translators, influence content and nature of the
messages they convey, and ultimately affect the perceptions and decisions of the agents for whom they act. The brokers in turn, are affected linguistically and affectively in different manners and degrees by brokering experiences” (p. 180).

Tse (1995) examined the prevalence of language brokering between linguistically and culturally different parties among 35 Latina/o high school students born abroad and in the U.S. Of additional concern in this study was the relationship of prevalence and brokers’ language development and school performance. All participants in this study reportedly served in the role of language brokers, regardless of length of residence in the U.S. and the availability of other language brokers. In addition, many participants also noted translating a variety of linguistically sophisticated documents. This study discussed the parental responsibilities that are taken on by the school-aged brokers. This includes dealing with schools and making educational decisions without parental input or knowledge. The author described students as being generally entrusted with two-way communication between the school and home in the form of written communication, serving as interpreters at parent teacher conferences, and other instances of oral communication either in person or over the telephone (Tse, 1995). When acting in such roles, brokers often determined the meaning conveyed in messages and as a result were making decisions for themselves and siblings that would normally be made by adults (Tse, 1995).

The study by Tse (1995) offers important insight related to language proficiency and academic performance within the population of interest. Child language brokers are likely to be quite proficient in their first and second languages (Tse, 1995). In this study, all foreign-born subjects reported brokering within 4 years of arrival to the U.S.,
indicating not only that that are learning English, but also that they are demonstrating advanced proficiency. Additionally, apparent fostering of acculturation is elicited by brokers as nearly half of the participants in this study reported that their brokering helped their parents learn about American culture.

Importantly, these findings exhibit the potential benefit of language brokering for the individual (broker) and their families. This represents a somewhat unique area of research in that it begins to target how language is related to positive or negative outcomes for Latina/o youth and their families. Such findings are of relevance to the current study as language brokering is an example of how some children are “caught in the middle” of the acculturation gap (Villanueva & Buriel, 2010).

As suggested by Tse (1995), efforts to identify and understand the out-of-school factors that affect the education of bilingual adolescents need to be made. For example, while bilingual students are often able to perform language tasks at a high level of proficiency (i.e., translating in complex situations), their school performance is not always reflective of these high levels. Additionally, nearly all language minority students make decisions that directly influence their education, much more so than their peers, simply due to translating between their teacher and parent (Tse, 1995). Educators who rely on students to translate information and materials for the home need to be aware that students are essentially managing the interactions between home and school (Love & Buriel, 2007; Tse, 1995). This is an example of how the educational system may not acknowledge, support or recognize the challenges youth often face in the cases of limited English language acculturation of their parent.
To summarize, Language Brokering (LB) has been conceptualized as a family process, rather than merely an individual phenomenon (Martinez et al., 2009). Previous research has indicated that those in high language brokering contexts demonstrated higher levels of family stress, lower levels of parenting effectiveness, and poorer adolescent adjustment (Martinez et al., 2009; Suárez-Orozco & Suárez-Orozco, 2001), though other studies and empirical commentaries have documented the role of language brokering as a potential strength (Valdés, 2003, p. 26-37). Therefore, the status of the literature is unclear as to whether language brokering can be seen as enhancing strengths, serving as a heightened stressor leading to subsequent maladjustment, or both (Villanueva & Buriel, 2010). In either case, language brokering is clearly an important factor to consider in the assessment of acculturation differences in families as it may be a potential confound to difficulties in youth adjustment due to a difference in levels of acculturation within families.

Implications of Bilingualism

The literature on Latina/o adolescents also explains how bilingual children, especially of monolingual parents, often face challenges in the family context (Martinez et al., 2009; Santiago-Rivera & Altarriba, 2002). This includes a negative impact on not only the child, but the entire family dynamic. For example, placing a child in a language brokering role can limit the parents’ ability to effectively manage the family environment by allowing for the child to be placed in a position of power and thus, increase stress on the family (Suárez-Orozco & Suárez-Orozco, 2001; Tse, 1995). This is in addition to the number of stressors that some families are likely to experience during the acculturation process following immigration.
As pointed out in Martinez et al. (2009), in some instances parents can become less influential in their role when children are asked to serve as language brokers in order to better navigate the social environment faced by the family. These authors also found family relations become strained due to role reversals between adults and children, thus compromising the ability of parents to effectively do their job as parents. Such parental disempowerment, combined with a child’s negative experience translating for the family may increase risk for poor outcomes among children (Love & Buriel, 2007). While there is literature indicating language brokering allows for more trusting relationships between parent and child (Tse, 1995), children may also be placed in stressful situations such as appeasing authority figures (e.g., police), serving as parent advocates, or feeling the need to present family members in a positive light (Valdés, 2003, p. 26).

Love and Buriel (2007) examined the relationship between language brokering, parent-child bonding, perceived autonomy, biculturalism and depression for Mexican American adolescents. It was hypothesized that adolescent language brokers that reported a strong parent-child bond and high levels of psychological autonomy, privilege, and responsibility would also report lower levels of depression. They found that in girls and boys, language brokering for people in more situations, including family members other than one’s parents (i.e., extended family) is related to higher levels of depression. Also, results of this study indicate boys who language broker for more people also report more depression.

Adolescents who are language brokers also report that they feel more bonded, or emotionally connected, with their parents as compared to their non-brokering immigrant peers (Buriel, Love, & DeMent, 2006). The cognitive and socioemotional skills
exhibited by language brokers, in addition to the special bond they report having with their parents, may help them deal with their adult responsibilities and the stress associated with adults in adult situations (Love & Buriel, 2007). These authors also indicated that this bond may lessen the stress associated with language brokering. This role may help adolescents identify with their parents’ values, despite rapid exposure to mainstream culture and values (Love & Buriel, 2007). This study found that a strong parent-child bond was correlated with positive feelings about language brokering for girls and boys. Additionally, a strong parent-child bond was also related to less depression for boys, suggesting bonding serves as a protective factor related to the stress of language brokering.

Also of important note, Love and Buriel (2007) found that privileges, responsibility, and psychological autonomy were not related to depression for boys, but responsibilities moderated the relationship between the number of different brokering contexts and depression for girls. In other words, girls who were language brokers in more places and report more responsibility, are less depressed (Love and Buriel, 2007). It is possible that such responsibilities add a sense of status for girls within the family.

In their study on language brokering contexts and the emotional and behavioral adjustment of Latina/o adolescents and their parents, Martinez et al. (2009) described the social interaction learning theory as a foundation for their study. According to Martinez et al. (2009), the social interaction learning theory delineates which risk and protective factors are proximal and which are more distal or indirect influences on negative outcomes for bilingual youth. Family members are presumed to influence each other’s behavior in a two-way shaping process (e.g., parent to child and child to parent). These
interactions between parent and child can either increase or decrease tendencies for displays of negative emotional behavior.

Furthermore, as indicated by the study discussed above, child and adolescent adjustment is predicted to be influenced most proximally by parenting practices and most distally by contextual factors. Such contextual factors include socioeconomic status (SES), family stress, family structure transitions, parental adjustment, genetic factors, neighborhood, marital adjustment, and social support. These contextual factors are thought to exert their effects on youth adjustment indirectly, through their effects on parenting practices. If one or more of these contextual factors impact a family, many aspects of strong parenting can be compromised and therefore negatively affect the adjustment of children and adolescents (Martinez et al., 2009). As stated in Martinez et al. (2009), the effects of contextual factors on the adjustment of youth is thought to be mediated by parenting practices.

These studies are important because they reflect the current lack of consistency within the existing literature about whether placement in the role of language broker is potentially harmful, or whether it serves as a protective factor for youth in a bilingual environment. The current study builds on the existing literature on children placed in the role of language brokering as it includes LB as one of the independent variables of primary analysis. In this sense, the role of language broker can be separated from other variables considered to have a large impact on the bilingual youth’s development.

Measuring the Acculturation Gap: Discrepancies and Interactions

As previously noted, differences between parents and youth in their levels of acculturation create acculturation gaps that increase stress in a family, which then can
disrupt effective parenting and healthy youth adjustment (Martinez, 2006). This acculturation gap is highly dependent on years of U.S. residency for immigrant Latino families, and the acculturation gap tends to increase with greater exposure to U.S. culture (Martinez, 2006; Szapocznik & Kurtines, 1993; Szapocznik, Kurtines, & Fernandez, 1980).

However, support for the acculturation gap distress hypothesis has been mixed. As pointed out by Schofield et al. (2008) further work is needed to determine the reason for the inconsistency across previous studies. The lack of consistency in support or refusal of the acculturation gap distress hypothesis has been due in part to small samples in some studies (Schofield et al., 2008). Furthermore, there has been high variability in samples across studies with regard to age, length of time in the U.S., and differences in what are considered problematic outcome variables (e.g., substance use in the youth, family conflict or lack of cohesion, specific mental health disorders in the youth; Schofield et al., 2008). Importantly, there is also a lack of consistent findings in the extant literature due to differences in measurement of the acculturation gap (Birman, 2006).

Several attempts have been made to empirically test the assumptions put forth by the acculturation gap distress hypothesis and results have been mixed. It is therefore important to consider the methods of measuring the acculturation gap, which could offer insights into the lack of consistency in findings of support for the acculturation gap-distress hypothesis.

The basis for how the acculturation gap was accounted for in the current study was based largely on the findings summarized by Birman (2006). In this study, Birman
(2006) outlines the limitations and pitfalls that often occur when attempting to measure acculturation differences within families. For example, researchers have measured perceived gaps in acculturation versus actual gaps. Such studies assess the discrepancy in levels of acculturation between parents and children through either parent or child report only, with one participant rating what they believed to be the rate of acculturation for the other (e.g., child rating their own level of acculturation as well as what they believe their parents rate of acculturation to be; Rick & Forward, 1992). In a previous study, greater levels of acculturation as indicated by self-report of the child participant predicted greater perceived acculturation gaps with their parents (Rick & Forward, 1992). A study by Buki, Ma, Stom, and Strom (2003) assessed Chinese immigrant mothers’ own reported level of acculturation as well as what they perceived their child’s level of acculturation to be. The acculturation gap was computed by subtracting the mother’s score from the child’s score.

As pointed out by Birman (2006), there are at least two potential problems with this approach. One is that children and parents may over/underestimate each other’s level of acculturation, and self-reported perceptions of the gap may inadvertently be confounded with perceptions of family discord (Birman, 2006). Therefore, it has been suggested that parent and child levels of acculturation be assessed independently as a means of assessing actual gaps as opposed to perceived gaps (Birman, 2006; Birman & Poff, 2010; Lau et al., 2005; Pasch et al., 2006).

Some researchers have taken a one-dimensional approach at measuring acculturation, in which it is assumed acquisition of the new/host culture displaces acculturation to the native culture. In such studies, it is assumed that with greater
acculturation to the host culture there is automatically loss of the native culture (Cuellar et al., 1980; Merali, 2002; Szapocznik, Scopetta, Kurtines, & Aranalde, 1978). In such studies the measured acculturation score indicates an individual’s position on a continuum between the new and old culture (Birman, 2006). However, a two-dimensional measurement approach is seen as providing more accurate information about an individual’s degree of acculturation as it incorporates an individual’s adherence to both the host and native culture (or language) at the same time.

In the existing literature on measuring acculturation gaps, the two predominant methods of measuring such gaps include: (a) the total discrepancy approach and (b) the interaction approach (Birman, 2006). Both approaches will be described here as they are both incorporated in the analyses within the current study. Both of the methods of using a two-dimensional approach involve utilizing measures that include two separate scales that assess acculturation, one with respect to the new culture, and one with respect to the native culture (as is the case with the Bidimensional Acculturation Scale used in the current study). The resulting scores can by used independently or as an interaction to predict outcomes of interest (Birman, 2006; Birman & Poff, 2010). The two-dimensional measurement approach is seen as providing more accurate information about an individual’s acculturative stance (Birman, 2006; Birman & Poff, 2010).

The discrepancy method of measuring the acculturation gap involves computing, or establishing the degree of discrepancy in acculturation between the parents and children. For example, previous studies have computed difference scores between parent and child levels of acculturation by subtracting the parent’s score from the child’s (Buki et al., 2003; Merali, 2002; Rick & Forward 1992). A potential flaw in using the two-
dimensional discrepancy approach is assuming that differences between parent and child always occur in the same directions, with the child always more acculturated to the dominant culture than the parent (Merali, 2002). To address this potential flaw, Merali (2002) used the absolute value of the difference in parent-child acculturation scores to compute the gap. In this manner, the total difference score represents the extent of the parent-child discrepancy, regardless of the direction of the difference (Merali, 2002). Such a model was adopted for the current study, and will be outlined in subsequent chapters.

At the same time, the literature on acculturation suggests that the acculturation-family discord relationship may be more complex than represented by a simple difference score (as described above) between the parents and children. Therefore the second method of measuring acculturation gaps between parents and children is the interaction approach. The literature suggests that it also may be particular combinations of parent and child acculturation levels that lead to family disconnect and subsequent emotional and behavioral problems for youth (Birman, 2006). Therefore, the interaction approach to the acculturation gap can be utilized as a means to account for the various combinations of parents’ and children’s acculturation levels and styles (e.g., child is high on English acculturation and the parent is low). Four possible combinations of high or low levels of English language acculturation within families exist: (a) parents are low and children are high on American acculturation, or English, (b) both parents and children are high, (c) both parents and children are low, (d) the parents are high and children are low (Birman, 2006).
This interaction approach, as suggested in the extant literature (Birman, 2006), allows for the exploration of differences among all four different groups listed above. This approach not only allows for an assessment of whether a discrepancy or total difference in levels of acculturation within families is related to difficulties in adjustment; it also allows for an examination of how differences among all four groups interact to create the acculturation gap. For example, the situation where children are low and parents are high in their level of adherence toward English (or host language) is often assumed not to exist in the literature, although it is possible (e.g., parent had prior experiences traveling or working in U.S. or had English language skills prior to migration; Birman, 2006; Buki et al., 2003; Lee et al., 2000; Merali, 2002).

By utilizing the interaction approach described above, researchers can better understand how specific acculturative styles within families may have an impact on youth adjustment (Birman, 2006). The presence of the grouping represented in the interaction model allows the researcher to examine whether it is one particular group (such as when the parents are low and children high in English language) that is related to family maladjustment, or whether acculturation discrepancies more generally are problematic (Birman, 2006).

As will be outlined in the subsequent chapters, there are limitations and challenges that arise in using the interaction approach (e.g., limited sample size for certain groups in the interaction model). However, as will be shown, the current study incorporates what is reflected in the current literature to be the strongest manner of measuring acculturation gaps between parents and children. This is due to the current
study’s utilization of both the total difference, as well as the interaction approach as means of measuring acculturation discrepancy.

**Summary**

As shown, many of the risk factors associated with acculturation have been well-documented. Evidence exists supporting the acculturation gap-distress hypothesis, indicating that when children acculturate at a faster rate than their parents, emotional and behavioral problems may occur in youth due to the discrepant levels of adjustment. Often, the means of measuring acculturation is determined by the frequency of language use. While these studies offer analysis on differing levels of acculturation between groups (e.g., between families or ethnic groups), they do not offer insight into discrepant levels of acculturation within families (e.g., between parent and child). Furthermore, these studies offer less-than-comprehensive incorporation of language as a variable (be it proficiency, preference, use in the home) since the way language is measured involves so few questions (i.e., less than four).

More comprehensive measures of acculturation that go beyond frequency of language use have also been used. Often, studies using such measures include an examination of discrepant levels of acculturation between parents and youth. However, even when frequency of language use is included in these more comprehensive measures of acculturation, the direct analysis of language variables is not provided in the results or discussion of such studies.

Among the studies that offer insight into the differing levels of acculturation between parents and children, the degree to which language acculturation discrepancy accounts for such differences has not been analyzed. There is also not clear evidence as
to the role placement in a language brokering (a role evidenced to be typical for bilingual youth) has in comparison to other demographic variables that have been previously considered. Furthermore, the degree to which language acculturation discrepancy accounts for subsequent emotional and behavioral problems in adjusting has not been explained. Therefore, the current study will offer unique insight into the degree language acculturation discrepancy between parents and their children accounts for the variance in emotional and behavioral problems for Latina/o youth.
Chapter Three

Method

This chapter describes the methodology used to address the research questions in this study. Descriptions of the participants, measures, and data analyses are included. The purpose of the current research is to better understand whether Language Acculturation Discrepancy (LAD) between Latina/o adolescents and their parents/caregivers can predict higher levels of total emotional and behavioral disorders in youth.

Participants

A total of 120 families were recruited to participate in this study. Child/parent dyads served as participants. Child participants included both male and female Latina/o adolescent students, ages 8-18, enrolled and attending 3rd through 12th grade. One willing parent/primary caregiver (hereafter referred to as parent) was asked to participate. Potential child participants were excluded from participation if they expressed current suicidal or homicidal ideation or showed visible signs of, or reported experiencing active psychotic symptoms, including delusions, paranoia, or hallucinations during contact with the researcher (this did not occur on any occasion with the current sample). Parent participants were excluded from participation if they were not a biological parent, step-parent, or adoptive parent (i.e., relative, foster parent). Participants in this study were recruited on a voluntary basis from local community center organizations and events, as well as local churches (as will be described in further detail below). Participants were not
recruited from mental health service providers as this study included a non-clinical sample of participants.

Inclusion Criteria

The inclusion criteria for participants to be accepted into this study was: (a) Children in grades 3 through 12, (b) Families who self-reported at least partial ethnic identity of Hispanic/Latina/o (or who specifically indicated descent from Mexico, Cuba, Puerto Rico, and Central and South America), (c) Parents and children must have had at least a third grade reading level in order to complete all assessment measures, (d) When available, the oldest sibling in the family was asked to be the child participant. Only one parent/child dyad from any given family was allowed to participate (i.e., a parent was not allowed to complete measures for more than one of their children). (e) One parent and child were both willing to complete a one-time demographic questionnaire and language acculturation measure each, and the parent completed a one-time assessment of total emotional and behavioral problems of their child.

Procedure

Participants were recruited through contacts with churches and leaders of community organizations. Community contacts were established by this researcher. This researcher contacted such leaders to request access to potential participants (e.g., via announcements at community meetings and church gatherings). When allowed, this researcher made brief announcements in Spanish describing the purpose of the study, the requirements and length of time needed to participate, and the compensation offered. This researcher typically coordinated meetings with Latino families immediately following previously arranged community meeting/church service times. Following these meetings,
participants were invited to speak with this researcher directly and/or complete a voluntary signup sheet with their name and preferred contact information. When possible, this researcher asked participants to complete the study materials (consent/assent forms and questionnaires) immediately following their meetings/gatherings. This researcher also offered to meet with potential participants at other preferred dates and times that met the needs of the participants, though this did not occur in the current study. Permission for this investigator to attend meetings/services was arranged in conjunction with the community leaders and heads of churches (i.e., priest). When possible, data was collected in a group setting at the meeting locations and the investigator was available to clarify instructions and answer questions about material presented in either English or Spanish.

Direct verbal communication and all written materials were provided in a bilingual capacity (English/Spanish) based on the needs and preferences of participants. This researcher gave verbal instructions for participation to all participants in a bilingual (English/Spanish) capacity. The researcher had contact with each parent/child dyad on one occasion to collect all data. During the verbal description of the study given, participants were informed that this study is intended to gather information from a broad range of families and that participation does not imply having psychological problems. Prior to completion of the measures, participants were informed the purpose of the study is to find out more about how language may or may not be related to psychological functioning. A clear description of this study was felt to be necessary in order to not deceive the participants. Participants were also informed that they could discontinue participation at any time. Participants were verbally informed that their individual responses would not be shared with others, including parents, children, and meeting
leaders and organizers. Participants were informed that the results gathered from the entire sample (i.e., not individual responses) would be shared upon request with the respective community organizations and churches.

Data were gathered from child and parent participants in various settings based on the location of the community organization meetings (e.g., typically schools and public libraries), as well as the churches from which participants were recruited. Data were collected at participating community organization meetings and events, as well as churches. The community events included Neighborhood Watch meetings and a community safety event in north Aurora, Colorado. This researcher also recruited participants from a local Catholic church, by attending and making announcements in Spanish at services for bilingual and Spanish-speaking attendees. The neighborhood from which participants were recruited is commonly known as “Original Aurora.” Cultural validity was increased in this study due to the bilingualism of this researcher. Specifically, this researcher was able to answer questions, address concerns and discuss the purpose of this study in the preferred language of the participants. This likely increased participants’ understanding of the research and improved their ability to make a decision about participation.

In all cases, informed consent was obtained prior to contact information being exchanged and prior to completion of any measures. The process of informed consent was conducted by the researcher in the preferred language of each participant. Consent forms were delivered in-person to study participants by this researcher prior to completion of the measures. Participants were provided with the option of completing consent forms and all other materials for this study in either English or Spanish (see
Table 3 for the frequency of the language the forms were completed in. The consent form requested participation and described the study and its goals, inclusion/exclusion criteria for participants, requirements of the participants, methods of data collection, an explanation of confidentiality and its limitations, and any potential risks included in participation. The parent figures returned the signed consent form directly to this researcher to permit their own and their child's participation. Adolescent participants who were under the age of 15 were asked to provide their assent to participate. Adolescents who were 15 and over were asked to provide their consent to participate in the study. Contact information for the researcher, supervising faculty member (also bilingual), and University Institutional Review Board (IRB) was provided so that participants could contact the researcher and others with questions or concerns. A written assent form was also provided for child participants to sign.

Several accommodations for confidentiality were maintained (e.g., enough space so that participants could feel comfortable answering questionnaires as freely as possible, without concern of others around them viewing answers). The investigator did not have access to the participants’ legal records or other information, and no such questions were asked of the participants. Specifically, participants were not asked about or expected to report legal status. The consent/assent forms were kept separate from the survey responses in order to maintain confidentiality. Names were not attached to the demographic measure and other questionnaires. Participants were reminded to only put their name on the consent/assent forms and no additional material. Each consent/assent form and questionnaire had a specific number-letter code for each individual participant, but names of participants were only placed on the consent/assent forms. This code
number was assigned to each form the participant completed. All forms were placed in a packet that was numbered (e.g., 001 through 120). Each form within the packet was numbered with a corresponding "P" for parent/padre (e.g., 001-P) and "C/H" for child/hijo/hija (e.g., 001-C/H). While the number was the same for each parent/child dyad, the letter denoted which participant (parent or child) completed which form. On all standardized/copyrighted measures (BAS and CBCL) the blanks for all identifying information (e.g., day/month of birth, name, etc.) were marked through with a black marker so participants knew not to complete.

A participant was only to be identified by their code if it was determined that referral information was needed to be provided to a participant (e.g., when responses given reflected areas of clinical concern). However, after the initial nine participants were collected, it was decided that all participants would be given resources for acquiring mental health services in Spanish or English. This was due to the frequency (5 of 9) of these initial parent participants expressing interest in such resources. Upon completion, all study materials were given directly to the investigator and subsequently placed in a locked location. All files were stored without names or personally identifying information. Once all measures were returned to the investigator, they were immediately placed in a locked file with their corresponding number. This file did not include the consent form as these were placed in a separate location. All data were entered into a secure database protected by a password that only the investigator had access to in order to minimize the risk to participants' confidentiality.

As mentioned previously, all forms and measures were provided in both English and Spanish. Participants were allowed to complete the forms and measures in the
language they preferred. Once consent was received, families were asked to complete a packet of measures. Both the parent and child completed the demographic information form and the Bidimensional Acculturation Scale for Hispanics (BAS). The Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL; Parent Report forms) was completed by the parent.

All participating families were informed that their voluntary participation would earn them a King Soopers $5 gift card each for the parent and child participant. The compensation to child and parent participants was approved by the IRB and was of minimal value ($5 each individual participant). Therefore, it was not expected that this compensation did unduly influence socioeconomically disadvantaged individuals’ decisions to participate.

**Measures**

*Demographics Variables:* Parents were asked to complete a demographic questionnaire in which they reported their age and gender, the age and gender of their child, the current grade level of the child, ethnicity, parental employment status (yes/no), parents’ length of time living in the U.S., parents’ country of origin (optional), child’s length of time living in the U.S., and child’s country of origin (optional; See Appendix C). Families were asked to indicate whether or not the child is currently receiving any mental health treatment. Questions for the child version of the demographic questionnaire were modified, but reflected the same content as the parent questionnaire.

*Language Brokering.* The final question on the child demographic form assessed the frequency of language brokering for each child participant. Specifically, it was assessed how many times in the past month the child has been in a situation in which they have had to translate for the parents or other family members. This question was assessed
on the following Likert-type scale, with responses ranging from: (a) never, (b) 1-3 times, (c) 4-6 times, (d) 7-9 times, and (e) 10 or more times (See Appendix C).

*Language Acculturation Discrepancy (LAD).* The Bidimensional Acculturation Scale for Hispanics (BAS) is a 24-item language-based measure of acculturation (Marín & Gamba, 1996). The BAS was validated using a random sample of 254 adult Hispanics and scores have been shown to demonstrate high internal consistency and include high validity coefficients in both the English and Spanish versions (Marín & Gamba, 1996). Results show that the scale works well with Mexican Americans and with Central Americans (Marín & Gamba, 1996). Additionally, studies have used the BAS to investigate connections between acculturation and psychosocial outcomes in adolescents and families (Christenson, Zabriskie, Eggett, & Freeman, 2006).

Each parent/caregiver and their youth enrolled in this study completed the BAS. The scale is bidimensional in nature and allows for examination of tendency toward the heritage language (Spanish) or toward the host language (English). The BAS provides an acculturation score toward two major language domains by including 12 items (per language domain) that measure three language-related areas: linguistic use (e.g., “How often do you think in English?”), linguistic proficiency (e.g., “How well do you speak English?”), and language of electronic media use (e.g., “How often do you watch television programs in English?”).

The items on the three subscales were presented in random order. Each participant was asked to rate their belief about the statement on a 4-point Likert type scale (1=Almost Never/Very Poorly; 4= Almost Always/Very Well), as it relates to their own degree of use and proficiency. The total scale consists of 24 items (12 for each
language domain). Respondents were allowed to choose to answer the BAS in English or Spanish. The answers to the 12 items that measure each language domain were totaled for each participant, and the participant was assigned a total Language Acculturation (LA) score for his/her Spanish and English domain. The total LA score for each domain was then divided by 12 (number of questions in each domain) in order to determine a mean LA score in each language domain. The possible mean LA score range is from 1 to 4 for each language domain (1 = low adherence; 4 = high adherence to specific language dimension). The two mean LA scores were used to determine the level of language acculturation of each respondent. Based on the literature, language acculturation categories were assigned with a mean score of 2.5 used as a cutoff to indicate either low or high adherence to each language domain, for descriptive purposes (Marín & Gamba, 1996). Scores above 2.5 in both language domains were interpreted as indicating bilingualism on the part of the participant (Marín & Gamba, 1996).

The LAD Total Difference variable was calculated by determining the absolute value of the difference between each child and parent participants’ total raw score (prior to calculation of the mean) across both language domains. In other words, a difference score was calculated from the absolute value of the child’s score on the English domain minus the parent’s score on the English domain. This value was added to the absolute value of the difference when the parent’s score was subtracted from the child’s score on the Spanish domain as well. Thus, a total difference score between the child and their parent participant was created. In this manner, the actual difference of language proficiency and language use between the parent and child is reflected in a continuous manner. Utilizing the absolute value of the difference between parent and child
participants allows for incorporation of all possibilities of the types of differences that might occur within families (e.g., parent has higher English language acculturation than the child).

The LAD Interaction variable was computed based on the parent-child dyad’s placement in the interaction model (See Table 6). It was determined by first assessing each participant’s primary language adherence, as described above. Next, based on the mean language acculturation score on each language dimension, each participant was considered as either high or low in that domain based on the 2.5 mean cutoff score (Marín & Gamba, 1996). When the child was high in English acculturation and the parent was low, the dyad was placed in group 1 of the model (n = 59). When both parent and child participants were high on English acculturation they were placed in group 2 (n = 32). When both participants shared low acculturation to English they were placed in group 3 (n = 2). When the parent was high on English acculturation and the child was low, the dyad was placed in group 4 in the model (n = 4).

Outcome Variable: Child Behavior Checklist for Ages 6-18 (CBCL/6-18). The Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL) is a widely used instrument used to assess a child’s problematic behaviors and competencies (Achenbach, 1991; Achenbach & Rescorla, 2001). The CBCL is a self-administered questionnaire and contains Teacher Report Forms, Youth Self-Reports and a Parent Report Form for children 1.5 to 5-years-old or ages six to 18. The first section of the measure consists of 20 competence items covering the child’s activities, social relations and school performance (participants were instructed to not complete these items in the current study as answers would likely make the participant more easily identified). The second section contains 120 items on behavior
and/or emotional problems appearing within the past six months. The CBCL is available in both English and Spanish versions.

The CBCL includes 120 items on a Likert-type scale with the following subscales: Aggressive Behavior, Anxious/Depressed, Attention Problems, Delinquent Rule-Breaking Behavior, Social Problems, Somatic Complaints, Thought Problems, and Withdrawn. Additionally, the CBCL yields a composite Total Problems subscale (used as the outcome variable in the current study; Achenbach & Rescorla, 2001). Standardized ratings permit separate normed comparisons by gender for three age groups: 4-5 year-olds, 6–11 year-olds, and 12–18 year-olds. T-scores are provided for the Total Problems score, two broad-band dimensions (Internalizing, Externalizing), the 8 clinical syndrome subscales listed above, adaptive functioning, and DSM-oriented scales (Achenbach & Rescorla, 2001).

A computer-based scoring program is utilized to determine the total scores (standardized T-score) for each subscale (Achenbach & Rescorla, 2001). Questions are answered based on, “how true each item is now or within the past six months” using the following scale: 0 = not true; 1 = somewhat or sometimes true; and 2 = very true or often true. Some examples of statements for items on this measure include: (a) “Argues a lot” (b) “Can’t sit still, restless, or hyperactive” (c) “Nervous, high-strung, or tense”. Only the CBCL Total Problems subscale was used for analysis in the current study.

The CBCL was normed on a diverse sample of 1,753 school aged children (6-18 years-old) from 100 different sites across 40 states within the U.S. (Achenbach, 1991; Achenbach & Rescorla, 2001). The ethnicity of the normative sample included African-American, Caucasian, Hispanic/Latina/o, and Other (Achenbach, 1991; Achenbach &
Rescorla, 2001). All versions of the measure are considered to have high internal consistency, with reliability estimates ranging from .78 to .97. Additionally, test-retest reliability ranges from .95 to 1.00 and the measure also proves to have high inter-rater reliability ranging from .93 to .96. Criterion validity is considered to be acceptable for all forms of the CBCL (Achenbach & Rescorla, 2001). For the purposes of this study, the CBCL for children ages six to 18 was used and only the Parent-Report was collected. Participants who did not fully complete CBCL measure were excluded from the final analyses of this study. Any missing data from this measure prevent a score report to be generated, therefore limiting the ability to obtain a Total Problems subscale.

As previously noted, all written and verbal materials were presented to participants in a bilingual (English/Spanish) capacity. Translated versions of the BAS and CBCL in Spanish have been standardized and validated and were used in the current study (See Table 3 for number of forms completed in Spanish and English). The brief demographic questionnaire, consent and assent forms were translated into Spanish and then back-translated from Spanish to English by one native and one non-native Spanish speaker and were found to match consistently.

**Data Analyses**

Data analyses were performed in two stages, preliminary and primary analyses. During the preliminary analyses, demographic information and descriptive statistics for participants and measures were investigated. The composite total problems subscale (based on parent report) from the CBCL was utilized as the principle outcome variable. Analyses of the demographics of the participants were conducted to describe the participants in the study. Analyses were also carried out to determine if there were any
differences on demographic variables between the families with varying levels of language acculturation and high and low language brokering environments.

Additionally, a power analysis for hierarchical multiple regression analyses was conducting using G-POWER in order to determine a sufficient sample size based on the research questions listed below. The power analysis was conducted using an alpha level of 0.05 and a desired statistical power level of 0.80. A moderate f-square effect size was set at 0.15 (Cohen, 1988). Based on the aforementioned assumptions, with five predictor variables included in the regression analyses, the desired minimum sample size was determined to be 91.

The primary statistical analyses of the research questions are as follows:

1. Is there a significant relationship between LAD and the Latina/o child participants’ Total Problems subscale scores? In order to investigate whether or not a relationship exists between LAD and CBCL Total Problems, a Pearson correlation coefficient was conducted.

2. Is there a significant relationship between language brokering (item 11 on child demographic questionnaire) and CBCL Total Problems subscale in Latina/o adolescents? Similar to the above question, a Pearson correlation coefficient was computed in order to explore the relationship between language brokering and the CBCL Total Problems subscale score for the youth in this study.

3. Can the CBCL Total Problems subscale score of emotional problems in Latina/o adolescents be best predicted by LAD total difference (e.g., the value of the difference in language acculturation between the parent and the child), when demographic variables (child length of time in the U.S., and sex of child), the specific
language acculturation score of the child (as measured by the BAS), and the language brokering score of the child are controlled? Additionally, when the parent-child dyad’s placement in the LAD interaction model is considered instead of the LAD total difference score, will LAD again be predictive of total emotional and behavioral problems?

Two separate three-block hierarchical regression analyses were to be conducted with the composite CBCL Total Problems subscale (based on parent report) as the dependent variable. The demographic variables child length of time in the U.S., and gender of child were entered as the first block in both regression equations. The total language acculturation score of the child (as measured by the BAS) and the language brokering score of the child were entered as the second block in both regression equations. The value of the total difference in language acculturation between the parent and child (LAD total difference) was entered as the third block in the first equation and the parent-child dyad’s placement in the LAD interaction model was to be entered as the third block in the second regression equation. However, due to limited number of dyads placed in group 3 and 4 in the LAD interaction model (n = 2 and n = 4 respectively) it was decided the second hierarchical regression would be dropped from the final analysis.

Summary

Chapter Three described the methodology used in the present study. Descriptions of the participants, procedure, measures, and data analyses were provided. Preliminary and primary analyses were subsequently conducted in order to answer the research questions of this study.
Chapter Four

Results of the Study

Overview

This chapter presents the results of the statistical analyses associated with the current study. The results of the preliminary analyses are presented, which are followed by the results of the primary analyses related to the research questions. All preliminary and primary statistical analyses were performed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences version 11.5 for Windows (SPSS 11.5). All statistical analyses used two-tailed tests of significance with an alpha level that was set at \( p < .05 \).

As previously indicated, the current study sought to determine whether the CBCL total problems subscale of emotional problems in Latina/o adolescents can be predicted by LAD (total difference value and interaction group) between the parent and the child. The variables for child length of time in the U.S., gender of child, the specific language acculturation (LA) score of the child (as measured by the BAS) and the language brokering (LB) score of the child were controlled.

Two separate three-block hierarchical regression analyses were conducted with the composite total problems subscale (as measured by the CBCL) as the dependent variable. In the first regression hierarchy the demographic variables (child length of time in the U.S., and gender of child) were entered as the first block. The specific language acculturation total score of the child (as measured by the BAS) and the language brokering score of the child were entered as the second block. The absolute value of the
difference in language acculturation between the parent and child (LAD total difference) was entered as the third block. For the second regression hierarchy, the variables controlled in blocks one and two were the same as in the first regression hierarchy and the parent-child dyad’s placement in the LAD interaction model was to be entered as the third block. However, due to the limited number of parent-child dyads in two of the groupings of the LAD interaction model, the second hierarchical regression was dropped from the analysis.

This section is organized in the following way: (a) demographic information, (b) explanation of creation of Language Acculturation Discrepancy (LAD) total difference variable and the LAD interaction variable, (c) descriptive statistics of the demographic, LAD variables, and CBCL measures, (d) correlations of LAD, language brokering (LB), and CBCL variables, (e) hierarchical regression analysis of the LAD variables as predictive of the outcome (CBCL) variables.

Demographic Information

A demographic questionnaire (Appendices C and D) was used to collect information on the participants’ demographic characteristics. These data are presented in Table 3. The demographic data are presented for the total sample of 97 parent-youth dyads who participated fully in the current study and who met all of the inclusion criteria previously indicated in Chapter Three. Among all of the participants recruited, 120 parent-child dyads agreed to participate and questionnaires were given to these participants. Among all dyads that agreed to participate, a total of 23 could not be included in the final sample due to incomplete data (e.g., incomplete outcome measure, data on parent or child completely missing).
Table 3
Demographic Information of Study Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Variables (N = 97)</th>
<th>Parent Participants n (%)</th>
<th>Child Participants n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>18 (18.6%)</td>
<td>55 (56.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>79 (81.4%)</td>
<td>42 (43.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean years (± SD)</td>
<td>37.22 ± 6.26</td>
<td>12.02 ± 2.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>25-59</td>
<td>8-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language Questionnaires Were Completed:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>84 (86.6%)</td>
<td>97 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>13 (13.4%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latina/o</td>
<td>95 (97.9%)</td>
<td>94 (96.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Multi-ethnic)</td>
<td>2 (2.10%)</td>
<td>2 (2.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Country of Birth:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States of America</td>
<td>17 (17.5%)</td>
<td>70 (72.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico (a.k.a., United States of Mexico)</td>
<td>78 (80.4%)</td>
<td>25 (25.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>2 (2.1%)</td>
<td>2 (2.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Length of Time Living in U.S.:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean years (± SD)</td>
<td>18.04 ± 9.58</td>
<td>10.96 ± 3.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>4-52</td>
<td>1-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Religious Affiliation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>73 (75.3%)</td>
<td>73 (75.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>10 (10.3%)</td>
<td>9 (9.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None/Not Indicated</td>
<td>14 (14.4%)</td>
<td>14 (14.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parent Employment Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>39 (40.2%)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>52 (53.6%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Indicated</td>
<td>6 (6.4%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Child in Mental Health Treatment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>10 (10.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>87 (89.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Language Acculturation Discrepancy Variables

The parent/caregiver and their youth each completed the Bidimensional Acculturation Scale for Hispanics (BAS; Marín & Gamba, 1996). This is a 24-item language-based measure of acculturation. The scale is bidimensional in nature and therefore allowed for examination of tendency toward Spanish language use and proficiency or toward English language use and proficiency. The BAS provides an acculturation score for 2 major language dimensions (Spanish and English) by including 12 items per dimension. The BAS measures three language areas including use, proficiency, and electronic media use (e.g., radio, TV). The scale items were presented in random order. Each participant was asked to rate their belief about the statement on a 4-point rating scale, regarding their behavior or adherence to the statement. Respondents chose to answer the BAS in English or Spanish.

As directed by the authors of the measure, the answers to the 12 items that measure each of the two language domains were summed for each participant producing a language acculturation (LA) score for the Spanish and English domains (Marín & Gamba, 1996). These LA scores were utilized in the primary analysis. The Language Acculturation Discrepancy (LAD) total difference variable was calculated by determining the absolute value of the difference between each participant’s total score for both language domains. In other words, a difference score was derived from the absolute value of the child’s LA score on the English domain minus the parent’s LA score on the English domain. This value was added to the absolute value of the difference of the parent’s LA score subtracted from the child’s LA score on the Spanish domain as well. Thus, a total language acculturation difference score between the child and their
respective parent participant was calculated. In this manner, the actual difference of language proficiency and use (LAD total difference) between the parent and child participants was reflected in a continuous, rather than discrete manner.

As instructed by the authors of the measure, missing data (e.g., a response was skipped or left blank) was accounted for by inserting the mean score of that participant’s other responses within that language dimension as a substitute for the missing data (Marín & Gamba, 1996). However, a cut-off was set so that each participant needed to complete at least 80% of the entire measure for their data to be included. For participants that did not complete at least 80% of the measure (e.g., did not complete the back of a double sided form) the parent-child dyad was removed completely from the analysis.

The mean language acculturation (LA) scores were derived based on results of the BAS. Within each language domain (English and Spanish), a score of 48 was the highest possible LA total, with a score of 30 or above indicating criteria for adherence to that specific language domain. The mean English language acculturation score was 27.86 and 42.39 for parent and child participants respectively. The mean Spanish language acculturation score was 41.71 and 33.04 for the parent and child participants respectively. Across each participating dyad, the language acculturation scores for each language was subtracted from one another in order to derive an absolute value, which is the LAD total difference score for each dyad.

In order to determine each participant’s primary language adherence, a mean score was derived from the BAS total score for each respective language. The possible score range is from 1 to 4 for each language domain and these two scores were used to determine the level of acculturation of the respondent (1 = low adherence to English or
Spanish language domain; 4 = high adherence to English or Spanish language domain).

Primary language adherence categories were assigned with a mean score of 2.5 used as a
cutoff to indicate either low or high adherence to a language domain, for descriptive
purposes. Scores above 2.5 in both language domains was interpreted as indicating
bilingualism on the part of the participant. When this was the case, the mean of the total
scores in both languages was calculated in order to derive a total score for the bilingual
participants. Table 4 indicates the frequencies of language adherence for each
parent/caregiver and youth participant.
Table 4
Descriptive Information for Language-based Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Child Language Brokering (past month):</th>
<th>n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>31 (32%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3 Times</td>
<td>21 (21.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6 Times</td>
<td>19 (19.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9 Times</td>
<td>5 (5.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 or more Times</td>
<td>21 (21.6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Adherence:</th>
<th>Parent</th>
<th>Child</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>11 (11.4%)</td>
<td>33 (34.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>59 (60.8%)</td>
<td>3 (3.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual</td>
<td>27 (27.8%)</td>
<td>61 (61.8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A reliability coefficient for the Bidimensional Acculturation Scale (BAS) was found to be strong (alpha = .72) and (alpha = .82) for the parent and youth respondents respectively. Reliability coefficient for the Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL) was found to be strong (alpha = .957) for the parent respondents. These results are presented in Table 5 below.
Table 5
Reliability of Measures Included in Analyses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bidimensional Acculturation Scale (BAS):</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Version</td>
<td>.719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Version</td>
<td>.821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 97; 24 items in measure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL):</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 97; 140 items in measure</td>
<td>.957</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Language Acculturation Discrepancy (LAD) interaction variable was calculated by utilizing an interaction approach (Birman, 2006). An interaction approach to the acculturation gap accounts for the various combinations of parents’ and children’s acculturation levels and styles (e.g., child is high on English acculturation and the parent is low). As illustrated in Table 6, four possible combinations of high or low levels of English language acculturation within families exist. The interaction approach, as suggested in the extant literature (Birman, 2006), allows for the exploration of differences among all four different groups represented in Table 6. This approach not only allows for an assessment of whether a discrepancy or total difference in levels of acculturation within families is related to difficulties in adjustment. It also allows for an examination of how the direction of the gap and specific acculturative styles may have an impact on youth adjustment.

The parent-child dyad’s placement in the interaction model was determined by first assessing each participant’s primary language adherence, as described above. Next, based on the mean language acculturation score on each dimension (English and Spanish) each participant was considered as either high or low in that domain based on the 2.5 mean cutoff score (Marín & Gamba, 1996). When the child was high in English acculturation and the parent was low, the dyad was placed in group 1 of the model (n = 59). When both parent and child participants were high on English acculturation they were placed in group 2 (n = 32). When both participants shared low acculturation to English they were placed in group 3 (n = 2). When the parent was high on English acculturation and the child was low, the dyad was placed in group 4 in the model (n = 4).
However, as Birman (2006) has indicated in her work, it is difficult to utilize this model to develop empirical findings due to the rarity of certain parent-child dyad combinations (e.g., as is the case with parent high on U.S. acculturation scores and the child is low). In the case of the current study, the number of cases in which the parent indicated a higher adherence toward English was four, and the number of cases in which both parent and child participants indicated a low adherence to English was two, as demonstrated in Table 6. In such cases of low representation for certain groups in the interaction model, the literature suggests dropping analysis involving so few cases and using the two-dimensional approach (e.g., LAD total difference) in determining the differing levels of acculturation within families (Birman, 2006; Pasch et al, 2006). Such a model has been applied in the current study as it was decided to not use the interaction approach, as represented by the LAD interaction variable, and the second hierarchical regression model was dropped from the study.

Instead, in order to still test the hypothesis that total emotional and behavioral problems would be higher for child participants in families who exhibit an acculturation gap, a one-way analyses of variance (ANOVA) was conducted with the LAD interaction groups and the outcome variable in order to determine if the mean of the CBCL Total Problems subscale significantly differed among the four groups of the LAD interaction model. The ANOVA was conducted with group 1 (child high/parent low on English LA) group 2 (child high/parent high on English LA) group 3 (child low/parent low on English LA) and group 4 (child low/parent high on English LA) as the independent variable and the total problems score as the dependent variable for the ANOVA. Tukey post hoc tests were to be used when the one-way ANOVA was significant.
As mentioned previously, the participants were not evenly distributed among the levels of the LAD interaction model. A homogeneity of variance test was computed in order to test this assumption for the analysis, and the groups’ variances are not significantly different from each other (p = .119); therefore successfully meeting this assumption. Finally, results of the ANOVA revealed that there were no significant differences among the groups: $F(3, 93) = 1.65$, $p = .184$. This indicates the interaction model may not be the most effective means of representing LAD within families, especially when groups within the model are not represented with a sufficient number of participants.
Table 6
LAD Interaction of Parent and Child English Acculturation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Children’s Acculturation</th>
<th>Parent’s Acculturation</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Group #1</td>
<td>Group #2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mismatched</td>
<td>Matched</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Both Acculturated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High risk</td>
<td>Both not Acculturated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n = 59)</td>
<td>(n = 2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group #3</td>
<td>Group #4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Matched</td>
<td>Mismatched</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Both not Acculturated</td>
<td>Unexpected Gaps</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n = 2)</td>
<td>(n = 4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive analyses of the critical variables included in the study were performed to determine if the responses were normally distributed and if the data showed sufficient variability. The analyses included the number of respondents, means, and standard deviations (see Table 7). The presentation of each variable includes parent and child assessment.
Table 7
Descriptive Statistics for Parent/Child Measures in Analyses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LA English Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>27.86</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>12-48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>42.39</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>22-48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LA Spanish Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>41.71</td>
<td>10.06</td>
<td>12-48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>33.04</td>
<td>6.92</td>
<td>18-48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LAD Total Difference (absolute value)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Parent and Child</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>27.74</td>
<td>13.41</td>
<td>5-55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CBCL Total Problems</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>97</td>
<td>51.11</td>
<td>12.32</td>
<td>24-76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Language Acculturation Discrepancy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>60.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Correlations of Critical Variables

Correlations of the variables comprising the primary analyses were calculated to describe the strength and direction of the linear relationship between the variables. Additionally, the assumptions of normality, linearity, and homoscedasticity were tested.

First, preliminary analyses were performed to determine whether there were any violations of the assumptions of normality, linearity, and homoscedasticity for the variables of LAD, language brokering, and CBCL. An examination of the data indicated that the responses were normally distributed and that there was sufficient variability within the sample. Scores on each variable appeared to be relatively normally distributed after viewing the histograms. Shapiro-Wilks statistics for test of normality revealed no violations of the assumption of normality for the three variables. In addition, the normal probability plots indicated a normal distribution. Scatterplots for all three variables indicated there was no violation for the linearity and homoscedasticity assumptions. Therefore, the data were considered to be independent of one another.

The relationships between the variables included in the primary analyses were investigated using a Pearson correlation coefficient. Correlation coefficients for the demographic variables of child’s gender and length of time living in the U.S. were correlated with the variables of language brokering, the child’s total language acculturation score, and the LAD total difference score. Results are presented in Table 8 and indicated a strong positive relationship between child gender and child total language acculturation score \((r = .278)\), LAD total difference and the length of time the child has been living in the U.S. \((r = .264)\), and LAD total difference and the child language brokering measure \((r = .271)\).
Table 8
Pearson Correlation for Variables included in Primary Analyses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Child Gender (male = 1)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Child Length of Time In U.S.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>.506</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Child LB Score</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.134</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>.822</td>
<td>.190</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Child LA Score</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.278</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.370</td>
<td>.847</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. LAD Total Difference</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-.057</td>
<td>.264</td>
<td>.271</td>
<td>-.049</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>.580</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.642</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .05, two tailed.**
Primary Analyses

The previous section addressed demographic information and other preliminary analyses. The following section concentrates on the analyses and results for the three research questions in this study.

Research Questions

Question 1. Is there a relationship between total language acculturation discrepancy (LAD) between parent and child participants and the total problems subscale on the CBCL among Latina/o youth?

In order to investigate whether or not a relationship exists between LAD and CBCL Total Problems, a Pearson correlation coefficient was conducted. Although a negative relationship was noted, there was no statistically significant correlation between the two variables ($r (95) = -.185, \ p = .069$). Results are presented in Table 9.
Table 9
Pearson Correlation for LAD and CBCL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LAD</th>
<th>CBCL Total Problems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language Acculturation Discrepancy (LAD)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CBCL Total Problems</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-.185</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 2. Is there a relationship between language brokering among Latina/o youth and the total problems subscale on the CBCL?

Similar to the above question, a Pearson correlation coefficient was computed in order to explore the relationship between language brokering and the CBCL total problems subscale for the youth in this study. The positive relationship between these two variables was not found to be statistically significant ($r (95) = .132, p = .199$).
Table 10
Pearson Correlation for Language Brokering and CBCL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Language Brokering</th>
<th>CBCL Total Problems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language Brokering</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CBCL Total Problems</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>.199</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 3. Can the total problems subscale of the CBCL be best predicted by the LAD total difference score, as well as by placement in the LAD interaction model?

A hierarchical regression analysis was conducted with the variables entered in a stepwise fashion. The gender of the child and length of time the child has been living in the U.S. were entered into the first block of the regression equation. Based on the literature, these variables were entered first in order to control for their potential effect on the Total Problems subscale of the CBCL (Birman, 2006; Gonzales et al., 2006; Lau et al., 2005). The second block of the regression included the language brokering variable and the child’s total language acculturation score (as measured by the BAS), based on their primary language adherence, in order to explore their predictability of the CBCL total problems subscale independent of the demographic variables included in the first block. Finally, based on the hypothesis that the total LAD will account for the highest amount of variance of the total problems CBCL subscale, the LAD total difference score was entered into the third block of the equation. Results of the hierarchical regression analysis are shown in Table 11 and indicated that the child’s total language acculturation score \((t (93) = 2.39, p < .05)\) and the measure of LAD total difference \((t (93) = -2.01, p < .05)\) were significant predictors of the total problems subscale on the CBCL.

Additionally, the third block of the regression analysis was significantly predictive of scores on the CBCL total problems subscale beyond controlled variables and explained a significant portion of the variance \((R^2 = .122, F (88, 93) = 2.448, p < .05)\). The percent of variability that was accounted for by the third block was increased from 8.2% predictive power at the second step, to 12.2%, indicating an additional 4% of the variance that is accounted for by the language acculturation discrepancy variable \(\Delta R^2 = .040, p = < .05)\).
Table 11
Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting CBCL Total Problems – LAD Total Difference Equation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE B</td>
<td>β</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Gender</td>
<td>.963</td>
<td>2.550</td>
<td>.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Length of time in US</td>
<td>-.069</td>
<td>.347</td>
<td>-.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Language Brokering</td>
<td>1.162</td>
<td>.808</td>
<td>.149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child LA Total Score</td>
<td>.716</td>
<td>.299</td>
<td>.250*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAD Total Difference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R²                                   | .002    | .082    | .122    |
F for change in R²                   | .081    | 3.878*  | 4.039*  |

* p < .05
Chapter Five
Discussion

Overview

Chapter Five will cover the following topics: (a) brief summary of the study, (b) discussion of the overall findings related to the research questions, (c) limitations of the study, (d) implications for future research, and (e) conclusions.

Summary of the Study

The main purpose of this study was to investigate whether language acculturation discrepancy among parents and adolescents predicts higher rates of emotional and behavioral disorders in Latina/o youth. Among the myriad of cultural and demographic variables that have been examined in the scientific literature, a direct analysis of language acculturation discrepancy within families as a predictor of emotional and behavioral problems is an area that is limited in the extant literature. It has yet to be determined whether or not language acculturation discrepancy is a risk factor for such problematic emotional and behavioral functioning.

Szapocznik and colleagues proposed an acculturation model to explain how acculturation gaps affect family functioning and adolescent behavior. The model hypothesizes that a tendency for parents to adhere more toward their culture of origin can lead to alienation from their children, who typically and more quickly adhere to the dominant U.S. culture (Szapocznik & Kurtines, 1980; Szapocznik & Kurtines, 1993; Szapocznik et al., 1984). In an effort to manage these differences, family conflict can
occur (Pasch, et al., 2006). The acculturation gap-distress hypothesis has been described as the clash of values and preferences arising from intergenerational acculturation gaps that lead to family conflict, which in turn result in youth maladjustment (Lau et al., 2005). Pasch et al (2006) suggested that in an effort to restrict their child’s acculturation to the dominant culture, the parent only succeeds in further alienating the child from the rest of the family. Vega et al (1995), found that the failure to resolve these differences can result in youth behavioral problems.

As noted in previous chapters, often the means of measuring acculturation is determined by the frequency of language use. While some studies offer analysis on differing levels of acculturation – with language competency and use being the primary indicator of acculturation – between groups (e.g., between families or ethnic groups), they do not offer insight into discrepant levels of acculturation within families (e.g., between parent and child; Gonzales et al., 2006; Sanderson et al., 2004; Vega et al., 1995; Yu et al., 2003). More comprehensive measures of acculturation that go beyond frequency of language use and competency have also been used. Often, studies using such measures include an examination of discrepant levels of acculturation between parents and youth. However, even when frequency of language use is included in these more comprehensive measures of acculturation, the direct analysis of language variables is not provided in the results or discussion of the study (Dinh et al., 2002; Martinez, 2006; Schofield et al., 2008). Among the studies that offer insight into the differing levels of acculturation between parents and children, the degree to which language acculturation discrepancy accounts for such differences has not been analyzed.
Furthermore, the degree to which language acculturation discrepancy accounts for subsequent emotional and behavioral problems in adjusting has not been explained. Therefore, the current study will offer unique insight into the degree language acculturation discrepancy between parents and their children accounts for the variance in emotional and behavioral problems for Latina/o youth.

A two-dimensional approach, as used in the current study with the use of the BAS, assumes that acculturation involves two independent processes, one to the new language and the other to the native language. The use of the Bidimensional Acculturation Scale in the current study allows for separate assessment for each dimension of acculturation, one with respect to the host culture, one with respect to the native culture. The resulting scores (as measured by the BAS) can then be used independently or as in interaction to predict outcomes of interest.

A major strength of the current study is that it does not assume that differences between parents and children always occur in the same direction, with children always having more language acculturation to new/host culture or language than their parents. The extant literature typically assumes that parents are always more attached to native culture than children (Birman, 2006; Farver et al., 2002). To address this limitation, Merali (2002) used the absolute value of the difference in parent-child acculturation scores to compute the gap. In this manner, with the use of a two-dimensional approach, the direction of the difference can still be accounted for but is not assumed to be occurring one way, as is the case in the current study (n = 4, families in which the parent scored higher in English acculturation than the child).
The current study considers acculturation, specifically language acculturation, as measured solely by linguistic proficiency and linguistic use. Previous literature has offered support for language factors (i.e., use and proficiency) as being the primary indicators of acculturation (Gonzalez et al., 2006; Marin & Gamba, 1996). As an additional strength, this study considers the relevance of language brokering in the context of differing levels of acculturation within families, as defined in previous chapters.

In the present study, Language Acculturation Discrepancy (LAD) between parent and child within the same family was assessed to determine the degree to which it may be related to subsequent emotional and behavior problems in youth. This study sought to answer the following questions:

1. Is there a significant relationship between LAD and the Latina/o child participants’ total problems subscale scores?

2. Is there a significant relationship between language brokering and total problems in Latina/o adolescents?

3. Can total problems in Latina/o adolescents be best predicted by specific parent and child predictor variables, specifically the LAD total difference score and the family’s placement in the LAD interaction model, when other variables are controlled?

Discussion of Overall Findings

Not surprisingly, the majority of the child participants indicated a primary language adherence to English (n = 33, 34.3%), or to English and Spanish equally (Bilingual; n = 61, 61.8%). Only three child participants indicated a primary adherence
to Spanish (3.9%), yet all child participants elected to complete the measures in English, indicating at least partial Bilingualism on the part of all youth participants. Among the parent participants, more than half of the sample indicated a primary language adherence toward Spanish (n = 59, 60.8%), followed by equal adherence to English and Spanish (n = 27, 27.8%), and only 11 parent participants indicated primary adherence to English (11.4%). All parent participants elected to complete the forms in Spanish.

The language brokering item was asked on both the parent and child demographic questionnaire. When a discrepancy occurred in the frequency of language brokering between the child and parent, it was determined the child report would be the most important to enter into the model (Love & Buriel, 2007; Martinez et al., 2009). Additionally, the parent and child responses on this item were found to correlate significantly (r = .725). Approximately one third (n = 31, 32%) of the child participants indicated never needing to translate for their parents or family members. This coincides with the 36 parent participants who reported either primarily English or Bilingual language adherence. Therefore, a remaining 68% of the sample indicated they had been placed in the role of language broker within the past month (n = 21, 1-3 times; n = 19, 4-6 times; n = 5, 7-9 times; n = 21, 10 or more times; n = 66).

Table 6 represents the frequency of parent-child dyad placement in the four possible categories of the LAD interaction variable. These numbers will be reported here despite the decision of the regression hierarchy including the LAD interaction variable to be dropped from the analysis. Further, it was decided such variables could still be tested with the inclusion of the one-way ANOVA’s. Most commonly, the child participant indicated high adherence to English, with their parent indicating low adherence to
English (n = 59). The second most common grouping occurred in which both the parent and child participants indicated a high adherence to English (n = 32). Within this sample it was rare for both the child and parent participant to indicate low adherence to English (n = 2) and for the parent to report high adherence to English with their child reporting low adherence to English (n = 4). As previously noted, these frequencies suggest that the acculturation gaps do not always occur in the expected direction, depending on which dimension of acculturation (English or Spanish) is considered. While language acculturation gaps in this study typically occurred in the direction expected, it is important not to discount the number of families that seem to have gaps in “unexpected directions” (Birman, 2006; Birman & Poff, 2010).

The purpose of the first research question was to determine if the LAD total difference score was related to the total problems outcome score. A Pearson correlation coefficient was computed and there was not found to be a statistically significant correlation between the two variables. This result is important given the findings of the regression hierarchy that will be discussed later in this chapter. As will be explained, the LAD total difference score was a significant predictor of the outcome variable when other variables of importance were controlled. Therefore, the hypothesis put forth by this author that a positive relationship would exist between these to variables was not supported and requires further investigation. Such findings indicate the relationship between the LAD total difference and the total problems subscale is only significant when other variables are controlled and is negative.

The purpose of the second research question was to determine whether a relationship exists between language brokering and the total problems scale. A Pearson
correlation coefficient was computed in order to explore the relationship between language brokering and the CBCL total problems subscale for the youth in this study. The positive relationship between these two variables was not found to be statistically significant. Therefore, the second hypothesis put forth by this author, that a positive relationship would exist between LB and the total problems subscale at a significant level was not supported. This finding is not entirely surprising. For one, approximately one third of the sample (n = 31, 32%) reported they are never in a language brokering situation. More importantly, there is inconsistency in the extant literature as to the possibility of language brokering representing a positive coping mechanism for the child language broker (i.e., a protective factor), or an additional source of stress and subsequent maladjustment (Love & Buriel, 2007; Martinez, 2006; Martinez et al., 2009; Valdés, 2003). It has been widely suggested in the literature that continued research needs to be done to examine the true implications for high language brokering situations (Villanueva & Buriel, 2010).

Additional preliminary analysis indicated there is a correlation between the LAD total difference and the LB measure. The positive relationship between these two variables was found to be statistically significant. As shown by this correlation, instances in which there is a high difference in language proficiency and use are likely to lead to more occasions in which the child is placed in a language brokering situation. However, as indicated above, placement in a language brokering situation was not found to be indicative of subsequent problems for the youth.

The purpose of the third research question was to determine whether a total language acculturation difference between parents and children would be most predictive
of total emotional and behavioral problems when certain variables were controlled. The rationale for controlling for each variable in the model was based on previous empirical research indicating these variables would be important to consider. The demographic predictors of gender and length of time in the U.S. have frequently been included as a variable to be accounted for, frequently in the first step of hierarchical multiple regression analyses (Birman, 2006; Lau et al., 2005; Szapocznik & Kurtines, 1980; Szapocznik & Kurtines, 1993; Szapocznik et al., 1984). Furthermore, length of time in the U.S. has been considered a crucial variable in not supporting the acculturation gap distress hypothesis due to the majority of the parents having lived in the U.S. for over 20 years (Lau et al., 2005).

In the second block, the child’s total language acculturation score was included due to evidence suggesting the parent and child’s score on acculturation (independent of a difference) could be an indicator of problems in adjustment (Gonzales et al., 2006; Pasch et al., 2006; Schofield et al., 2008; Unger et al., 2009). Language brokering was also entered as a variable to be controlled for since a range of stressors experienced by parents and youth in high language brokering contexts may account in important ways for the strong and positive associations previously noted between brokering and poorer emotional and behavioral adjustment (Love & Buriel, 2007; Martinez et al., 2009). As a strength, this study assessed the amount of language brokering that actually occurs in each family, which was entered in the equation model independently of the combined language proficiency and use within the families.

Based on the hypothesis that the total LAD will account for the highest amount of variance of the total problems CBCL subscale, the LAD total difference score was
entered into the third block of the equation. Results of the hierarchical regression analysis are shown in Table 11 and indicated that the child’s total language acculturation (LA) score and the measure of LAD total difference were significant predictors of the total problems subscale on the CBCL. Further, the third block of the regression analysis was significantly predictive of scores on the CBCL total problems subscale and still explained a significant portion of the variance as compared to the two previous blocks included in the model. Therefore, even when the child’s LA score, independent of that of the parent was controlled, the total difference between parent and child on language acculturation remained a significant predictor.

Overall, the total difference score accounted for the most amount of variance in the hierarchical regression model. This result provides support for the hypothesis put forth in the current study that the LAD will account for the highest degree of variance of the total problems subscale for youth participants. These findings provide continued support of the acculturation gap distress hypothesis originally put forth by Szapocznik and colleagues. Results demonstrate that the specific variable of language acculturation discrepancy is significantly predictive of total emotional and behavioral problems, even when other crucial variables of interest are controlled for. Therefore, results add to the body of literature on acculturation as a whole in that this research considers a specific aspect of acculturation. The level of acculturation, as indicated by adherence to a specific language dimension in terms of use and proficiency, is therefore indicated to be a crucial variable of interest when considering acculturation discrepancies within families.

The inclusion of the family’s placement in the interaction model was included in this study due to previous theoretical and empirical indications of the importance of
considering the model (Birman, 2006; Birman & Trickett, 2001; Pasch et al., 2006). As noted in previous chapters, the model is relevant because it allows for the various types of acculturative – or language-based – differences that occur within families to be included in the analysis. It is likely the interaction model was not found to be significant due to the limited number of parent-child dyads representing two of the groups in the interaction model (parent low/child low and parent high/child low on the English language domain). Though dyad placement in the interaction model (i.e., the type of LAD represented by the family) was not found to be a significant indicator of the outcome measure, this does not minimize considering the various types of acculturation processes that occur within families. While measuring language acculturation discrepancies may be done most effectively with a continuous measure (e.g., LAD total difference) examining the implications for varying combinations of language use and proficiency (i.e., as represented by the four groups in the interaction model) within families is still warranted.

Limitations of the Study

Several limitations to the current study are present. First, the majority of the parent figures that participated in the study were female (n = 79, 81.4%). The effects found in the current study may operate to a greater or lesser degree depending on the gender distribution of the child-parent dyads (e.g., mothers-sons, fathers-daughters). The limitations in sample size prohibited complete examination of the varying combinations, and therefore limit the generalizability somewhat.

This study only assessed differences between two family members. Assessing for differing levels of acculturation across multiple family members would likely provide much deeper insights on the impact LAD has on the entire family system. Unger et al.
(2009) suggested it is possible that acculturation discrepancies also may exist between the parents (indicating a potential reason for youth maladjustment) or among other extended family members. For example, it is possible that the father has more outside contact than the mother does, and he therefore might adopt the U.S. culture more rapidly than the mother does. The current study did not explore this potential effect.

Furthermore, it is possible that multiple generations of extended family members may be living in the home or nearby, and acculturation discrepancies between the grandparents and parent could affect the entire family climate, which may consequently affect the younger generations. More U.S.-oriented cousins or other relatives also may influence youth indirectly due to differences in degrees of acculturation. Future research may investigate the language orientations of all family members in the immediate and extended family in order to account for the varying combinations of discrepancies that exist within the family.

An additional limitation of the current study is failure to account for birth order of the child participant. Though when asked, the researcher encouraged families to have the oldest child participate in the study, this could not always be implemented due to the limited availability of all siblings. This was also not accounted for or documented in the demographic measure. The literature on language brokering speaks to the importance of considering birth order when considering its impact on families, as it is most often the oldest, female child that is typically placed in the language brokering situation (Martinez et al., 2009). Furthermore, differences in gender roles (not accounted for by this study) may be an indicator of being selected more frequently for language brokering. Among Latin/o adolescents, language brokering is less stressful for girls than boys (Love &
Buriel, 2007) perhaps because language brokering is more consistent with the gender-role expectation of Latinas. In larger families, parents may selectively choose more than one child to serve as language broker, depending on the situation (Villanueva & Buriel, 2009) and parents may even designate primary and non-primary language brokers within the same family could contribute to differing outcomes for the youth (Love & Buriel, 2007).

Another limitation of the current research is the wide age range of the child participants. As observed by Gonzales et al. (2006), the family mediators of the relationship between acculturation and youth are frequently changing. That is to say, mediators such as family conflict may change in degree and severity as the child gets older. Family acculturation can show many complex patterns that can vary across time. Therefore it is difficult for this study to capture the way family mediators can impact the family across time. It may have been helpful to narrow the focus of the age range in order to clarify how LAD can make an impact at a specifically identified developmental stage.

The current study only involved a one-time measure of the LAD within the families. Szapocznik and colleagues (1984) clarified that the acculturation gap is likely to widen as a function of time. Specifically, the difference in levels of acculturation is likely to increase the longer the family is living in the U.S. To accurately assess the risks for immigrant families, it is important to examine the association between acculturation gaps and youth behavioral problems across time in order to assess whether the gap does indeed widen with time (Lau et al., 2005).

Finally, it appears that the majority of the sample included Mexican American families. Most of the parent participants (n = 78, 80.4%) indicated they were born in
Mexico, as did approximately one quarter of the child participants (n = 25, 25.8%).

While this sample is largely reflective of the current trends in the U.S. population (U.S. Census Bureau, 2009), the results are not necessarily generalizable to all Latina/o families given the degree of heterogeneity within the group. While the current research is extremely valuable as it relates to mostly Mexican immigrant families and U.S. born participants of Mexican familial descent, it is also important to study Latina/o groups as different entities and consider the importance of nationality, migration history, and within-group language variability when studying acculturative effects (Pasch et al., 2006).

Implications for Future Research

One strength of this study is that it allows for inclusion of both the child and parent participant scores on the acculturation model to be included separately. Indeed, the child’s score, independent of the parent, accounted for a large portion of the variance in the total problems subscale. Findings from additional research also speak to the potential importance of analyzing parent and child acculturation scores independently (Gonzales et al., 2006; Pasch et al., 2006). Findings from previous research lend support to the idea that higher levels of acculturation among parents and their children may independently predict familial processes and adolescent outcomes, irrespective of an acculturation gap. While assessing the discrepancies that occur within families is of primary interest in the currents study, future research could assess implications of parent and child levels of language acculturation independent from the other.

It should also be noted that when Szapocznik and colleagues developed the acculturation gap distress model, they did so with clinical populations of families
considered to be “at risk.” The current study recruited participants from a community sample, including community meetings and church gatherings. Due to the apparent support of the acculturation gap distress hypothesis the current study offers, it is important to note that LAD discrepancies may be problematic and relevant to consider for more “typical” Latina/o families.

Future research might also consider the moderators and mediators for LAD on emotional and behavioral problems for youth. For example, Gonzales and colleagues (2006) assessed both family conflict and parenting practices as a mediator of acculturation and adolescent mental health links, while using language variables as a marker for acculturation. The researchers found family conflict mediated the link of acculturation with the outcome variables conduct problems and depressive symptoms (Gonzales et al., 2006). However, as noted in the literature review of this study, these authors did not assess the discrepancy in linguistic acculturation between parents and children. Martinez (2006) found differential acculturation (i.e., greater youth Americanism relative to parents) was shown to be strongly related to youth externalizing behaviors, yet that relationship was fully mediated by the effects of differential acculturation on family/cultural stress and effective parenting practices. The author suggested future research needed to identify factors, other than acute stressors, that may link acculturation processes to parenting practices.

As previously noted, the interaction model as an indicator or the acculturation gap has been theoretically and empirically discussed in the extant literature as a means to account for the different acculturation processes that occur within families (e.g., when the parent is higher on dominant language score than the child; Birman, 2006; Birman &
Trickett, 2001; Pasch et al., 2006). However, the use of the interaction model has been difficult to include in previous studies due to the limited number of dyads representing each group in the interaction, as was the case in the current study (Birman, 2006). Therefore, it will be important for future researchers to seek out participants that meet inclusion criteria to be in the different groups of the interaction model (e.g., parents that have been working in the U.S. prior to immigration of their children to be included in group four, families very recently immigrated to U.S. in which both parents and children are likely to have low adherence to English for group three). Additionally, the current study only intended to utilize the interaction model based on participant adherence to English only. Future research could also include an assessment of adherence toward Spanish in order to account for all of the possibilities (i.e., eight instead of four) of various combinations of language acculturation processes.

Finally, the acculturation gap distress hypothesis specifies that the effects of acculturation gaps are negative, (i.e., they lead to family conflict and problem behaviors among the younger generation). However, as suggested by Unger et al. (2009) parent-child acculturation gaps also may have the effect of encouraging the youth to become more responsible and more accountable since at times they are the brokers of information for the family. Depending on the context, this could serve them well in terms of improving self-efficacy and self-esteem (Villanueva & Burriel, 2010). It seems, if the amount of added responsibility is not too high, as is frequently the case for language brokers, it is possible that the dependability exhibited by bilingual and bicultural youth could encourage continued responsible decision making about their personal behaviors (Martinez et al, 2009). Therefore, continued research should explore whether
acculturation gaps, and language acculturation gaps in particular, could have beneficial effects (Unger et al., 2009).

**Conclusions**

The results of the current study provide support for the hypothesis that LAD will account for the highest degree of variance of the emotional and behavioral total problems subscale (as measured by the CBCL) for youth Latina/o youth participants. These findings provide continued support of the acculturation gap-distress hypothesis, as the specific variable of language acculturation discrepancy is significantly predictive of total emotional and behavioral problems, even when other crucial variables of interest are controlled. Therefore, these results add to the body of literature on acculturation as a whole in that this research considers a specific aspect of acculturation. Limitations of the current study notwithstanding, language acculturation (as indicated by use and proficiency), and language acculturation discrepancies within families in particular, appear to be crucial variables of interest when considering the overall well-being for Latina/o youth in the U.S.
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Appendix A

Parental/Child Consent to Participate in Study

INFORMED CONSENT (Parent/Child)

You and your adolescent are being asked to participate in a research study. This form provides you with information about the study, what is being asked of you should you agree to participate, any potential risks you may incur due to your participation, and what to do if you have questions or concerns regarding your participation.

This study is being conducted by Jonathan Muther, M.S. under the supervision of Dr. Jesse N. Valdez as part of the requirements for the doctoral degree in Counseling Psychology at the University of Denver. This study is being conducted to better understand whether or not language use (English vs. Spanish) of Latina/o adolescents impacts their emotional and behavioral functioning. You are being asked to participate in this research study because you have an adolescent who attends school between 3rd and 12th grade, who identifies as Hispanic or Latina/o.

As the parent or caregiver will be asked to complete three short questionnaires, which should take approximately 45 minutes to one hour of your time. The first questionnaire is a demographic questionnaire where you will be asked to provide specific information about yourself, your child, and your family. The second questionnaire is an acculturation questionnaire that will ask you to complete information regarding your preferred language. The third measure is the Child Behavior Checklist, a 140-item questionnaire where you will be asked to answer questions about your child in the areas of: behavior, emotional functioning, and academics. Additionally, your child will be asked to complete two of these same measures.

There are minimal foreseeable risks or discomforts that you or your adolescent will endure as a result of participation in this study. It is possible that you or your child may find that you become tired filling out the questionnaires, or may experience some psychological distress in responding to the items on the questionnaire and disclosing any potential difficulties for your child or within your family. Although it is not anticipated that the questionnaires will cause you or your child any significant distress, if this does occur, you and your adolescent can choose not to complete the questionnaire and terminate your participation in this study at any point. There is absolutely no penalty to you or your child if you decide to withdraw from the study. Your participation in this study is completely voluntary, and you and your child may withdraw your participation at any time, without any loss of benefit to you.

It is possible that this study’s findings may be presented and published for professional use; however, no identifying information about you or your child will be used in any written or verbal manner. Your consent forms and all other identifying information will be kept separate from your completed questionnaires in order to maintain confidentiality.
If you have any questions or concerns about this study, please contact Jonathan Muther at 303.946.1469, or Dr. Jesse N. Valdez at 303.871.2482. If you have any concerns or complaints about how you were treated during the interview, please contact Susan Sadler, Chair, Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects, at 303-871-3454, or Sylk Sotto-Santiago, Office of Research and Sponsored Programs at 303-871-4052 or write to either at the University of Denver, Office of Research and Sponsored Programs, 2199 S. University Blvd., Denver, CO 80208-4820.

Please read the information below, and sign if you are willing to participate:

I understand that there are two exceptions to the confidentiality that will be maintained throughout this study. If information is revealed in any of the questionnaires regarding suicide, homicide, or child abuse and neglect, it is required by law that this be reported to the proper officials. Secondly, should any information in this study be subject to a court order or lawful subpoena, the University of Denver may not be able to avoid compliance with the order of release of information.

I have read and understand the above descriptions of the study on the relationship between language usage and behavioral/emotional, academic, and family functioning in Latina/o adolescents. I have asked for and received a satisfactory explanation for any language that I did not fully understand. I agree to participate in this study, and I understand that I may withdraw my consent at any time. I have received a copy of this consent form.

By signing this form I hereby give my consent to be a participant and give consent for my child to be a participant in this study.

Name of Participant (Parent) Date

Name of Participant (Child) Date

Signature of Participant (Parent) Date
INFORMED CONSENT (Parent/Child) – Spanish

El Consentimiento Paternal para Tomar Parte en Estudio (Padre e Hijo)

Usted y su adolescente es pedido tomar parte en un estudio de investigación. Esta forma le proporciona con información sobre el estudio, lo que es preguntado de usted le debe concuerda en participar, algún riesgo potencial que usted puede contraer debido a su participación, y qué hacer si tiene preguntas o preocupaciones con respecto a su participación.

Este estudio es realizado por Jonathan Muther, M.S. bajo la supervisión de Dr. Jesse N. Valdez. Este estudio es como la parte de los requisitos para el título doctoral a Psicología de Aconsejar, en la Universidad de Denver. Este estudio es realizado para comprender mejor sin tener en cuenta si el uso del idioma (inglés vs. español) de adolescentes latinas impresiona su funcionar emocional y conductista. Es pedido tomar parte en este estudio de investigación porque tiene a un adolescente que asiste la escuela entre grado 3 y grado 12, que identifica como hispano o el latinoamericano.

Como el padre/cuidador de niño será pedido completar tres cuestionarios cortos, que deben tomar entre aproximadamente 45 minutos o una hora de su tiempo. El primer cuestionario es un cuestionario demográfico donde usted será pedido se proporcionar información específica sobre usted mismo, sobre su niño, y sobre su familia. El segundo cuestionario es un cuestionario de aculturación que pedirá completar información con respecto a su idioma preferido. La tercera medida es un cuestionario de 140 artículos donde usted será pedido se contestar preguntas acerca de su niño en las áreas de: conducta, funcionar emocional, y los académicos. Adicionalmente, su niño será pedido completar dos de estas mismas medidas.

Hay riesgos mínimos que usted o su adolescente aguantará a consecuencia de participación en este estudio. Es posible que usted o su niño pueda encontrar que llega a ser el llenar cansado los cuestionarios, o puede experimentar alguna pena psicológica en responder a los artículos en el cuestionario y revelar dificultades para su niño o dentro de su familia. Aunque no sea anticipado que los cuestionarios le causarán usted o su niño ninguna pena significativa, si esto ocurre, usted y su adolescente puede escoger no completar el cuestionario y terminar su participación en este estudio en cualquier momento. No hay absolutamente pena a usted ni a su niño si decide retirar del estudio. Su participación en este estudio es completamente voluntaria, y usted y su niño puede retirar su participación en tiempo, sin cualquier pérdida de beneficio a usted.

Es posible que las conclusiones de este estudio puedan ser presentados y pueden ser publicados para el uso profesional; sin embargo, **ninguna información de identificación sobre usted ni su niño serán utilizados en alguna manera escrito ni verbal. Su**
consentimiento forma y toda la otra información de identificación será mantenida separada de sus cuestionarios completados para mantener la confidencialidad.

Si tiene cualquier pregunta o las preocupaciones acerca de este estudio, contactan por favor Jonathan Muther en 303.946.1469, o el Dr. Jesse N. Valdez en 303.871.2482. Si tiene cualquier preocupación o las quejas acerca de cómo fue tratado durante la entrevista, contacta por favor Susan Sadler, la Supervisora, el Grupo Institucional de Revisión para la Protección de Sujetos Humanos, en 303-871-3454, o Sylk Sotto-Santiago, la Oficina de Investigación y Programas Patrocinado en 303-871-4052 o escribe a cualquiera en la Universidad de Denver, la Oficina de Investigación y Programas Patrocinados, 2199 S. La universidad Blvar., Denver, CO 80208-4820.

Lea por favor la información abajo, y firme si está dispuesto a participar:

Comprendo que hay dos excepciones a la confidencialidad que será mantenida a través de este estudio. Si información es revelada en cualquiera de los cuestionarios con respecto a suicidio, el homicidio, o los malos tratos a niños, es requerido por la ley que esto es reportado a los autoridades. También, debe información en este estudio es susceptible a un mandato judicial o la citación lícita, la Universidad de Denver no puede poder evitar conformidad con la orden de la liberación de información.

He leído y comprendo las descripciones mencionadas del estudio en la relación entre uso de idioma y las condiciones conductista/emocional, el académico, y la familia que funciona en adolescentes latinas. He pedido y he recibido una explicación satisfactoria para ningún parte que yo no comprendí completamente. Concuerdo en tomar parte en este estudio, y yo comprendo que puedo retirar mi consentimiento en tiempo. He recibido una copia de esta forma de consentimiento.

Firmando esta forma yo por la presente doy mi consentimiento a ser un participante y dar consentimiento para mi niño a ser un participante en este estudio.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nombre de Participante</th>
<th>(Padre)</th>
<th>Fecha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nombre de Participante</td>
<td>(Hijo/Hija)</td>
<td>Fecha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firma de Participante</td>
<td>(Padre)</td>
<td>Fecha</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B

ASSENT FORM-English Version
(Completed by all minors younger than 18 years old)

You are being asked to participate in a research study. This form provides you with information about the study, what is being asked of you should you agree to participate, any potential risks you may incur due to your participation, and what to do if you have questions or concerns regarding your participation.

I am conducting research on the language usage (English vs. Spanish) of Latina/o adolescents and their parents and how it may impact their emotional and behavioral functioning. You are being asked to participate in this research study because you currently are between the grades of 3rd and 12th and identify as Hispanic or Latina/o. If you decide to help by participating in this study, you will be asked to complete 2 questionnaires related to information about you, your family and language use. These questionnaires should take no longer than about 15 minutes to complete. You are only being asked to fill out the questionnaires one time.

If you and your parent/caregiver agree to be involved in this study, you will help expand understanding of Latina/o adolescents in the United States and potential challenges and strengths of language use. There are no foreseeable risks associated with being part of this research. Agreeing to participate in this study is entirely up to you and no one will hold it against you or your parent or caregiver if you decide not to be involved. If you do decide to be a part of the study, you may stop participation at any time without any penalty.

If you would like to know more about this research project or have any questions or concerns, please contact me at 303.946.1469 or jpmuther@gmail.com. You may also contact my advisor, Jesse N. Valdez, Ph.D. at 303.871.2482. This project has been approved by the Institutional Review Board at the University of Denver. If you have any concerns or complaints about how you were treated during the interview, please contact Susan Sadler, Chair, Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects, at 303-871-3454, or Sylk Sotto-Santiago, Office of Research and Sponsored Programs at 303-871-4052 or write to either at the University of Denver, Office of Research and Sponsored Programs, 2199 S. University Blvd., Denver, CO 80208-4820.

Please read the information below, and sign if you are willing to participate.

I agree to participate in this study. I understand what I am being asked to do and understand that I can stop my participation at any time without penalty. I have received a copy of this consent form.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adolescent Name (printed)</th>
<th>Adolescent Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Esta forma le proporciona información sobre este estudio, lo que es preguntado de usted se debe concuerda en participar, algún riesgo potencial que usted puede contraer debido a su participación, y qué hacer si tiene preguntas o preocupaciones con respecto a su participación.

Realizo un estudio en el uso del idioma (inglés vs. español) de adolescentes latinas y sus padres. Me pregunto cómo puede impresionar el uso de idioma su funcionar emocional y conductista. Es pedido tomar parte en este estudio de investigación porque está entre los grados de 3 y 12 e identifica como hispano o el latinoamericano. Si quiere participar en este estudio, será pedido completar 2 cuestionarios relacionados a la información sobre usted, su familia y el uso de idioma. Estos cuestionarios deben tomar menos que aproximadamente 15 minutos de completar. Usted sólo es pedido llenar los cuestionarios una vez.

Si usted y su padre/cuidador concuerda en participar en este estudio, ayudará a expandir la comprensión de adolescentes latinas en Estados Unidos y el proceso de aculturación. No hay riesgos asociados con su participación de este estudio. Si decides no quiere participar en este estudio no tendrá ninguna consecuencias contra usted o contra su padre/cuidador. Si decide ser una parte del estudio, puede parar participación en cualquier momento sin pena.

Si quiere saber que más acerca de este proyecto o tienes cualquier pregunta o preocupaciones, por favor me contacte en 303.946.1469 o jpmuther@gmail.com. Usted también puede contactar a mi supervisor, Jesse N. Valdez, PhD en 303.871.2482. Este proyecto ha sido aprobado por el Grupo Institucional de Revisión en la Universidad de Denver. Si tiene cualquier preocupación o las quejas acerca de cómo fue tratado durante la entrevista, contacta por favor Susan Sadler, la Supervisora, del Grupo Institucional de Revisión para la Protección de Sujetos Humanos, en 303-871-3454, o Sylk Sotto-Santiago, la Oficina de Investigación y Programas Patrocinado en 303-871-4052 o escribe a cualquiera en la Universidad de Denver, la Oficina de Investigación y Programas Patrocinados, 2199 S. La universidad Blvar., Denver, CO 80208-4820.

**Lea por favor la información abajo, y firme si está dispuesto a participar:**

Estoy de acuerdo en tomar parte en este estudio. Comprendo lo que soy pedido hacer y comprendo que puedo parar mi participación en cualquier momento sin pena. He recibido una copia de esta forma de consentimiento.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nombre de Adolescente</th>
<th>Firma de Adolescente</th>
<th>Fecha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Appendix C

Demographic Questionnaire (Child) El Cuestionario demográfico (Hijo)

1. What is your age? __________________
   ¿Qué es su edad? __________________

2. What is your gender? (circle one): Male/Female
   ¿Qué es su género? (marque uno): Macho/Embrazo

3. With which Racial/Cultural/Ethnic group do you identify? (circle one):
   ¿Con que grupo le hace identifica? (marque uno):
   Hispanic/Latina/o  Asian/Pacific Islander  African American
   Caucásico/Blanco  Asiático/Isleño pacífico  Norteamericano Africano
   American Indian  Other (please specify): ____________________________
   Indio norteamericano  Otro (especifique por favor): __________________

4. What grade are you in? __________________
   What is your GPA? ________________
   ¿En qué grado es Ud.? ¿________________?  Qué es su GPA? ________________

5. In what country were you born? ________________
   ¿En qué país fue usted nacido? ________________

6. In what country were your parents born? __________________
   ¿En qué país fue su padre nacido? __________________

7. What is your primary religious affiliation? ________________
   ¿Qué es su afiliación religiosa primaria? ________________

8. Approximately how long have you been living in the United States? ________________
   ¿Aproximadamente cuánto tiempo ha estado viviendo usted en Estados Unidos? ________________

9. Approximately how long have your parents been living in the United States? ________________
   ¿Aproximadamente cuánto tiempo han estado viviendo sus padres en Estados Unidos?

10. Are you currently working with a therapist? (e.g., school counselor, social worker, psychologist, or psychiatrist) (Yes/No) (please circle one)
    ¿Asistes algun terapia/platicas con un terapeuta/consejero? (por ejemplo, consejero escolar, un trabajador social, el psicólogo, o el psiquiatra) (Sí/No) (marque por favor uno)
11. How many times in the past month have you been in a situation in which you have to translate for your parents or other family members? (please circle one)

Never           1-3 Times          4-6 Times          7-9 Times          10 (or more) Times

¿Cuántas veces en el mes pasado has estado en una situación en la que tiene que traducir para sus padres u otros miembros de la familia? (marque por favor uno)

Nunca           1-3 veces          4-6 veces          7-9 veces          10 (ni más) veces
Appendix C, continued

Demographic Questionnaire (Parent/Caregiver)  
El Cuestionario demográfico  
(Padre/Cuidador)

1. What is your age? _________________  What is the age of your child? ____________
   ¿Qué es su edad? _________________  ¿Qué es la edad de su niño? ____________

2. What is your gender? (circle one):  What is your child’s gender? (circle one):
   ¿Qué es su género? (marque uno):  ¿Qué es el género de su niño? (marque uno):
   Male/Macho  Female/Embra  Male/Macho  Female/Embra

3. With which Racial/Cultural/Ethnic group do you identify? (circle one):
   ¿Con que grupo le hace identifica? (marque uno):
   Hispanic/Latina/o  Asian/Pacific Islander  African American
   Caucasian/White  Asiatico/Isleño pacífico  Norteamericano Africano
   Hispano/Latina  American Indian  Other (please specify):
   Caucásico/Blanco  Otro (especifique por favor):
   Indio norteamericano

4. What grade is your child in? ____________  What is your child’s GPA? ______
   ¿En qué grado es su niño? ____________  ¿Qué es GPA de su niño? ______

5. In what country were you born? _____  6. In what country was your child born? ___
   ¿En qué país fue usted nacido? _______  ¿En qué país fue su niño nacido? _____

7. What is your primary religious affiliation? ________________
   ¿Qué es su afiliación religiosa primaria? ________________

8. Are you currently employed?  (Yes/No)  (please circle one)
   ¿Es empleado actualmente usted?  (Sí/no) (marque por favor uno)

9. Approximately how long have you been living in the United States? ____________
   ¿Aproximadamente cuánto tiempo ha estado viviendo usted en Estados Unidos? ______

10. Approximately how long has your child been living in the United States? ______
    ¿Aproximadamente cuánto tiempo ha estado viviendo su niño en Estados Unidos? ___

11. Is your child currently working with a therapist or counselor? (e.g., school counselor, social worker, psychologist, or psychiatrist)  (Yes/No)  (please circle one)
¿Su niño asiste algún terapia/platicas con un terapeuta o el consejero? (por ejemplo, consejero escolar, el asistente social, el psicólogo, o el psiquiatra) *(Sí/no) (marque por favor uno)*

12. How many times in the past month has your child been in situations in which he or she is required to translate for you or other family members? *(please circle one)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>1-3 Times</th>
<th>4-6 Times</th>
<th>7-9 Times</th>
<th>10 (or more) Times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

¿Cuántas veces en el mes pasado tiene a su niño estuvo en situaciones en las que él o ella son requeridos a traducir para usted o para otros miembros de la familia? *(marque por favor uno)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nunca</th>
<th>1-3 veces</th>
<th>4-6 veces</th>
<th>7-9 veces</th>
<th>10 (ni más) veces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Appendix D

Bidimensional Acculturation Scale for Hispanics (BAS)

Please circle number that best completes the sentence as you believe it to be true.

1. How often do you speak English?
   1. Almost Never
   2. Sometimes
   3. Often
   4. Almost Always

2. How often do you speak English with your friends?
   1. Almost Never
   2. Sometimes
   3. Often
   4. Almost Always

3. How often do you think in English?
   1. Almost Never
   2. Sometimes
   3. Often
   4. Almost Always

4. How often do you speak Spanish?
   1. Almost Never
   2. Sometimes
   3. Often
   4. Almost Always

5. How often do you speak Spanish with your friends?
   1. Almost Never
   2. Sometimes
   3. Often
   4. Almost Always

6. How often do you think in Spanish?
   1. Almost Never
   2. Sometimes
   3. Often
   4. Almost Always

7. How well do you speak English?
   1. Very Poorly
   2. Poorly
   3. Well
   4. Very Well

8. How well do you read in English?
   1. Very Poorly
   2. Poorly
   3. Well
   4. Very Well

9. How well do you understand T.V. programs in English?
   1. Very Poorly
   2. Poorly
   3. Well
   4. Very Well

10. How well do you understand radio programs in English?
    1. Very Poorly
    2. Poorly
    3. Well
    4. Very Well

11. How well do you write in English?
    1. Very Poorly
    2. Poorly
    3. Well
    4. Very Well

12. How well do you understand music in English?
    1. Very Poorly
    2. Poorly
    3. Well
    4. Very Well

13. How well do you speak Spanish?
    1. Very Poorly
    2. Poorly
    3. Well
    4. Very Well

14. How well do you read in Spanish?
    1. Very Poorly
    2. Poorly
    3. Well
    4. Very Well

15. How well do you understand T.V. programs in Spanish?
    1. Very Poorly
    2. Poorly
    3. Well
    4. Very Well

16. How well do you understand radio programs in Spanish?
    1. Very Poorly
    2. Poorly
    3. Well
    4. Very Well
17. How well do you write in Spanish?  
18. How well do you understand music in Spanish?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

19. How often do you watch T.V. programs in English?  
20. How often do you listen to radio programs in English?  
21. How often do you listen to music in English?  
22. How often do you watch T.V. programs in Spanish?  
23. How often do you listen to radio programs in Spanish?  
24. How often do you listen to music in Spanish?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Almost Never</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Almost Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix D

**La Escala de la Aculturación del Bidimensional para hispanos (BAS)**

Por favor marque el número que completa mejor la oración como cree que ser verdad.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Casi nunca</th>
<th>A Veces</th>
<th>A Menudo</th>
<th>Casi Siempre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. ¿Con qué frecuencia habla usted inglés?

2. ¿Con qué frecuencia habla usted inglés con sus amigos?

3. ¿Con qué frecuencia piensa usted en inglés?

4. ¿Con qué frecuencia habla usted español?

5. ¿Con qué frecuencia habla usted español con sus amigos?

6. ¿Con qué frecuencia piensa usted en español?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Muy Mal</th>
<th>Mal</th>
<th>Bien</th>
<th>Muy Bien</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. ¿Qué tan bien habla usted inglés?

8. ¿Qué tan bien lee usted en inglés?

9. ¿Qué tan bien entiende usted los programas de televisión en inglés?

10. ¿Qué tan bien entiende usted los programas de radio en inglés?

11. ¿Qué tan bien escribe usted en inglés?

12. ¿Qué tan bien entiende usted música en inglés?

13. ¿Qué tan bien habla usted español?
14. ¿Qué tan bien lee usted en español?  
1 2 3 4  
15. ¿Qué tan bien entiende usted los programas de televisión en español?  
1 2 3 4  
16. ¿Qué tan bien comprende usted los programas de radio en español?  
1 2 3 4  
17. ¿Qué tan bien escribe usted en español?  
1 2 3 4  
18. ¿Qué tan bien comprende usted música en español?  
1 2 3 4  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Casi nunca</th>
<th>A Veces</th>
<th>A Menudo</th>
<th>Casi Siempre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Con qué frecuencia ve usted programa de televisión en inglés?  

20. ¿Con qué frecuencia escucha usted programas de radio en inglés?  

21. ¿Con qué frecuencia escucha usted música en inglés?  

22. ¿Con qué frecuencia ve usted programas de televisión en español?  

23. ¿Con qué frecuencia escucha usted programas de radio en español?  

24. ¿Con qué frecuencia escucha usted música en español?  

1 2 3 4
Appendix E

Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL/6-18) Parent Form

Please print

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHILD'S FULL NAME</th>
<th>CHILD'S GENDER</th>
<th>CHILD'S AGE</th>
<th>CHILD'S ETHNIC GROUP OR RACE</th>
<th>PARENTS' USUAL TYPE OF WORK, even if not working now. (Please be specific — for example, auto mechanic, high school teacher, homemaker, laborer, lathe operator, shoe salesman, army sergeant.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>Boy</td>
<td>6-18</td>
<td></td>
<td>FATHER'S TYPE OF WORK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Girl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MOTHER'S TYPE OF WORK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>THIS FORM FILLED OUT BY: (print your full name)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please fill out this form to reflect your view of the child's behavior even if other people might not agree. Feel free to print additional comments beside each item and in the space provided on page 2. Be sure to answer all items.

Your gender: □ Male □ Female

Your relationship to the child:

- □ Biological Parent
- □ Step Parent
- □ Grandparent
- □ Adoptive Parent
- □ Foster Parent
- □ Other (specify)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRADE IN SCHOOL</th>
<th>NOT ATTENDING SCHOOL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I. Please list the sports your child most likes to take part in. For example: swimming, baseball, skating, skate boarding, bike riding, fishing, etc.

- □ None

a. 

b. 

c. 

Compared to others of the same age, about how much time does he/she spend in each?

- □ Less Than Average
- □ Average
- □ More Than Average
- □ Don't Know

Compared to others of the same age, how well does he/she do each one?

- □ Below Average
- □ Average
- □ Above Average
- □ Don't Know

II. Please list your child's favorite hobbies, activities, and games, other than sports. For example: stamp collection, video games, piano, crafts, cars, computer, singing, etc. (Do not include listening to radio or TV.)

- □ None

a. 

b. 

c. 

Compared to others of the same age, about how much time does he/she spend in each?

- □ Less Than Average
- □ Average
- □ More Than Average
- □ Don't Know

Compared to others of the same age, how well does he/she do each one?

- □ Below Average
- □ Average
- □ Above Average
- □ Don't Know

III. Please list any organizations, clubs, teams, or groups your child belongs to.

- □ None

a. 

b. 

c. 

Compared to others of the same age, how active is he/she in each?

- □ Less Active
- □ Average
- □ More Active
- □ Don't Know

IV. Please list any jobs or chores your child has. For example: paper route, babysitting, making bed, working in store, etc. (Include both paid and unpaid jobs and chores.)

- □ None

a. 

b. 

c. 

Compared to others of the same age, how well does he/she carry them out?

- □ Below Average
- □ Average
- □ Above Average
- □ Don't Know

Be sure you answered all items. Then see other side.
Please print. Be sure to answer all items.

V. 1. About how many close friends does your child have? (Do not include brothers & sisters)
   □ None □ 1 □ 2 or 3 □ 4 or more

2. About how many times a week does your child do things with any friends outside of regular school hours?
   (Do not include brothers & sisters)
   □ Less than 1 □ 1 or 2 □ 3 or more

VI. Compared to others of his/her age, how well does your child:

   a. Get along with his/her brothers & sisters? □ □ □ □ Has no brothers or sisters
   b. Get along with other kids?
   c. Behave with his/her parents?
   d. Play and work alone?

VII. 1. Performance in academic subjects.

Check a box for each subject that child takes
a. Reading, English, or Language Arts
b. History or Social Studies
   etc.

Other academic subjects—for example: computer courses, foreign language, business. Do not include gym, shop, driver's ed., or other nonacademic subjects.

   □ □ □ □

   □ □ □ □

   □ □ □ □

   □ □ □ □

2. Does your child receive special education or remedial services or attend a special class or special school?
   □ No □ Yes—kind of services, class, or school:

3. Has your child repeated any grades?
   □ No □ Yes—grades and reasons:

4. Has your child had any academic or other problems in school?
   □ No □ Yes—please describe:

   When did these problems start?

   Have these problems ended?
   □ No □ Yes—when?

   Does your child have any illness or disability (either physical or mental)?
   □ No □ Yes—please describe:

   What concerns you most about your child?

   Please describe the best things about your child.
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Below is a list of items that describe children and youths. For each item that describes your child now or within the past 6 months, please circle the 2 if the item is very true or often true of your child. Circle the 1 if the item is somewhat or sometimes true of your child. Circle the 0 if the item is not true of your child. If the item does not seem to apply to your child, please answer all items as well as you can, even if some do not.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0 = Not True (as far as you know)</th>
<th>1 = Somewhat or Sometimes True</th>
<th>2 = Very True or Often True</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 1. Acts too young for his/her age (describe):</td>
<td>0 1 2 32. Feels he/she has to be perfect (describe):</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 2. Drinks alcohol without parents' approval (describe):</td>
<td>0 1 2 33. Feels or complains that no one loves him/her (describe):</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 3. Argues a lot</td>
<td>0 1 2 34. Feels others are out to get him/her</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 4. Fails to finish things he/she starts</td>
<td>0 1 2 35. Feels worthless or inferior</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 5. There is very little he/she enjoys</td>
<td>0 1 2 36. Gets hurt a lot, accident-prone</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 6. Bowel movements outside toilet</td>
<td>0 1 2 37. Gets in many fights</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 7. Bragging, boasting</td>
<td>0 1 2 38. Gets teased a lot</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 8. Can't concentrate, can't pay attention for long</td>
<td>0 1 2 39. Hangs around with others who get into trouble</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 9. Can't get his/her mind off certain thoughts; obsessions (describe):</td>
<td>0 1 2 40. Hears sounds or voices that aren't there (describe):</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 10. Can't sit still, restless, or hyperactive</td>
<td>0 1 2 41. Impulsive or acts without thinking</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 11. Clings to adults or too dependent</td>
<td>0 1 2 42. Would rather be alone than with others</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 12. Complains of loneliness</td>
<td>0 1 2 43. Lying or cheating</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 13. Confused or seems to be in a fog</td>
<td>0 1 2 44. Bites fingernails</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 14. Cries a lot</td>
<td>0 1 2 45. Nervous, highstrung, or tense</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 15. Cruel to animals</td>
<td>0 1 2 46. Nervous movements or twitching (describe):</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 16. Cruelty, bullying, or meanness to others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 17. Daydreams or gets lost in his/her thoughts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 18. Deliberately harms self or attempts suicide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 19. Demands a lot of attention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 20. Destroys his/her own things</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 21. Destroys things belonging to his/her family or others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 22. Disobedient at home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 23. Disobedient at school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 24. Doesn't eat well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 25. Doesn't get along with other kids</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 26. Doesn't seem to feel guilty after misbehaving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 27. Easily jealous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 28. Breaks rules at home, school, or elsewhere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 29. Fears certain animals, situations, or places, other than school (describe):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 30. Fears going to school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 31. Feels he/she might think or do something bad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

56. Physical problems without known medical cause:

| 0 1 2 a. Aches or pains (not stomach or headaches) | 0 1 2 |
| 0 1 2 b. Headaches | 0 1 2 |
| 0 1 2 c. Nausea, feels sick | 0 1 2 |
| 0 1 2 d. Problems with eyes (not if corrected by glasses) (describe): | 0 1 2 |
| 0 1 2 e. Rashes or other skin problems | 0 1 2 |
| 0 1 2 f. Stomachaches | 0 1 2 |
| 0 1 2 g. Vomiting, throwing up | 0 1 2 |
| 0 1 2 h. Other (describe): | 0 1 2 |
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Please print. Be sure to answer all items.

0 = Not True (as far as you know)  
1 = Somewhat or Sometimes True  
2 = Very True or Often True

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>57. Physically attacks people</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. Picks nose, skin, or other parts of body (describe):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. Plays with own sex parts in public</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. Plays with own sex parts too much</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61. Poor school work</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62. Poorly coordinated or clumsy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63. Prefers being with older kids</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64. Prefers being with younger kids</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65. Refuses to talk</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66. Repeats certain acts over and over; compulsions (describe):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67. Runs away from home</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68. Screams a lot</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69. Secretive, keeps things to self</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70. Sees things that aren't there (describe):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71. Self-conscious or easily embarrassed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72. Sets fires</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73. Sexual problems (describe):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74. Showing off or clowning</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75. Too shy or timid</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76. Sleeps less than most kids</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77. Sleeps more than most kids during day and/or night (describe):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78. Inattentive or easily distracted</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79. Speech problem (describe):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80. Stares blankly</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81. Steals at home</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82. Steals outside the home</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83. Stores up too many things he/she doesn't need (describe):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please be sure you answered all items.
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# Inventario del Comportamiento de Niños(as) de 6-18 Años para Padres (CBCL/6-18)

**Nombre del Niño**

**Apellido del Niño**

**Edad**

**Raza o Grupo Étnico**

**Fecha de Hoy**

**Fecha de Nacimiento**

**Trabajo Habitual de los Padres, Incluido si Ahora No están Trabajando (por favor específicar - por ejemplo: Maestro, Jardinería, Médico, etc.)**

**Trabajo del Padre**

**Trabajo de la Madre**

**Este Cuestionario Fue Contestado Por:**

(escríba el nombre completo)

**Sexo del Informante:**

- [ ] Hombre
- [ ] Mujer

**Relación con el niño:**

- [ ] Padre o madre biológica
- [ ] Padre o madre adoptiva
- [ ] Otro

**Curso Escolar**

- [ ] No va a la escuela

**¿Cuáles son las actividades deportivas en las que más le gusta participar a su hijo(a)?**

Por ejemplo: natación, fútbol, básquet, montar en bicicleta, monkey bar, pescar, etc.

- [ ] Ninguna

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Menos que los demás</th>
<th>Igual que los demás</th>
<th>Más que los demás</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**¿Cuáles son las actividades, juegos o pasatiempos favoritos de su hijo(a)?**

(No incluye deportes)

Por ejemplo: coleccionar sellos, jugar con muñecas, leer, tocar el piano, pintar, coches, cantar, etc. (No incluya ver TV o oír la radio)

- [ ] Ninguna

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Menos que los demás</th>
<th>Igual que los demás</th>
<th>Más que los demás</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**¿A qué organizaciones, clubes, equipos o otros grupos pertenece su hijo(a)?**

- [ ] Ninguna

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Menos activo</th>
<th>Promedio</th>
<th>Más activo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**¿Qué trabajos o tareas hace su hijo(a)?**

Por ejemplo: cuidar niños, hacer la cama, dar clases particulares, tirar la basura, repartir periódicos, etc. (Incluya tanto trabajos o tareas pagados como no pagados)

- [ ] Ninguna

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Menos que los demás</th>
<th>Igual que los demás</th>
<th>Más que los demás</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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