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ABSTRACT

During adolescents individuals develop many lasting features of their identity (Erikson, 1950, Bowen, 1978, Phinney, 1992, 1996, 2005) including the development of self-differentiation and multi-group ethnic identification. Bowen’s (1978) theory of differentiation of self and Phinney’s (Phinney, 1992) theory of multi-group ethnic identification provided the theoretical and measurement bases for the study. The purpose of this study was to examine the strength of Hispanic adolescents’ level of multi-group ethnic identification and their parents’ level of self-differentiation and multi-group ethnic identification in predicting second generation Hispanic adolescents’ level of self-differentiation. One hundred two (102) Hispanic adolescents, ages 13 to 18, and their parents were surveyed. Skowron and Friendlander’s (1998) Differentiation of Self Inventory and Phinney’s (2005) Multi-group Ethnic Identification Measure were the principal measures used to survey the parents and the students. Key findings included that parents’ birth place was not significantly correlated with teen’s multi-group ethnic identification scores. Adolescents’ levels of multi-group ethnic identification were significantly associated with their levels of differentiation of self. Parents’ levels of differentiation of self scores were significantly associated with adolescents’ differentiation of self scores. Using multi-level regression analysis, a significant intra-class relationship between the parent group’s self-differentiation scores and the adolescent group’s multi-group ethnic identification scores was found. There was also a significant intra-class relationship between the parents’ multi-group ethnic identification scores and the adolescents’ self-differentiation scores. Adolescent self-differentiation scores were partially predicted by adolescent multi-group ethnic identification scores and parent self-differentiation scores.
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CHAPTER ONE

THE STUDY PROBLEM AND SIGNIFICANCE

Introduction to the problem

During adolescence and early twenties, young people are making life choices. During adolescent years, individuals expand beyond the family unit to interact significantly with wider social networks. They begin exploring ways of understanding themselves apart from and different from their family, its values and ways of interacting. They test and experiment with interactions with other social groups. For Latino youths in the United States, particularly newly immigrated youths, this is also time when they find their way around the complicated and often conflicting behavior codes that often divide the two cultures in which they live (Pew Hispanic Center, 2005).

Hispanics comprise the largest and youngest minority group in the United States. One in five school children is Hispanic, and one in four newborns is Hispanic. Many expect that the kind of adults young Latinos become will shape the future of United States’ society (Pew Hispanic Center, 2005). With the growth of multiculturalism in the U.S., emotional and social inclusiveness becomes every individual’s responsibility in order to learn to live without constant conflict and discrimination, as well as creating a culture that promotes positive self-differentiation within a range of normative and behavioral diversity. How well the U.S. functions as a nation will be determined by how well all residents adjust to inclusivity’s demands (Skowron, 2004).

However, working towards social and emotional inclusivity is not an easy task. There are numerous challenges faced by family and community members. Young
Hispanics grow up in a world where the news media and politicians present a negative image of immigrants. Myths, stereotypes, and media misperceptions commonly portray negatively new arrivals’ participation in and impact on public safety, crimes and other violent acts, and drug use (Stanfield, 2008). Many young people grow up in places that reject them because they are immigrants or children of immigrants. When this happens it can lead young people to feel ashamed of who they are and reject their own ethnic group and the cultural behaviors and traditions that characterize their ethnicity.

Paradoxically, recent immigrants tend to be less prone to develop any anti-social or emotional problems and are less of a burden to society than second and third generation immigrants (Stanfield, 2008). Studies generally find that American born children and grandchildren of first generation immigrants tend to exhibit higher rates of crime and incarceration than their first generation immigrant cohorts (Stanfield, 2008). Second generation children tend to be influenced by the U.S. materialistic and consumption culture which changes their value system and sense of who they are and what they want. However, they may not be prepared to achieve materialistic goals (Merton, 1938 cited by Stanfield, 2008).

Actually, studies indicate that as the level of acculturation increases, the likelihood of Hispanics presenting social and emotional problems increases (Pew Hispanic Center, 2005). Sadly, studies have found that Hispanics are more likely than other American groups to drop out of school, become teenage parents, and are more likely than Caucasian and Asian Americans to live in poverty (Pew Hispanic Center, 2005).

If young Hispanics growing up in the United States are more likely to present antisocial behaviors and more social problems than their non-Hispanic peers and also
than their Hispanic migrant peers, it can be concluded safely that something is happening in the way these children are being socialized that affects their self- and ethnic group identity. The human and social developmental problems that second generation immigrants have are more complex than what many media and policymakers present.

In the United States, Hispanic youths’ social and emotional developmental challenges may have a tremendous impact on the society in general. The number of Hispanic children born and raised in the United States is enormous and their need to develop a safe and mature personal, social, and emotional life should be of great concern to all. These children are peculiarly foreigners and natives of two cultures. It is important to investigate the factors that promote more positive self-differentiation in Hispanic youths and how to support migrant parents as they seek to nurture their children as well as adapt their own identity in a new culture.

**Acculturation’s relationship to self-identity and self-differentiation**

Immigrant families often experience disconnection from their original culture, including a separation from known social institutions, family, friends, and other sources of support available in their homeland. Individuals acculturate to try to deal with cultural disconnection. Individuals employ two simultaneous processes to adapt to the norms and expectations of the new setting, while at the same time trying to maintain at least some of the norms, values, and traditions of the culture of origin (Suarez-Orozco, Todorova, & Louie, 2002 as cited by Schwartz, Montgomery, & Briones, 2006). Acculturation results as in an attempt to construct a new cultural identity, to shape new goals, to adopt values and beliefs that derive from the interaction of the culture of origin and the new social context (Erikson, 1950; Schwartz, Montgomery, & Briones, 2006; Vega, Alderete, Koloy, & Aguilar-Gaixola, 1998; Vega & Gil, 1998 cited by Stanfield, 2008).
Relationship between self-differentiation and acculturation

Acculturation is a challenge to an individual’s perception of self-identity and the construction of a new one. Self-identity is defined as an internalized positional designation of one’s self (Stryker, 1980 cited by Stets & Burke, 2000). Socio-cultural changes that occur during migration lead to personal disorientation. This disorientation prompts individuals to question their own perceptions of self and others, and, ultimately, to form a new sense of identity. Identity formation is a central factor in self-differentiation (Bray & Harvey, 1992; Carter & McGoldrick, 1989 cited by Johnson, Buboltz & Seemann, 2003).

Self-differentiation was defined by Bowen (1978) as the degree to which the individual is able to balance emotional and intellectual functioning, and intimacy and autonomy in relationships. Personal and cultural identity development is a key factor in any person’s ability to function adequately. Well differentiated individuals are capable of thinking independently and in congruence with their own values and beliefs. Well differentiated individuals are less vulnerable to peer pressure and are less likely to impose their own views on others (Bowen, 1978). People with higher levels of differentiation are more likely to act responsibly and be aware of their feelings and wishes. They are able to recognize their dependence on others, but can remain clear headed in the face of conflict, criticism, and rejection. Promoting well differentiated individuals is one of the most important tasks of the family system, as well as one of the most difficult. Supporting differentiation within the family leads to better emotional health and helps adults maintain their values in their interactions with others (Kerr & Bowen, 1988).
**Self-differentiation and interactions with others**

From Bowen’s (1978) viewpoint, individual differentiation is a key factor in an individual’s ability to interact properly with family, friends, partners, and society in general. Bowen (1978) noted that “Many of the elements of differentiation of self in the individual are inborn conditions, but relationships during childhood and adolescent determine how much self the individual will develop”. Family relations and interactions are a major determinant in the development of self and differentiate one individual from another.

Immigration to a new country challenges all family members to redefine their own identity. During this process, they are more likely to adopt behaviors that work against their ability to adapt to the new culture. They may isolate themselves from community interactions that affect their ability to acquire host culture friends who may provide support needed to adjust properly. Many immigrants lose themselves in a cultural search of place in the new receiving society. Some end up creating low self-images which manifest in behaviors not valued by the host culture. Others successfully adapt behaviors that allow them to cope with cultural differences and overcome cross-cultural challenges. In this adaptation process, they gain greater understanding of self, their own values, and place in the new community (Stanfield, 2008).

**Ethnic group identity effects on self-differentiation**

Ethnic identity is linked to individual development in many ways, including self-differentiation. A strong identification with one’s ethnic group is a predictive factor in determining how well differentiated individuals are (Skowron, 2004). Helms (1997 cited by McCullough, 2005) defined ethnic identity as the measure of influence of a person’s
cultural characteristics on his or her emotional and social development. Tzuriel and Klein (1977) researched the relationship between psychological ego development and ethnic identity development. They found that both processes followed similar paths of development (Zuriel & Klein, 1977 cited by Sholomo & Simcha, 2009). They also found that those with positive ego development also identified positively with an ethnic group.

In 2009 based on Tzuriel and Klein’s results, Sholomo and Simcha (2009) conducted a study with native born and immigrant Ethiopian adolescents living in Israel. They found that ethnic identity in adolescent immigrants led to a better perception of their own individual identity. In this study, they used Erikson’s developmental stages as a basis for comparison with ethnic identity.

Erikson’s theory of psychological development identifies eight development crises that developing children typically face as they grow emotionally and socially. Each developmental crisis leads to the learning of new skills. The eight stages described by Erikson (1950) are: 1) trust vs. mistrust, from birth to age 18 months, 2) Autonomy vs Doubt, starting at 18 months to the age 3; 3) Initiative vs Guilt, starting at approximately age 3 and lasting until approximately age 6; 4) Industry vs Inferiority, from age 6 to 12 years old; 5) Identity vs Role confusion that goes from the 12 years old to age 20; 6) Intimacy vs. Isolation, a stage that starts in young adulthood from 20 years old to 30 years old; 7) Generativist vs Stagnation, from 30 years old to 65 years old; and 8) Ego integrity vs Despair, going from 65 years old until the individual’s death. According to Erikson, along the entire experienced crisis the individual moves from the original undifferentiated structure of self to a more differentiated one, hence increasing the individual’s level of functioning (Erikson, 1950).
Garbarino (1995), in a sample of two hundred and twenty four individuals, examined the relationship between self-differentiation theory and Erikson’s psychological development theory. Garbarino’s research sample was mainly composed of Latinos. He used three instruments: 1) The Measure of Psychological Development, 2) The Level of Differentiation of Self Scale and 3) The Personal Authority in the Family System Questionnaire. He found a significant positive relationship between self-differentiation and psychological identity resolution. This meant that for the Latinos participating in this study, a person’s level of differentiation of self significantly correlated with a person’s level of psychological development.

McCullough’s (2005) study on self-differentiation among Latinos in California also examined ethnic identity in relation to marital and partner satisfaction. Although this study’s results were not statistically significant, its finding suggested that ethnic identity and self-differentiation followed a similar developmental path in this population. As ethnic identity increased so did self-differentiation. In addition, a significant relationship was found between ‘bi-culturality’ and ethnic identity. When a person was more bi-cultural, they also identified more with their ethnic group. Ethnic identity also correlated significantly with dyadic adjustment within couples. When a person was more identified with their ethnic group, they were also more adjusted in their relationship with their partner. Finally, this study reported that higher levels of differentiation from family of origin were predictors of marital dyadic adjustment for Latinos. That is, if a person said they were more separated from their family of origin, they were also more likely to be satisfied in their marital relationships. McCullough’s study is also relevant for the current study because the two instruments used to measure; the differentiation of self and ethnic identity of participants in McCullough’s study were uses in the current study.
These two instruments are Differentiation of Self Inventory (DSI) and Multi Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM).

Differentiation theory has proven to be applicable with different cultures, and McCullough’s findings suggested that self-differentiation theory, as measured using the Self-differentiation Scale, has been a valid and reliable measurement of self-differentiation when used with a variety of different cultural groups, including Caucasian Americans and Latinos (McCullough, 2005, Skowron, 1998).

*Research on Hispanic self-differentiation*

There is a need for more research in Latino self-differentiation in the family therapy field (Bean & Crane, 1996). The majority of research on family psychological interactions and well-being has focused on Caucasian Americans (Santiago, Rivera, Arredondo, & Gallardo, 2002; Ponerrrotto & Cassas, 1991; Zinn & Wells, 2000 cited by McCullough, 2005; Skowron, 2004). However, because of the increase of Latino families in the United States, scholars, policy makers and practitioners need to understand more fully how self-differentiation works within Hispanic families and what can be done to help facilitate healthy self-differentiation in this population. More needs to be known about how Hispanic self-differentiation developmental processes are different from Caucasian and African-American populations, among others.

In addition, Hispanic families come with a variety of Latino cultural traditions that strongly value the family’s well-being above the individual’s well-being. One’s sense of self is much more tied to one’s sense of family identity than is characteristic of other racial and ethnic groups found in the U.S. (Ho, 1987 cited by McCullough, 2005). Studying immigrant Hispanic adolescent self-differentiation within the context of family
interaction is an important theme in psychological research (Murray, Phillips, Smith, & Hill, 2001 cited by McCullough, 2005). Understanding Hispanic families’ core values related to maintaining a focus on the family as the central unifying principle of identity is essential in understanding Hispanic individuals’ differentiation of self and identity.

**Purpose of the study**

The purpose of this study was to examine the strength of Hispanic adolescents’ level of ethnic identity and their parents’ level of self-differentiation and ethnic identity in predicting second generation Hispanic adolescents’ level of self-differentiation. In addition, the study examined how language use, cross-cultural friendship and community organization participation patterns, and selected family characteristics were associated with parent and adolescent ethnic identity and self-differentiation in Hispanic adolescents, ages 13 to 18. Bowen’s (1978) differentiation of self-theory provided the theoretical framework for the study’s directions and analysis plan.

**Research questions**

The study was guided by the following questions:

1. What is the relationship between parents’ multi-group ethnic identity score and their self-differentiation score?

2. What is the relationship between adolescents’ multi-group ethnic identity score and their self-differentiation score?

3. Is there a significant relationship between the parents’ multi-group ethnic identity scores and the adolescents’ multi-group ethnic identity scores?

4. Is there a significant relationship between parents’ self-differentiation scores and adolescents’ self-differentiation scores?

5. What is the relationship between parents’ multi-group ethnic identity score and adolescents’ self-differentiation score?
6. Is there a significant relationship between parents’ self-differentiation scores and adolescents’ multi-group ethnic identity scores?

7. Are there significant intra-class effects of the parents’ multi-group ethnic identity scores on the adolescents’ multi-group ethnic identity scores and self-differentiation scores?

8. Are there significant intra-class effects of the parents’ self-differentiation scores on adolescents’ multi-group ethnic identity scores and self-differentiation scores?

9. Are there significant intra-class effects (interdependencies) of the parents’ multi-group ethnic identity scores on adolescents’ multi-group ethnic identity scores?

10. Are there significant intra-class effects (interdependencies) of the parents’ self-differentiation scores on adolescents’ self-differentiation scores?

11. Does combining parents’ multi-group ethnic identity and self-differentiation scores, with other socialization variables have significant power to predict adolescents’ self-differentiation scores? What is the power of prediction?

12. Which of the self-differentiation subscales is best predicted by the created model to predict the Hispanic adolescence differentiation of self?

**Summary**

In this chapter, the problem was stated and its significance indicated. The chapter closed by providing twelve research questions which guided the study and analysis. In the next chapter, the theoretical framework and related literature is reviewed, and the study’s hypotheses presented.
CHAPTER TWO

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND LITERATURE REVIEW

A review of literature on self-differentiation and ethnic identity was conducted using the databases available through Academic Premier, PSYCH-REF, and the Clemson University library catalog. The search terms were differentiation of self, ethnic identity, adolescent development, acculturation, immigrant families’ adjustment, Hispanic adolescents, second generation immigrants, minority self-differentiation, cultural identity, identity development, and minority adolescent social adjustment. Some findings were excluded because they were not of relevance to the present study, these were educational success of minority students, early childhood differentiation of self, and differentiation of self and marital satisfaction.

Theoretical framework

The development of differentiation of self

All humans enter the world totally dependent on others. All begin life in a complete emotional symbiosis with a caregiver who, in the majority of cases, is the mother. This fusion between mother and child is so automatic that the symbiosis of the relationship is assumed as a naturally occurring process (Kerr & Bowen, 1988). Family life provides the young child with the basic structure that allows the child to become self-aware. Children not only learn to achieve their own individuality but also their sense of belonging to their own family in contrast to other families (Anderson, 1999). As children grow and develop, their capacity to be responsible for themselves increases. Children have the task and opportunity to become an individual in their own right, and parents or
caregivers have the task and the opportunity to allow this individual to emerge (Kerr & Bowen, 1988; Thomasna, 2008).

Theoretically, there is an instinctive force in every human that propels the development of such individuality or differentiation that permits a person’s emotional separation and the individual ability to think, feel, and act for him or herself. But also there is an instinctually rooted force that propels children and family members to remain emotionally connected and operate in reaction to one another (Kerr & Bowen, 1988). As a result of these opposing forces and the push and pull of the two forces, no one achieves a complete emotional separation from his or her family and the early attachment is never fully resolved (Kerr and Bowen, 1988). Theoretically, the absolute differentiation of one’s self is never achieved.

Two factors, at minimum, are linked to the amount of emotional separation a person achieves with the family: 1) the degree to which a person’s parents have achieved emotional separation from their own families, and 2) the characteristics of the relationship that the person has with his or her parents, siblings and other important relatives. Not all children from the same family achieve the same levels of emotional separation because the relationship of parents with each child is not the same. A parent could establish a relation with one child that may promote more emotional separation than is the case with another child. It is possible that one child achieves more emotional separation than his or her parents did, and another child achieves less emotional separation than his or her parents, even when developing within the same family system (Kerr & Bowen, 1988).

In well differentiated families, children are less vulnerable to the influence of their parents’ and siblings feelings, beliefs, and opinions and the relationship between
them. Under such circumstances, a child is less exposed to the other’s intense emotions. As a result, children are allowed to think, feel and act for themselves. Children’s actions are more reliant on their own feelings rather than a reaction to the anxieties of other family members, and they gains an understanding of their parents and siblings as distinct individuals. It has been said that “The child’s ‘self’ is not incorporated automatically from others through emotional pressure to gain acceptance and approval. In contrast, beliefs, values and convictions are arrived at thoughtfully and are consistent with one another. A child grows to be part of the family yet separate from it” (Kerr and Bowen, 1988).

Children who grow up in low differentiated families will function mostly in reaction to others, and their values, beliefs, and actions will be determined in reaction to the emotions of others. Their own feelings, values and behaviors usually will be inconsistent and unstable. When away from home, children will replicate the same behaviors with others, trying to obtain the same responses from outsiders, and establish the same sequences of relations that they have at home with people external to the family context (Kerr & Bowen, 1988).

The more intense the emotional field in which people develop, the more their life will be governed by the influence of others’ emotions. That kind of influence limits the achievement of an emotional separation which leads to achieving emotional separation. A person’s operating level of self-differentiation is the degree to which emotional separation has been achieved. To determine and describe the differences between differentiation levels, Bowen proposed a continuum of self-differentiation (Kerr & Bowen, 1988).
Bowen’s theoretical framework clarified “all levels of human functioning from the lowest possible levels to the highest potential level on a single dimension” (Bowen, 1978). Bowen’s theory of self-differentiation does not describe pathology. People with low levels of differentiation can live their lives without developing any pathological symptoms and act in emotional equilibrium just as much as people with high levels of differentiation can present some pathological symptoms under stressful periods. Bowen’s self-differentiation scale only refers to the likelihood that the person who has a lower level of self-differentiation will be more predisposed to functional misbehavior caused by emotional imbalance. This person’s recovery is thought to take longer than a well differentiated person (Bowen, 1978).

A highly differentiated person has a clear understanding of the following: “this is who I am”, “what I am”, “what I will do”, and “what I will not do”. Bowen called this construct the “I” position. The “basic self” of a person is not negotiable in a relationship system and does not change to satisfy the anxieties of others, or their desires and needs. The basic self is sustained even when receiving pressure from others.

Bowen also described another level of self which he called the “pseudo self”. The pseudo self was defined as the sum of the mixed facts, beliefs, and principles that a person learns through a relationship system and that are accepted in order to develop the individual’s relationship with others. This person can be influenced by the emotional environment of the moment, and the person’s emotions fuse with the emotions of others. As Bowen states, “The pseudo self, acquired under the influence of the relationship system, is negotiable in the relationship system” (Bowen, 1978).

People with low self-differentiation tend to function at the level of the pseudo self and live subjectively rather than objectively, and in a state where feelings eclipse
perceptions of facts (Bowen, 1978). Their actions are based on what feels right and their goals are oriented towards love, happiness, security, and the like. They only accomplish these goals when their relationships with others are in balance. When equilibrium is lost, anxiety and distress occur. As a result social dysfunctions, emotional and physical illness may arise (Bowen, 1978).

Highly differentiated individuals act more at the basic self-level and less at the pseudo self-level. These individuals tend to be more autonomous, their actions are more goal-oriented, and their satisfaction arises from the activity itself more than from the impression of others regarding their actions. Highly differentiated people are more capable of distinguishing between feelings and facts, and are more sensitive to appreciating the reality of circumstances. They have defined convictions and opinions on the most essential issues, but are able to appreciate and be sensitive to others’ opinions on essential issues. They can make decisions based on feelings so as not to disturb the equilibrium of their relations with others, but the majority of such individuals’ actions will be motivated by their own basic level of self (Bowen, 1978).

Theoretically, in all close relationships there is some amount of fusion and in every family there is some degree of shared emotional attachment. The absolute differentiation from others is a utopian concept. According to Bowen, absolute differentiation can only be reached at a differentiation level of one hundred on his scale, which is a level reserved for a perfect being that can completely function in all areas of his life, independently from others. Bowen said,

“I expect there might be some unusual figures in history, or possibly some living persons who would fit into the mid-90 range. Increasing experience with the scale indicates that all people have areas of good
functioning and essential areas in which life functioning is poor. It has not yet been possible to check the scale on extremely high level people, but my impression is that a score of seventy five is a very high-level person and that those above sixty constitute a small percentage of society” (Bowen, 1978, used with permission).

People with higher levels of self-differentiation tend to live their lives by reason rather than feeling. Their thoughts are deliberate and they are able to distinguish the difference between feeling and thinking. Low differentiated people, on the other hand, either avoid closeness in their relationships with others to avoid falling into an uncomfortable symbiosis, or pursue an extremely close relationship to gratify emotional needs (Bowen, 1978).

The basic level of self-differentiation acquired during formative years much determines how a person is likely to function for the rest of his or her life. Many life experiences can change the functioning level of an individual’s self, but there are few experiences that can change the basic level of self-differentiation that a person acquires, while developing within their parental family unit.

There are four different types of functions that differentiate self. These functions are as follows (Hertlein, Ray, Wetchler, & Killmer, 2003):

- Emotional reactivity, or the degree to which a person responds to his or her environment with excessive emotion or hyper-sensitivity.
- The “I” position, a clearly defined sense of self, an ability to stick to what one believes when under pressure.
• Emotional cutoff where the individual has feelings of being threatened by engaging in a close relationship with someone and feeling extremely vulnerable in the presence of others.

• Fusion with others, the over emotional involvement with others, for example, over-identifying with parents or being part of a triangulation.

The formation of ethnic identity

Erikson (1950) described identity as a personality component that is developed during adolescence. Having a positive sense of one’s identity is meant to protect individuals during life changes. This first conception of identity lacked consideration of race, culture, and ethnicity as factors that are intrinsic in the development of self-identity (McCullough, 2005; Cooper, 1999). Later conceptions of identity considered the process of identity development contingent upon negotiation and exploration with and commitment to a person’s identity of origin. A personal commitment to one’s identity of origin was also referred to as the development of one’s ethnic identity (Phinney, 1996, Skowron, 2004).

Several current theoretical models of ethnic identity posit that ethnic identity occurs in stages with the first stage being fairly unarticulated and unconscious (Phinney, 1992; Atkinson & Mortenand, 1989 cited by Skowron, 2004). Ethnic identity is taken for granted. The second stage of ethnic identity formation includes a search for what it means to belong to one’s ethnic group which leads to constructing a conscious, articulated ethnic identity.

Phinney (1992) builds upon Erikson’s work and proposes that ethnic identity, as a complex construct, includes a person’s sense of belonging to an ethnic group and his personal evaluation of the group. In addition, when determining whether or not they will
commit to the ethnic group, the person develops an interest in knowing what the group is, and embraces the group’s activities and traditions. Taking a more clinical perspective, Helms (1997 cited by McCullough, 2005) defined ethnic identity as the measure of influence of a person’s cultural characteristics on his or her emotional and social development.

According to Marger (2006) an ethnic group within the larger society presents a unique set of cultural traits. Nielson (1987) and Berry (2001) defined culture as the set of values, beliefs, attitudes, and processes held by members of a group or a community. Culture is learned and not inherited, and passed along from generation to generation by means of language and socialization (Yetman, 1999). Hence, cultural factors distinguish ethnic groups from one another, and are used by individuals to identify themselves.

Cultural identification is a crucial factor in self-differentiation (Bray & Harvey, 1992 Carter & McGoldrick, 1989 cited by Johnson, Buboltz, & Seemann, 2003; Wang, 2006). In Phinney’s (1993) model of how individuals develop their own ethnic identity, during the first stage of “unexamined ethnic identity” which refers to the absence of exploration of one’s ethnicity, individuals accept society’s cultural values without questioning them. With regard to Latinos, Phinney said that during this stage, the Anglo Saxon culture one is exposed to is usually imitated and there is a depreciation of their own culture. A second stage generally begins when there is a cultural shock that leads to the search of the cultural values of the person’s ethnic group. She argues that this shock dislodges the person from his or her worldview and prompts him or her to consider different perspectives. Phinney’s (1993) third phase begins when the individual has a clear and confident sense of belonging to his reference group and hold a positive attitude regarding it. During the whole process, the nature of the group’s cultural values, as
understood by the individual, as well as the individual’s value of the group’s cultural values play an important role in constructing a positive ethnic identity.

Cultural views about an individual’s sense of self shape how information is processed, retained, and accessed later. Indeed, culture shapes individual knowledge and perceptions of the world. Theoretically, a person develops a personal and social identity in response to basic human needs and societal expectations (Wang, 2006; Idler, 2005).

One’s cultural values and beliefs are partially shaped by societal expectations and generations of family traditions passed along through parents and extended family. In the majority of situations confronted by adolescents, their family and social groups encountered are in cultural agreement and do not challenge the adolescent’s identity formation. However, in other situations, there may be a significant disagreement in the cultural values, beliefs, and traditions held and promoted by the family and what other social groups promote and value. The formation of an individual’s cultural identity becomes more challenged by this disagreement. Phinney, Canta, & Kurtz (1997 cited by Skowron, 2004) found that individuals with a more positive ethnic identity exhibit higher self-esteem. Stronger ethnic identity has been associated with lower stress and an individual’s vocational maturity (Quintana Voger & Ibarra, 1991; Perron, Vondracek, Skorikov, & Corbiere, 1998 cited by Skowron, 2004).

When minority individuals achieve a positive ethnic identity, they affirm and say they belong to one’s ethnic cultural group (Cross, 1978; Phinney, 1992; Ponterotto & Pederson, 1993 cited by Skowron, 2004). Individuals find differences between the in-group and the out-group. By distinguishing group differences, individuals can satisfy their own need for social distinctiveness, and such satisfaction reduces the need to view and talk derogatively about out-groups. Being proud of one’s ethnic identity is
fundamental to positive identity development within members of ethnic minorities groups (Carpenter, Zarate, & Garza, 2007; Idler, 2005).

Migration represents several challenges to individuals and families relative to the formation of ethnic identity. It is one of the most radical transitions and life changes a family can face. Migration stressors include alteration of financial status, loss of close relationships, new recreational and educational patterns, pressures to succeed in new occupations, establishment of new work and social relations, housing problems, new community involvement, fears of the unknown, a sense of isolation, and acquiring new secondary relations with doctors, religious leaders, service providers, among others. (Greff & Holzcamp, 2007).

Scholars have created different conceptual frameworks to explain the process one goes through when adjusting to a new culture. Moving to a new society triggers stress linked to mental health problems including anxiety, depression, alcohol abuse, and issues with self-esteem (Cortes, Rogler, & Malgady, 1994). Over the years, scholars’ views have changed regarding how cross-cultural adjustments happen. Early views conceived cross-cultural adjustment more as giving up one’s culture of origin and learning new cultural values, beliefs, rules for behavior, and traditions (i.e. early work call this giving up process ‘assimilating’). Later views did not conceive of the adjustment process as one of giving up, but rather of selecting from and adapting to both cultures’ values, beliefs, rules for behavior, and traditions (i.e. referred to as ‘accommodation’ or ‘multiculturalism’) (Cassaba, 2003; Manager, 2006; Lamphere, 2007).

One can observe recently migrated individuals engaging in both kinds of behavior in almost any recently immigrated community and or in communities where the immigrant group’s culture differs deeply from the receiving group’s culture (Ramos,
2004). People adopt new ideas, values, and beliefs from the receiving culture, while maintaining ideas, values, and beliefs from the original culture (Schwartz, Montgomery, & Briones, 2006; Fernandez, 2007; Cassaba, 2003).

Cross-cultural adjustment is a crisis of self-identity and a change in self-perception (Schwartz, Montgomery, & Briones, 2006). Some may not consciously identify with their ethnic group until they are confronted with a different cultural tradition. For example, Feliciano (2006) provided a case study of an adolescent Latina American girl who did not identify herself as a “Latina” until she immigrated to the United States. Her definition of who she was changed. This example also illustrates Erikson’s construct that the environment helps develop one’s sense of self. (Schwartz, Montgomery, & Briones, 2006).

Erikson viewed identity as the “organization of self-understanding that defines one’s place in the world” (Erikson, 1950 cited by Schwartz, Montgomery, & Briones, 2006). Its primary functions are to maintain a self-regulatory social and psychological structure that directs all individual cognitive processes and behavior (Schwartz, Montgomery, & Briones, 2006). From Erikson’s perspective (1950), identity is a protector of the individual against life changes. In previous studies, a strong identification with one’s ethnic group positively correlated with higher levels of self-esteem (Phinney, 1992; Phinney & Kohatsu, 1997 cited by McCoullough, 2005), higher overall psychological functioning (Phinney, et al., 1997), and higher quality of life and life satisfaction (Utesy, Chae, Brown, & Kelly, 2002 cited by McCoullough, 2005).

Adolescents’ differentiation of self and ethnic identification

During the adolescent years, individuals are greatly concerned about self. It is at this stage that identity issues are more likely to appear (Shwartz Montgomery, & Briones,
Adolescents struggle to individuate themselves from their family and expand their relational context, trying to construct intimate relations with people outside of the family. The role of the family is to allow this individualization and provide the necessary support in order that a well-adjusted individual can emerge (Chun & MacDermid, 1997; Stierlin, Levi, & Savard, 1971 cited by Gavazzi, 1993; Castro, et al., 2007).

In poorly differentiated families adolescents’ efforts to individuate are viewed as threats to the family’s stability (Allison & Sabatelli, 1988 cited by Chun & MacDermid, 1997). Family members’ extreme emotional dependency makes them resistant to any effort of a family member’s attempt to separate. Both parents and siblings may fear loneliness and perceive the individuation process as the adolescent member’s attempt to abandon them. The family may react by obstructing any attempt by the adolescent to gain more autonomy. Or the family may encourage more separation than the teen wants, forcing alienation from the rest of the family without providing enough intimacy or support to emotionally separate from the rest of the family (Sabatelly & Anderson, 1991 cited by Chun & MacDermid, 1997; Gavazzi, 1993).

Autonomy from primary caregivers is necessary for healthy identity development in teens. Unconditional acceptance and support for separation and autonomy are necessary for a person to get sufficient emotional maturity to act objectively in response to others’ actions. Jhonson and Bubolz (2000) found that young people who are less able to function in an autonomous way, directed by themselves, and free from parental control, feelings of guilt, or responsibilities for their parents will exhibit greater levels of fear regarding threats to their freedom.

In a study on adolescent differentiation and self-esteem among Koreans, Chun and MacDemid (1997) found a positive relationship between same sex parent-adolescent
differentiation and individualization. Their findings suggested that the parent-child dyad was the primary bond within Korean families with respect to adolescents’ psychological adjustment, ranking above the marital dyad relational context in determining adolescents’ adjustment.

Gavazzi (1993) reviewed numerous studies which indicated that the amount of intimacy parents demonstrated with others had a significant impact on adolescent adjustment. Gavazzi studied families with adolescent children who participated in clinical services in central Connecticut. He found that family differentiation levels were significant predictors of adolescent school-related difficulties, peer relationship problems, individual oriented difficulties, and illegal activities (Gavazzi, 1993).

Bicultural, multicultural, and ethnic minority adolescents have more complex challenges than their non-minority peers (Jucovv, 2000). Minority adolescents face conflicting normative expectations imposed by each of two different cultural sources. These youths are at risk of developing what Castro et al. (2007) have called the “mismatch syndrome” which is caused by a conflict over choices in values and personal identity as they struggle to live successfully between two conflicting sets of cultural norms. This syndrome can lead to youths feeling alienated, depressed, and dissatisfied with themselves.

In summary, less differentiated individuals will be more likely to develop problems associated with the mismatch syndrome. Lower differentiated individuals tend to function more with a pseudo self and are affected by the context in which they are interacting and the people with whom they are interacting at the moment, than are better differentiated individuals. In bicultural environments, less differentiated individuals are more likely to present inconsistent attitudes and less congruent behaviors than well
differentiated ones. Low differentiated individuals are forced to adjust their behaviors to satisfy the expectations of both cultures.

**Differentiation of self, ethnic identity formation, and ethnic group inter-dependencies**

Only recently has differentiation of self been studied among non-European American groups. Studies have demonstrated the application of differentiation of self-concepts among African-Americans (Skowron, 2004), Hispanic Americans (McCoullough, 2005), Filipinos (Tucson & Fiendlander, 2000), and Chinese living in Taiwan (Yang, 1999). But less is known about the role that ethnic identity plays in the differentiation process.

McCullough (2005) argued that the process of forming a unique identity is intrinsically linked to differentiating from one’s family of origin. Even when not empirically proven, Sicalides (1997) argued that more differentiated individuals, those who are more capable of autonomous thinking and behaviors, and of following their own personal beliefs and values, would be less likely to internalize racism and also be more likely to identify more positive attitudes toward, and a greater sense of belonging to, their ethnic cultural group (Skowron, 2004).

In various research studies, secure parent-child attachment and support for identity corresponded with lower risk of delinquency among African-Americans and among older adolescents of minorities (Smith & Krohn, 1995). African-American adolescents whose parents support their identity development reportedly had a closer relationship with their parents during their adolescent years (Cernkovich & Giordano, 1987 cited by Skowron, 2004). Skowron (2004) found a positive relationship between African-American’s high ratings of ethnic identity and self-differentiation. The study focused on African-American college students and found that higher differentiation of
self-predicted a higher sense of belonging to an ethnic group. Those with a more positive attitude and stronger ties with their ethnicity were also less emotionally cut off in their relationships with family members and significant others.

In their research on cultural pluralism and prejudice reduction, Carpenter, Zarate, and Garza (2007), found that individuals who identified less with their ethnic group used alternative strategies of distancing themselves from the in-group. Their findings were similar to what Bowen (1978) described as low differentiated individuals’ response to distancing themselves from the rest of their family members. As Idler (2005) suggested, echoing Bowen’s (1978) theoretical framework, having a stronger self-differentiation implies having a certain understanding of “who I am”. Such individuals are able to value their own group membership as well as value positively members of other groups. A clear “I” is the fundamental attribute of the differentiation of self, accomplished by emotional and intellectual separation between “others” and “me.”

**Differences in immigrant parent and adolescent adjustment**

Immigrant families with children face even more complex adjustments because of intergenerational differences in social interactions with host culture individuals. These differences in interaction and exposure to the host culture’s traditions, beliefs, and values create different adjustment paths for parents and children. Children raised within immigrant family structures may have faster adjustment demands than do their parents (Rumbaut, 2001). Children learn English and host culture traditions faster than their parents who may still be thinking and living much as they did in their culture of origin. In some cases, there are differences in the speed and nature of cultural adjustments which cause conflicts within the family. Children can be ashamed of their parents and feel embarrassed by their presence in their peer circles.
A reversal of roles also has been observed in which the adolescent assumes some of the roles that parents usually play because of the parents’ English language difficulties. Intergenerational gaps in migrant families are sometimes more accentuated than in regular families because of the dramatic changes in the socio-political and economic contexts in which the migrant parents were raised contrasted with the contexts with which their children are contending (McCoulough, 2005; Rubaut, 2005; Parke, Coltrane, & Schofield, 2007).

Children of immigrant parents may not have experienced migration themselves or migrated at such a young age that their parents’ culture) has only been lived and understood within their family environment or with other members of their ethnic groups (Lackland, 2000).

Second generation children of immigrants tend to think that they are one of the main reasons why their parents migrated (Rumbaut, 2015). The literature provides ample cases and examples in which parents and their more acculturated second generation children faced conflict, embarrassment, marginalization, and role reversals (Rumbaut, 2001). Immigrant parents have to learn to be parents without the advantage of relying on many of their own cultural experiences and while ignorant of the new culture’s accepted norms, behaviors, and traditions.

Monzo and Rueda (2006) provided an example of how migration challenges discipline practices among Hispanic families in the U.S. They found that even when some Hispanic Americans believed that spanking their children was an effective way to teach them discipline, the majority did not actually spank their children because they thought that spanking was illegal in the United States and were afraid that if they did, their children would be taken away from them. Others continued to spank their children
but told the children that they were not supposed to tell anybody, and that spanking is how discipline was administered in their culture. Still others assumed that they could discipline their children with other methods and that spanking their children, even if it was permitted, was not a good option.

Considering Monzo and Rueda’s (2006) study researchers need to determine the factors essential in helping adolescents and their parents form a new cultural identity without having to feel they have to give up their ethnic identity. Little is known about what cultural traditions and elements promote positive child and adolescent development. For example, the benefits and importance of Hispanic adolescents maintaining Spanish language skills or Hispanic families maintaining close family relationships (i.e. “familism”) are not well understood (Zambra, 1995, cited by Schimtz, 2005).

**The effects of maintaining the language of culture of origin**

Studies indicate that Hispanic parents who maintained their culture of origin’s language also provided greater cognitive stimulus to their children. In a study conducted by Schmitz (2005), it was found that children whose mothers spoke Spanish in their house and with them tended to be more stimulated cognitively than the ones whose mothers spoke English with their children. Indeed, the maintenance of the language of origin represents a positive factor in the development of Hispanic children. Raumbaut (2001) also found that bilingualism was associated with higher educational expectations.

In cognitive psychology, language is considered an operational medium for the individual’s construction of the world and a means by which social relationships are partially constituted. Speech provides a map of the social terrain in which the individual develops (Anderson, 2001; Castano, Biever, Gonzalez, & Anderson, 2007). Bilingual individuals have a dual sense of self with two languages and two distinct ways of

Valentine (2006) and Schimitz (2005) conducted studies among immigrant Hispanic women in the United States and found that working women with higher acculturation levels had higher self-esteem. Some elements in the new culture had a positive effect on the emotional life of these women (Parke, Coltrane, & Schofield, 2007). Tsaj, Ying, and Lee (2001) studied the relationship between acculturation and self-esteem in Chinese Americans, focusing on language proficiency, cultural pride, and relations maintained with other Chinese Americans. They found that language proficiency in Chinese and English, as well as maintaining Chinese cultural pride was positively associated with healthy self-esteem. Conversely, Chinese Americans who had limited their personal relations only to other Chinese people tended to have lower self-esteem levels than other Chinese Americans who had broader social interactions (Tsaj, Ying, & Lee, 2001).

In the case of adolescents, language acculturation has been moderately associated with higher probabilities of adolescent violence such as hitting or being involved in gangs and fights. It also have been noticed that the risk increases from foreign born to second generation, and from second generation to third generation immigrants (Stainfield, 2008).

**The effects of maintaining Latino cultural traditions on self-identity**

Self-identity is enhanced when Latino cultural traditions are preserved. Maintaining Hispanic cultural traditions are found to be a protective factor in avoiding youth behavioral problems (Gonzales, et al., 2007; Castro, et al., 2007). A study conducted with Hispanic adolescents whose fathers were drug abusers found that some of the cultural traditions of the family protected the adolescent from developing anti-social
behaviors. It was also found that social responsibilities and family traditionalism were associated with family staying together, which fostered resilience in children (Gonzales, et al., 2007). When Latino migrants had less identification with their ethnic group they tended to have higher rates of health problems such as alcohol abuse, cigarette smoking, illicit drug use, and sedentary lifestyles in Latino migrants in the United States (Castro, et al., 2007).

**Familism and self and ethnic identity**

Other studies have considered the relationship between “familism” as a suggested characteristic of Mexicans’ culture and acculturation, and how significant it is on the individual’s well-being. Familism is “a cultural value that involves individuals’ strong identification with and attachment to their nuclear and extended families, and strong feelings of loyalty, reciprocity, and solidarity among members of the same family” (Marín & VanOss Marín, 1991). While first studied with Mexicans, several scholars have used Marins’ scale on other Latino national groups. Marins’ studies concluded that there exists a positive relationship between the importance attributed to family relations and multiculturalism, family support, and Mexican cultural identity. Psychological well-being was positively associated with Mexican cultural identity and family support (Rodriguez, Bingham, Paez, & Myers 2007, Schimitz, 2005).

In a study that focused on familism, Vazquez and Garcia (2000) found that in Hispanic adolescents the length of time of living in the United States did not affect adolescents’ endorsement of familism. However, their commitment to the value of respect for their own family members was positively affected (Eduard & Lopez, 2006).

Eduard and Lopez (2006) found that high school students of Mexican descendent who identified more with the Mexican culture reported more life satisfaction than
students who identified more with the Anglo-American culture. Sommers, Fagan, and Basking’s study (1994) on familism and Puerto Rican delinquency found that higher levels of acculturation increased the risk that Puerto Rican boys would engage in theft and violence. They found that this was due to the blurring boundaries and roles in Puerto Rican families in which traditional values were not reinforced. Their findings suggested that in addition to teaching respect and affection, teaching values of duty and obligation were relevant in the development of adolescents in this culture.

Family is considered the single most important institution among Hispanics (Christenson, Zabriskie, Eggett, & Freeman, 2006). Parents encourage their children to participate in family rituals. They teach their children respect for the elderly. They teach a sense of obligation toward their families and the children are expected to be active in supervising younger siblings. Latino children exhibit higher rates of cooperation than competition compared with their Anglo-American counterparts (Fernandez, 2007; Aarons, McDonald, Connely, & Newton, 2007). Fernandez (2007) found that traditional Hispanic values emphasized rituals such as family eating meals together and participation in family activities on weekends (Fernandez, 2007; Aarons, McDonald, Connely, & Newton, 2007). In their study on Hispanic adolescents and cultural traditions as protective factors, Castro, et al. (2007) found that, although cultural orientation in itself may not be a potent shield, other factors such as adults teaching adolescents social responsibility and advocating family traditionalism were powerful protective factors in preventing Hispanic adolescents in engaging in socially unacceptable behavior.

Families that have a strong sense of cultural heritage and practice religious traditions provide a basis for meaning and purpose in times of crisis. Families that consciously shared important values, have specific times for being affectionate, engage in
cultural rituals, and share family traditions provide a sense of stability that can help the family manage the cultural adjustments required following migration (Greff & Holtzkamp, 2007).

**Differentiation of self from a systemic perspective**

Bowen’s (1978) theory of self-differentiation is framed from a systemic perspective. Systems theory is a conceptual framework that provides a basis for studying the interactions and interdependencies among elements. Systemic family theory studies human interactions among individual family members and the resultant properties that occur because of these interactions. In systemic family theory, the individual is defined in terms of their function in the context of their relationship with others. The interactions among family members and the manner in which each member is defined are examined (Minuchin, 1985).

A family system is defined as a group of individuals interacting with each other and influencing each other, creating a circuit of interactions that are called relations. A family system is a defined unit of interactions existing within its environment. In this unit, even when not recognized by the individual, every family member is dependent on every other, as well as being relatively independent. Each individual family member always responds to the actions and expectations of other family members (Jackson, 1974).

The capacity for autonomy and emotional connection were considered by Bowen to be necessary for an individual’s maturity and optimal personal adjustment. He maintained that the emotional forces underlying family system functioning were expressions of family emotions (Ochoa de Alda, 1995). Bowen’s conception of family relationships having different functions, needing different inputs, and producing different
outcomes, and his recognition of the significance of these interactions in developing positive or negative emotional connection to others allowed scholars to have a basis by which to assess the effect of the cultural context on family relations (Skowron, 2004).

**Family cohesion and self-differentiation**

Just as individuals developed self-differentiation so do family units (Kerr & Bowen, 1988). The human capacity for cohesiveness, altruism, and cooperativeness varies between families because of different levels of differentiation. The higher the level of differentiation in any family or social group, the more the members can cooperate, look out for each other’s welfare, and stay in adequate contact during stressful, as well as serene, periods (Kerr & Bowen, 1988). In the words of Kerr and Bowen (1988), “Humans seem to be the only species that can be individual and team players at the same time”. Humans have the capacity to restrain selfish and unpleasant urges even during periods of high anxiety.

The human capacity to be team players as well as individuals is the basis for understanding the concept of cohesiveness which is a fundamental concept in differentiation theory. In a low differentiated family, cohesiveness is based on togetherness where people are clinging to one another for emotional support. In a well differentiated family, cohesiveness is the result of individuals’ recognition of the realistic dependence on each other, and at the same time the ability to be fairly autonomous in their emotional functioning. During calm periods, both groups will look the same, but under conditions of anxiety the low differentiated family is highly vulnerable to erosion and to the appearance of dysfunctional symptoms (Bowen, 1978; Peleg, 2005).

Self-differentiation has been empirically linked with emotional infidelity (Hertlein, Ray, Wetchler & Killmer, 2003), identity development (Johnson, Buboltz &,
Seeman, 2003 cited by Jenkins, Boubolz, Schwartz, & Johnson, 2005), and psychological development of young adults in all eight stages of Erikson’s well known personality theory (Jenkins, Bubolz, Schwartz, & Johnson, 2005).

**Hypotheses**

Based on the literature review the following hypotheses tested in this study were as follows:

H1 Parents birth place is not significantly correlated with their teen’s Accepted MEIM scores.

H2 Adolescents’ levels of ethnic identity are significantly with Accepted adolescents’ differentiation of self.

H3 Parents’ multi-group ethnic identification scores are significantly Rejected associated with the parents’ differentiation of self-scores.

H4 Parents’ level of differentiation of self-scores significantly associated Accepted with adolescents’ differentiation of self-scores.

H5 Parents’ and adolescents’ multi-group ethnic identification scores are Rejected significantly associated with one another.

H6 Parents’ multi-group ethnic identification scores will significantly Rejected associate with adolescents’ self-differentiation scores.

H7 Parents’ self-differentiation scores are significantly and positively Rejected related to adolescents’ multi-group ethnic identification scores.

H8 Within each group (parent or adolescent group), multi-group ethnic Rejected identification scores will have the same effect on their self-differentiation scores. If parents multi-group ethnic identification scores had a positive relationship on parents self-differentiation scores, the same relationships will be found in adolescents (intra-class relationship).

H9 There is a significant intra-class relationship between the parent’s self-Accepted differentiation scores and the adolescent group's multi-group ethnic identification scores.

H10 There is a significant intra-class relationship between the parents’ Accepted multi-group ethnic identification scores and the adolescents’ self-differentiation scores.
H11 Adolescent self-differentiation scores will be partially predicted by adolescent multi-group ethnic identification scores, parent self-differentiation scores and some of the factors associated with adolescents’ patterns of socialization such as: group participation, student clubs attendances, church attendances, etc.

H12 Given the relation of the subscales that comprise the self-differentiation inventory scores, each subscale will partially predict at some level each of the other sub-scales that compose the overall SDI score.

**Logic model**

Based on the theoretical frameworks used, and the research questions and hypotheses that were formulated, Figure 2.1 presents the logic model guiding this study’s conceptual framework and analysis plan.

![Figure 2.1. Study’s logic model](image-url)

**Summary**

The purpose of this study was to examine the strength of Hispanic adolescents’ level of ethnic identity and their parents’ level of self-differentiation and ethnic identity in predicting second generation Hispanic adolescents’ level of self-differentiation. One hundred and two Hispanic adolescents ages 13 to 18 and their parents were surveyed in 2010. The sample was recruited from three high schools in Greenville County, South

Chapter Two examined the nature of self-differentiation within the contexts of family, friendship, and community associations. Factors promoting and hindering adolescent and parent development of self-differentiation and ethnic identity were noted. The relationships between parents’ self-differentiation and ethnic identity, and that of their adolescent children were explored. The effects of a strong ethnic identity on the development of self-differentiation were identified. The effects of selected cultural factors, in particular familism, use of language of country of origin, and national culture of origin were examined in relationship to how they affected the development of self-differentiation and identification with one’s ethnic group. Bowen’s (1978) theory of self-differentiation was used to frame the study and the directions of analysis as reflected in the hypotheses.

Chapter Three reviews the research design, procedures and analysis plan used.
CHAPTER THREE

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

The purpose of this study was to examine the strength of Hispanic adolescents’ level of ethnic identity and their parents’ level of self-differentiation and ethnic identity in predicting second generation Hispanic adolescents’ level of self-differentiation. One hundred and two (102) Hispanic adolescents ages 13 to 18 and their parents were surveyed in 2010. The adolescent research participants attended one of three high schools in Greenville County, South Carolina. Bowen’s (1978) self-differentiation theory and Phinney’s (1992) multi-group ethnic identification theory provided the theoretical framework for the study’s directions and analysis plan.

Study design

The study was a cross-sectional survey, without a comparison group, of a convenience sample of Hispanic adolescents ages 13 to 18 and their parents who resided in Greenville County, South Carolina.

Sample

The 2010 U.S. Census indicated that South Carolina had 235,893 individuals of Hispanic or Latino origin. In Greenville County, there were approximately 36,549 Hispanics of which, at the time of this study, 13,052 were adolescents (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010). This study surveyed adolescents attending three high schools in Greenville County, South Carolina (Table 3.1). Although four high schools agreed to participate, none of the surveys that were handed out in the fourth high school was
returned completed. Hence, this high school was eliminated from the original sample and only three high schools were included in this study.

**Table 3.1. Hispanic Population in Greenville and Participating Schools**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greenville County, S.C.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total population</td>
<td>451,225</td>
<td>2,181</td>
<td>644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total of Hispanic population</td>
<td>36,549</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hispanic adolescents between the ages of 13 to 18 who were born in the United States or had entered the U.S. five years before were chosen for data collection. This second generation Hispanic adolescent group was chosen to ensure that they had been exposed to a sufficient amount of cross-cultural interactions that may affect the development of self-differentiation. If participants had a sibling who also was participating in the study, sibling data was also collected. The intention was to be able to compare between siblings in regard to both levels of differentiation and ethnic identification, however only five of the participants were identified as siblings which only allowed for two cases. Hence, no further analysis for siblings was done.

**Sample size**

To determine the sample size, the number of Hispanic students who were enrolled in one of the three participating high schools was calculated. Table 3.1 shows the distribution of Hispanic students per each participating High school. The following formula (Kraemer,, & Thiemann, 1987) was used to calculate the sample size:

\[ n = \frac{N}{1 + N(e)}^2 \]

where “n” is the sample size, “N” the population size and “e” that the expected level of significance which, in this case, equals 0.05.
In this instance, “N” equals the number of Hispanic students enrolled in the 2009-2010 school year in the participating schools which was a total of 185 students. Applying the formula, then
\[ n = \frac{185}{1 + 185(0.05)^2} \approx 1.4625; n = 126 \]
participants were required for the sample.

**Recruitment**

The principals of a total of 13 schools were approached either by email or personally. The researcher clarified the nature of the study and how students would be involved. Four principals gave permission for their school’s Latino students to participate in this study. A total of seven teachers from participating schools were approached personally and six gave permission for the researcher to invite Hispanic students during a class period to participate in this study. Permission was also obtained from the parents of participating Latino adolescents because research participants were under the age of 18. Permission from parents was obtained using a signed consent form. Finally, permission was obtained from the adolescent using a signed consent form.

Data from only three of the participating schools were included in this study analysis because a fourth school was eliminated due to lack of achieving an adequate level of students’ participation. None of the schools approached by mail responded positively. Once the principals’, parents’, and teachers’ permissions were obtained, the researcher went to each participating teacher’s classroom at an invited time and students were asked to participate in the study. All school, teacher, parent, and student participation in this study was voluntary. No incentives were given to participate in this study.
Data collection

Pre-data collection procedures

This study was submitted to the Clemson University Institutional Board of Review (IRB) for approval. A full review was necessary because the study collected data from subjects under the age of eighteen. In order to comply with the regulations of the IRB, signed consent was obtained from both parents and children, as well as consent from the principal and teachers at each school.

Prior to submission to the IRB, a questionnaire was constructed, translated into English and Spanish, back translated, and a pilot test conducted. The questionnaire consisted of a total of eighteen questions and is further described in the data collection instrument section. The questionnaire was written in English and translated to Spanish by the researcher. The Spanish version of the questionnaire was translated to English by an independent translator and the two English versions were compared and revised for consistency.

Consent procedure

The researcher sought permission from principals or vice principals at all participating high schools in Greenville County prior to engaging teens and their parents. Four principals agreed to participate. Once permissions from the principals were obtain, then the researcher sought permission from teachers to present during class time the opportunity for teens to participate in the survey. Six (6) teachers agreed to allow the researcher to come to their class to present the opportunity.
Participant data collection procedure

Students that agreed to participate each received a survey envelope. The envelope included an instruction sheet stapled on the top of each envelope. The instructions, as well as all the documents included in the envelope, were in both English and Spanish. Inside each envelope the student found two packages, one marked “for the parents” the other marked “for the student”. The parents’ package included two consent forms. One of the forms was to be signed by a parent giving permission for their teen to participate in the study and the other was for the parent to keep for their own records.

Table 3.2. Number of Survey Envelopes Distributed in Participating Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Envelopes Distributed*</th>
<th>Envelopes Completed &amp; Returned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*After the first time that the researcher handed out survey envelopes, some students asked for another survey envelope because they misplaced the first one.

In the package for parents, a copy of the multi-group ethnic identity measure (MEIM) and a copy of the Self-differentiation Inventory (SDI) was included. One of each student’s parents was asked to sign a parent consent form, complete the MEIM and SDI, and return it to the researcher in the envelope provided. Parents were instructed to give their adolescent(s) the sealed envelope(s) and the teen was instructed to return it to the participating teacher.

The student survey package included two copies of a consent form, one copy of the MEIM, a copy of the SDI, and a short questionnaire. Students were instructed to sign one consent form and keep the other. They completed the MEIM and the SDI and placed
it back in the envelope provided, along with their parent’s package. The student returned the sealed envelope to their teacher at school. The researcher collected the sealed envelopes from the teachers.

**Confidentiality procedure**

To ensure confidentiality, each envelope was to be sealed by the student and handed in to the participating teacher. Once the envelopes were collected from each teacher, the researcher assigned a case number to each envelope. This number was written on the parents’ package and the students’ package, and on each of the signed consent forms. The consent forms were separated from the rest of the data collection instruments. The data was entered into a data file on a password protected computer to which only the researcher had access. The consent forms and the data collection instruments were stored in separate boxes, and sealed and placed in a locked cabinet.

**Study variables**

The study examined the power of parents’ self-differentiation and ethnic identity scores, and adolescents’ ethnic identity scores to predicted adolescent self-differentiation scores. The study used generalized linear and multi-level regression analyses, combined with bivariate and multivariate correlations to explore the relationships and the predictive power of the study’s model. Selected socio-cultural factors were added to the basic model to determine how they affected the power of prediction of adolescents’ self-determination scores.

The socio-cultural variables for which data were collected were 1) language used at home; 2) language used with friends; 3) frequency of social interaction with Hispanic friends; 4) frequency of social interaction with people of other ethnicities; 5) nature and
frequency of community and school organization participation; 6) country of birth; 7) how strongly they identified with country of birth; 8) age of immigration to U.S.; 9) where the mother was born; 10) how long mother has been in U.S.; 11) how strongly they identified with mother’s country of birth; 12) the father’s country of birth; 13) how long father has been in U.S.; 14) how strongly they identified with father’s country of birth; 15) whether or not they considered themselves Hispanic or Latino; 16) and information on family members living in the household (i.e. mother, father, respondent, oldest sibling, next oldest sibling, grandfather, grandmother, aunt, uncle, cousin), their age, gender, born in U.S., born outside U.S.).

Each of the three instruments used in the study are reviewed in the next section.

**Instruments**

**Differentiation of Self Inventory**

Differentiation of self is understood as an individual’s capacity to discern between one’s emotional and intellectual functioning and one’s ability to act in accordance with one’s own independent thinking (Bowen, 1978). The Self-differentiation Inventory (SDI) designed by Skowron and Fiendlander (1998) was used in this study. To avoid misunderstanding due to lack of language proficiency in English (Cassaba, 2002), a Spanish version of the inventory was provided to teens and parents, in addition to an English version. Skowron’s and Fiendlander’s (1998) SDI was designed for a population
of over twenty five years of age, but the scale has been used and validated with adolescents as young as thirteen years old (Skowron, 2004).

Skowron and Friedlander’s (1998) SDI was selected over other differentiation of self-scales because it contained all the subscales originated by Bowen (1978). Other scales such as the differentiation of self-scale (DOSS) developed by Kear (1978), and Personal Authority in the Family System (PAFSQ) developed by McCollum (1991) were criticized because they did not include all the subscales for all of the dimensions originally proposed by Bowen. Another benefit of Skowron and Friedlander’s SDI is that it has been used with different ethnic populations, including the Hispanic population (McCullough 2005; Maser 2011).

The SDI (Skowron & Friedlander, 1998) is a 43-item categorical response scale with response options arranging from 1 (not at all true of me) to 6 (very true of me). The items cover Bowen’s (1978) four constructs covering self-differentiation. These are emotional reactivity (ER), “I” position (IP), emotional cutoff (EF), and fusion with others (FO). The subscales are named after each of Bowen’s constructs. Table 3.3 shows each scale item that belongs on each factor of the subscales. The higher scores reflect less emotional reactivity, less emotional cutoff, less fusion with others, and greater ability to take an “I” position in relationships, meaning greater differentiation of self (Skowron, 1998).

Table 3.3. Skowron & Friedlander’s (2004) Differentiation of Self Inventory Factors Grouped By Scale Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Item number</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taking an I position</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>I tend to remain pretty calm even under stress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>No matter what happens in my life, I know that I'll never lose my sense of who I am.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>I usually do not change my behavior simply to please another person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>When I am having an argument with someone, I can separate my thoughts about the issue from my feelings about the person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>There's no point in getting upset about things I cannot change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>I'm fairly self-accepting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>I am able to say no to others even when I feel pressured by them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>I'm less concerned that others approve of me than I am about doing what I think is right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>My self-esteem really depends on how others think of me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>I usually do what I believe is right regardless of what others say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I tend to feel pretty stable under stress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>People have remarked that I'm overly emotional.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reactivity</td>
<td></td>
<td>When someone close to me disappoints me, I withdraw from him or her for a time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>I wish that I weren't so emotional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>At times my feelings get the best of me and I have trouble thinking clearly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>At times, I feel as if I'm riding an emotional roller coaster.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>I'm overly sensitive to criticism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>If I have had an argument with my spouse or partner, I tend to think about it all day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>If someone is upset with me, I can't seem to let it go easily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>I'm very sensitive to being hurt by others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>I often wonder about the kind of impression I create.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>I feel things more intensely than others do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fusion</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>I'm likely to smooth over or settle conflicts between two people whom I care about</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with</td>
<td></td>
<td>It has been said (or could be said) of me that I am still very attached to my parent(s).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>others</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Whenever there is a problem in my relationship, I'm anxious to get it settled right away</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>It's important for me to keep in touch with my parents regularly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>When my spouse or partner is away for too long, I feel like I am missing a part of me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>I try to live up to my parents' expectations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Arguments with my parent(s) or sibling(s) can still make me feel awful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>I find myself thinking a lot about my relationship with my spouse or partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>I worry about people close to me getting sick, hurt, or upset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>I have difficulty expressing my feelings to people I care for.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cut-off</td>
<td></td>
<td>I often feel inhibited around my family.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>I tend to distance myself when people get too close to me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>My spouse or partner could not tolerate it if I were to express to him or her my true feelings about some things.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The scores were converted to the differentiation of self-scale created by Bowen (1978) because Bowen’s scale provided cut points in the differentiation of self-scale. The Skowron and Fiendlander (1998) scale had an answer range from one to six, while Bowen’s (1978) description started from zero to one hundred, in which zero was the lowest point of differentiation and one hundred was the highest. Using Skowron’s and Fiendlander’s (1998) items, the maximum score was six and the minimum was one. To better understand the results according to Bowen’s description of the cut off points of self-differentiation (i.e. 0 to 25, 25 to 50, 50 to 75, and 75 to 100), a new variable was computed to transform the Skowron’s and Fiendlander’s (1998) results so that scores could be interpreted according to Bowen’s (1978) scale. This new variable was created using the compute option of SPSS, multiplying each value by 100, and then dividing the value by six.

In previous studies, the SDI had good internal reliability when used with Hispanic populations. In McCullough’s (2005) study with 210 Hispanic participants, the SDI reliability for the sample was alpha = .84.
For the purpose of this research study, ethnic identification was defined by the scores that each participant parent and student obtained from the use of the Multi-group Ethnic Identification Measure (MEIM) designed by Phinney (1992). This scale contained 15 items to assess ethnic group belonging. As with the SDI, a Spanish translation of the MEIM was provided, along with an English version.

The MEIM has two sub-scales: 1) an identity index that assesses the cognitive component of the ethnic identity search and 2) a belonging index that assesses the emotional component of ethnic identity. The identity index is composed by five statements while the belonging index is composed by seven statements. For each statement the respondent has to assign a value from one to four, depending on how much the respondent identifies with each statement. Research participants respond to each of twelve items using a four-point, Likert scale in which respondents strongly disagree (1), disagree (2), agree (3), or strongly agree (4) with each item stated. Higher scores reflected greater feelings of belonging to one’s ethnic group and lower scores reflected less identification with an ethnic group. The last three items of the scale are questions about the respondent’s ethnic heritage and belonging. Seven options were provided for these questions: (1) Asian or Asian American, including Chinese, Japanese, and others, (2) Black or African-American, (3) Hispanic or Latino, including Mexican American, Central American, and others, (4) White, Caucasian, Anglo, European American; not Hispanic, (5) American Indian/Native American, (6) Mixed; Parents are from two different groups, and (7) Other.

The MEIM provided a metric that enabled meaningful comparisons between diverse ethnic groups (Skowron, 2004). The MEIM had the advantage of considering
different aspects of ethnic identification, had been validated with Hispanic populations, and has been widely used in studies of Latino Americans. This scale was selected because previous research revealed a positive relationship between MEIM’s higher scores and psychological well-being, and higher self-esteem among white Americans, African-Americans and Mexican Americans (McCullough, 2005) in studies where self-identity or self-differentiation were also discussed. The MEIM has probes creating good internal consistency. In her study with 210 Hispanic Americans, McCullough (2005) found the overall MEIM reliability of alpha = .78.

**Socio-cultural variables**

Following completion of the SDI and the MEIM, participants were asked to complete a short questionnaire on selected factors that helped explain respondents’ self-differentiation and ethnic identity scores. The factors included Spanish and English language use, cross-cultural friendship and community organization participation patterns, and selected family characteristics. In addition, each respondent was asked to identify three values or characteristics they particularly liked about their ethnic group.

**Socio-cultural Characteristics of Hispanic Adolescents and Parents**

- Language use at home
- Language use with friends
- Frequency of social interaction with Hispanic friends
- Frequency of social interaction with people of other ethnicities
- Nature and frequency of community and school organization participation
- Three characteristics or values they most like about their ethnic or cultural background
- Country of birth
- How strongly they identify with country of birth
- Age of immigration to USA
- Where mother was born
- How long mother been in USA
- How strongly they identify with mother’s country of birth
- Fathers country of birth
• How long father has been in USA
• How strongly they identify with father’s country of birth
• Whether or not they consider themselves Hispanic or Latino
• Information on household for all who live in household (mother, father, respondent, oldest sibling, next oldest sibling, grandfather, grandmother, aunt, uncle, cousin): age, gender, born in USA (yes/no), born outside USA (yes/no)

The questions were constructed in a format that allowed for a limited number of responses. The instrument had only one open question that asked respondents to identity three cultural characteristics or values that they most liked related to the ethnic group identified in a previous question.

Data analysis plan

Data management

Two hundred forty one (241) envelopes containing questionnaires were handed out. One hundred and five (105) envelopes were returned. Only 102 from the returned packages were used to create the data base to be analyzed. One of the returned packages was eliminated because the consent form from the parents was not signed. Three cases were eliminated because the lack of data did not permit further analysis. The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS 18.0 Graduate pack) was used to analyze the data obtained from the Differentiation of Self Inventory for both parents and children, the Multi-group Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM), and the student questionnaire.

All questions from the survey documents were entered into a database and the data were cleaned. Data from the parents’ and adolescents’ SDI were coded according to the Skowron and Friedlander (1998) instrument correction instructions. Once all the recoded variables were computed, a new variable with the mean of all SDI questions was created with the overall score for differentiation of self for adolescents and parents. In
addition, four new variables were created for each differentiation of self-subscale, using the variables from the questions that compress the I position sub-scale, the emotional cutoff sub-scale, emotional reactivity sub-scale, and fusion with others sub-scale. Also, new variables were created for the overall score of affirmation index of the MEIM for adolescents and parents. Finally, frequencies were run to observe the participants’ country of origin which allowed for the creation of a new variable which collapsed the number of participating countries examined. A new database was created with each case duplicated to allow for the intergroup analysis comparing bi-directionally the parents’ and adolescents’ scores.

Two kinds of regression analyses (generalized linear and multi-level) were used to test hypotheses eight, nine, ten, eleven, and twelve presented in this study and revealed the power and significance of adolescents’ level of ethnic identity and parents’ levels of self-differentiation and ethnic identity to predict adolescents’ level of self-determination. Selected socio-cultural variables were added to the generalized linear regression model to determine if their addition added to the power of predicting adolescents’ SDI scores. Multi-level regression analysis examined the intra-class effects on adolescents’ SDI scores. Descriptive, bivariate and multivariate analyses were done to further examine the nature of each variable and the significant associations between variables. These analyses are explained further in the following sections of this chapter.

**Descriptive analysis**

A descriptive univariate analysis was conducted. Frequency distributions were reported for discrete variables with absolute values and percentages. The mean and its standard deviation were calculated for continuous variables. A profile of research subjects (teens and parents) according to age, gender, and country of origin was created,
along with the frequencies measures: mean and percentages of age, country of origin, and gender. The same type of analysis for differentiation of self and ethnic identification scores was done.

**Bivariate analysis**

An exploratory correlation analysis with a one-tailed significance level was conducted between the self-differentiation scores of teens and parents and the socio-cultural variables selected for the study. One table presented the correlations with SDI and another displayed correlations on the MEIM.

A bivariate analysis was done on dependent and independent variables using Chi-square tests. For nominal data, Chi-square analysis examined differences between the socio-cultural variables among different levels of adolescent and parent self-differentiation.

In order to facilitate further analysis, groups of respondents were created in accordance to the four levels of self-differentiation defined by Bowen (1978). Four groups for parents and four groups for adolescents resulted. T-tests were calculated in order to observe the differences between the created groups relative to ethnic identification for parents and adolescents. Correlations were calculated for both parents’ and adolescents’ ethnic identity and the differentiation of self-scores to determine whether or not there were any significant relationships present between their self-differentiation and ethnic identity scores. Correlations between parents’ and adolescents’ differentiation of self-scores, and between parents’ and adolescents’ ethnic identity scores were calculated. Correlations also were calculated between parents’ SDI and MEIM scores, and between adolescents’ SDI and MEIM scores. This analysis helped establish a relationship between differentiation of self and ethnic identity.
**Regression analysis**

The first type of regression analysis used was intra-class regression analysis. This analysis allowed for the evaluation of the interactions of actors and partner effects in each person. In order to carry out this analysis, a new data set was created, duplicating each case in the original data set. To control for non-independence between parents’ and adolescents’ differentiation of self-scores, as conceptualized in the research literature and presented in Chapter Two, a multi-level regression model studied the actor effects and partner effects of multi-group ethnic identification scores on self-differentiation scores.

The model used a regression analysis that permitted the observation of the random effect of SDI scores across dyads or families in this case. The model was estimated by creating a new database in which each of the cases were duplicated making each participant an actor and a partner, which allowed for multi-level models of the actor and partner effects. Hence for this analysis, the adolescents’ SDI scores were analyzed in relationship to the adolescents’ MEIM and parents MEIM scores, and the parents’ SDI scores were analyzed in relation to the adolescents’ MEIM and parents’ MEIM scores. The following figure shows the interactions of actor and partner effect in the intra-class regression.

In Figure 3.1 the intra-class analysis evaluates the effect that each of the included variables analyzed had on actors (a) and partners (p), and vice-versa.
To test the hypotheses for this study, regression analyses were performed. Parents’ differentiation of self and adolescents’ ethnic identity scores were used to test the direction and power of predicting adolescents’ differentiation of self-scores. Regression analyses were performed on adolescents’ and parents’ scores, grouped according to the SDI subscales (i.e. the Emotional cut off, I position, Emotional reactivity and the Fusion with others subscales) to determine what subscale scores contributed the most to adolescents’ and parents’ total score of the differentiation of self. The adolescents’ and parents’ scores on the SDI subscales were also used to assess which of the subscales had more power to predict adolescent ethnic identification.

Beyond testing the basic analytical model, some of the socio-cultural factors were added to the basic regression model to determine their effect on the basic model’s power to predict the differentiation of self-scores. Some of these factors related to the nature and extent of adolescents’ socialization with the receiving culture (i.e. whether or not they had friends outside of their cultural group; and what kind and how often they associated with selected community organizations, some of which were ethnic group affiliated and some of which were receiving culture affiliated).
In addition, adolescents’ use of Spanish and English languages with family and with their friends was examined. Language use was correlated with student ethnic identification scores. The language patterns that correlated significantly with ethnic identification scores were used within a regression model to examine their power to predict levels of ethnic identity as represented by the MEIM scores.

Using central tendency measures, groups were created according to country of origin to observe the differences among groups related to their differentiation of self-levels and ethnic identity scores. Only the two countries that were most represented were categorized separately. As expected, the new country groups were Mexicans, Colombians, and other countries. Therefore, using a t–test analysis to observe the differences between groups, two country-of-origin groups were analyzed relative to parents’ and adolescents’ MEIM and SDI scores. Finally, from the list of Latino cultural characteristics that were most liked by adolescents and parents, and using the ones that were most often repeated, dummy variables were created. Each of these variables was correlated with parents’ and adolescents’ MEIM scores. This procedure helped the researcher understand which Hispanic cultural characteristics were most valued by adolescents who identified the most with their Latino ethnicity and which characteristics had a significant association statistically with adolescents’ ethnic identification scores.

**Methodological limitations to the study**

One of the potential problems related to the validity of the study was the anticipated lack of diversity that might be represented in the three schools surveyed. Census data indicated that the majority of Hispanics living in the Upstate of South
Carolina, including Greenville County, were from Mexico. Thus, the researcher understood that the study may have to be qualified to address only characteristics present in one Latino national group and may not be characteristic of other national groups from Latino nations.

Before 2000, the national origin of the Latino population of South Carolina was 56.6% Mexican descendant, 12.8% Puerto Ricans, 3.0% Cubans, 0.8% Dominicans, 6.1% other Central American nations, 5.2% from South American nations, and 16.5% identified as Latinos from other national origins. Hence, it was anticipated that the collected data may not allow for comparison between a great number of Latino groups from different national origins. In fact, the sample was predominately Mexican by country of origin. Therefore, for between group comparisons, only two categories were created: 1) Mexicans and 2) Latinos from other countries of origin.

Another possible threat to the study’s validity was the possible confusion that Hispanic adolescents or their parents may have had in responding to the survey because of their lack of exposure to testing formats. The SDI was organized as a Likert scale with numerical values. In order to address this issue, a definition was assigned to each number to assist respondents in knowing what a number meant.

There were also threats posed by sampling bias, considering that Hispanics had shown low levels of response and participation in this type of research, and the fear that undocumented Hispanic had in filling out any information that may make them feel threatened. It was anticipated that more Hispanics who had a trusted relationship with the researcher and/or participating teachers would be more likely to participate in the study and complete the survey. However, this may have caused a sampling bias and
therefore the results may be characteristic of Hispanic parents and adolescents with greater trust in receiving culture leaders.

Add the limitation posed by convenience sampling—the sample is not representative of Hispanics living in the area.

**Summary**

Chapter Three reviewed the research design, procedures and analysis plan used to examine parents’ and adolescents’ self-differentiation and ethnic identity in Greenville County, South Carolina. Sample and sample size calculation techniques were discussed. The procedure for school, teacher, parent, and adolescent student recruitment were identified. Data collection and consent procedures were discussed. Confidentiality issues were explained. The primary analyses plan was based on the use of regression analysis, complimented with descriptive, bivariate, and multivariate analysis. The basic conceptual model tested was the strength of parents’ self-differentiation and ethnic identity scores, and adolescents’ ethnic identity scores in predicting Hispanic adolescents’ self-differentiation scores. Using this basic regression model, additional socio-cultural variables were added to determine if they contributed to the strength of prediction. Major data analysis procedures were described. Finally, the methodological limitations of the study were discussed. Chapter Four presents the study’s major findings.
CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

This chapter reviews the results of data analysis. A series of regression analysis was performed to test the hypotheses and address the central research questions. After presenting a basic profile of the adolescents and parents that participated in the study, bivariate analyses were carried out on all key variables to determine the significance of the relationship between MEIM and SDI scores for both parents and adolescents, and the relationship that existed between parent MEIM and adolescent MEIM scores, and between parent SDI and adolescent SDI scores. In addition, the correlations between parent MEIM scores and adolescent SDI scores were reported. Using a multi-level regression analysis procedure, the actor and partner effects of MEIM on SDI were examined for both parents and adolescents. A linear regression was done to determine selected variables’ ability to predict the adolescents’ SDI score. Finally, a regression analysis was carried out to determine which adolescent SDI subscale scores had the most power to predict adolescents’ total SDI score.

Hypotheses are reported as the findings were identified, and either accepted or rejected. A summary of hypothesis acceptance or rejection is provided at the end of Chapter Four.

Respondents’ profile

A total of 98 Hispanic adolescents from 3 high schools from South Carolina participated in this study. A total of 98 Hispanic parents completed their surveys and returned them through their teen to the school and were collected by the researcher.
A total of 90 adolescents completed the questions dealing with age and gender. There were 33 male and 57 female adolescents that participated in this study (Table 4.1). The mean age of the adolescents was 15.88 SD 1.36, and the mode was 16. The youngest participant was 13 years old and the oldest was 18 years of age. The majority of the adolescent participants were females (58.2%) and the mean age for female adolescent participants was 15.82 SD 1.19, and for males 15.93 SD 1.57.

### Table 4.1. Family Members’ Age and Respondents’ Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Respondent’s Father’s Age</th>
<th>Respondents’ Mother’s Age</th>
<th>Respondents’ Oldest Sibling’s Age</th>
<th>Respondent’s Second Oldest Sibling’s Age</th>
<th>Respondent’s age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>45.17</td>
<td>40.89</td>
<td>18.32</td>
<td>16.05</td>
<td>15.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants’ fathers’ mean age was 45 years old. At 40.89 years of age, participants’ mothers tended to be younger than participants’ fathers. This difference was significant ($t (73) = -6.97, p < .001$). Adolescent respondents’ oldest siblings’ ages varied between a minimum age of 2 and a maximum of 35 years old. The majority of older siblings were males. For the next oldest siblings, the mean age was 16.05 years old. Most of the adolescent participants occupied the second position in number of children in their household.

Adolescent participants or their parents were born in twelve different countries (Table 4.2). The majority of adolescent participants were born in Mexico (39.6%). Participants’ fathers and mothers were mainly born in Mexico, accounting for 51.1% and 48.4% of the sample of fathers and mothers respectively. Thirty five percent (35.4%) of adolescent participants were born in the United States, the second most represented
group. However, only 5.3% of participants’ fathers and 3.2% of participants’ mothers were born in the United States. Colombia was the third most represented country in the study sample with 6.3% of the adolescent participants being born in Colombia, while 8.5% of the participants’ fathers and 8.4% of the participants’ mothers were born in Colombia.

Table 4.2. Adolescents’ and Parents’ Birthplaces by Country of Origin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Birthplace</th>
<th>Adolescent Respondents’ Birthplace</th>
<th>Respondents’ Fathers’ Birthplace</th>
<th>Respondents’ Mothers’ Birthplace</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>34 (35.4%)</td>
<td>5 (5.3%)</td>
<td>3 (3.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>38 (39.6%)</td>
<td>48 (51.1%)</td>
<td>46 (48.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>2 (2.1%)</td>
<td>3 (3.2%)</td>
<td>5 (5.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>2 (2.1%)</td>
<td>2 (2.1%)</td>
<td>2 (2.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>1 (1.0%)</td>
<td>5 (5.3%)</td>
<td>5 (5.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>6 (6.3%)</td>
<td>8 (8.5%)</td>
<td>8 (8.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>5 (5.2%)</td>
<td>7 (7.4%)</td>
<td>7 (7.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>2 (2.1%)</td>
<td>5 (5.3%)</td>
<td>5 (5.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>3 (3.1%)</td>
<td>2 (2.1%)</td>
<td>3 (3.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>2 (2.1%)</td>
<td>1 (1.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>2 (2.1%)</td>
<td>7 (7.4%)</td>
<td>9 (9.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (1.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To reduce the number of countries represented in the sample for further analyses, a variable was created, Parents’ Birthplace, using the participants’ fathers’ and mothers’ country of birth (Table 4.3). Adolescent participants whose mother and father were born in the same country were categorized as being from that country of origin, while participants whose parents were born in two different countries were classified as belonging to mixed birthplace families. In the following analyses, the Parents’ Birthplace variable was created with the most represented birthplace countries being managed.
separately, while the countries that were least represented were clustered into a category called “other birthplace countries” (i.e. parents whose place of birth was the United States, El Salvador, Ecuador, Puerto Rico, Guatemala, Costa Rica, and Peru were grouped together). The new variable was comprised of seven groups. Only two participants had both their mother and father born in the United States. However, they still identified themselves as Hispanic which means that these two participants were third generation immigrants who still had some identification and connection with their family’s culture of origin.

**Table 4.3. Parents’ Birthplace**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Birthplace</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed birthplace marriages</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other birthplace countries</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4 presents the use of languages by adolescent respondents when speaking with friends or when speaking with family members. The majority of the respondents (78.9%) reported speaking in English when interacting with their friends. However, when speaking with other members of their family, most of the respondents (71.9%) spoke in Spanish. Males reported using English with their friends more than females: 93.9% of the males respondents reported speaking English with their friends, while only 70.21% of the females reported speaking in English with their friends. There was a significant
difference in male and female adolescents’ use of the English language with friends ($\chi^2 (1) = 7.087, p = .008$). Furthermore, the use of English when speaking to family members was also greater for males (38.2%) than for female participants (22.8%), although there was no significant difference found in male and female respondents’ use of English with family members ($\chi^2 (1) = 2.484, p = .115$).

**Table 4.4. Adolescent Respondents’ Language Use Preferences**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>With Friends</th>
<th>With Family Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male Respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>31 (93.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>2 (6.1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Socialization with Hispanics and non-Hispanic friends was very similar in the males and females adolescent respondents’ answers (Table 4.5). Sixteen percent (16.1%) of respondents never socialized with non-Hispanic friends, while only 7.3% never socialized with Hispanic friends. The majority of the adolescent respondents socialized with both Hispanics and non-Hispanic friends on a weekly basis, 39.6% and 40.9% respectively. Correlations showed no significant differences between male and female adolescents in their patterns of socializing, socializing with Hispanic friends ($p = .168$), and socializing with no Hispanic friends ($p = .059$).
Table 4.5. Adolescent Respondents’ Frequency in Socializing with Hispanic and Non-Hispanic Friends

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Socialization with Hispanic Friends</th>
<th>Socialization With Non-Hispanic Friends</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>7 (7.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15 (16.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or three times a month</td>
<td>23 (24.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16 (17.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a week</td>
<td>38 (39.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38 (40.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>28 (29.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24 (25.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.6 presents the nature and frequency of adolescent respondents’ participation in school and community organizations. Participation in any type of organized group or club was very low in this sample. The most common group in which adolescents reported participating was school study groups. Sports group participation was the only activity in which differences were observed between males and females in their patterns of socialization. Males tended to participate more in sports clubs than females.

Table 4.6. Nature and Frequency of Adolescent Respondents’ Community Organization Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Sometimes during the year</th>
<th>Once or twice a month</th>
<th>Once a week or more</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School study groups</td>
<td>44 (44.9%)</td>
<td>27 (27.6%)</td>
<td>14 (14.3%)</td>
<td>9 (9.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community centers</td>
<td>65 (66.3%)</td>
<td>17 (17.3%)</td>
<td>7 (7.1%)</td>
<td>3 (3.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School special interest groups</td>
<td>55 (56.1%)</td>
<td>11 (11.2%)</td>
<td>7 (7.1%)</td>
<td>15 (15.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic oriented clubs</td>
<td>65 (66.3%)</td>
<td>12 (12.2%)</td>
<td>8 (8.2%)</td>
<td>9 (9.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic oriented clubs</td>
<td>51 (52.0%)</td>
<td>18 (18.4%)</td>
<td>2 (2.0%)</td>
<td>23 (23.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport groups</td>
<td>70 (71.4%)</td>
<td>11 (11.2%)</td>
<td>2 (2.0%)</td>
<td>19 (10.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic church groups</td>
<td>63 (64.3%)</td>
<td>9 (9.2%)</td>
<td>1 (1.0%)</td>
<td>20.4 (20.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic church groups</td>
<td>63 (64.3%)</td>
<td>9 (9.2%)</td>
<td>2 (2.0%)</td>
<td>19 (19.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**SDI and MEIM Scales’ reliability and validity**

The Differentiation of Self Inventory proved to have a relatively high consistency in the reliability test for parent participants ($\alpha = .89$) and in the case of adolescents ($\alpha = .89$). Similar Cronbach’s alphas were obtained in the SDI on its original validation by Skowron and Friendlander in 1998 ($\alpha = .88$) and by Skowron (2004) with a sample of African-American adolescents in her study on differentiation of self, personal adjustment, problem solving and ethnic group belonging among persons of color ($\alpha = 89$).

Cronbach’s alphas for the adolescents’ multi-group ethnic identification measure was $\alpha = .86$ and for parents’ MEIM $\alpha = .85$. Skowron (2004) found a similar Cronbach’ alpha to this study in her sample of high school students ($\alpha = .81$).

**Bivariate, multivariate, & regression analyses**

**Bivariate and multivariate analysis**

Correlations were calculated on the core variables related to the hypotheses of this study (i.e. adolescents’ differentiation of self and ethnic identity scores, and the parents’ differentiation of self and ethnic identity scores). The following tables present the correlations between parents’ and adolescents’ ethnic identity and differentiation of self scores. In addition, tables are included that summarize the correlations of adolescents’ multi-group ethnic identification and differentiation of self scores, and their associations with some of the socio-cultural variables hypothesized to increase the power of predicting adolescents’ differentiation of self.

To observe the significance of the relationships between adolescent ethnic identification scores and each of the four differentiations of self subscales, bivariate correlation analyses were conducted and a matrix was produced (Table 4.7). The
adolescents’ MEIM scores (measuring the level of multi-group ethnic identification) correlated significantly with adolescents’ emotional reactivity ($r = -0.29, p = .005$) and emotional cut off ($r = -0.21, p = .039$) differentiation of self subscale scores. The negative direction implies that adolescents who scored higher on the emotional reactivity and emotional cut off subscales had lower multi-group ethnic identification scores. Correlations between adolescents’ fusion with others scores and their taking an “I” position subscale scores did not correlate significantly with their multi-group ethnic identification scores.

Correlations were also calculated to examine adolescents’ mean scores on the SDI. A total score and scores for each of the subscales were calculated. Table 4.8 presents the summary scores. Skowron’s and Fiendlander’s (1998) SDI scale was used in this study. In order to interpret the data, the scores produced were translated into Bowen’s (1978) 100 point scale. This was done by creating a new variable in which each of SDI value was multiplied by 100 and divided by six.
Table 4.8 presents the scores obtained using Skowron’s and Fiendlander’s (1998) SDI scale. Both subscale and total scores are presented. As the reader may recall, Bowen (1998) said that the individual differentiation of self can be understood using a scale from 0-100. Zero being the lowest point of the scale and meaning a total dependency on others, and 100 being the maximum score which according to Bowen was a hypothetical score, because nobody reaches such independence from others. The score is divided from 0 to 25, for low differentiated individuals, 25 to 50, to mid-low differentiated individuals, 50 to 75 to mid- high differentiated individuals and finally from 75 to 100 for highly differentiated individuals.

Table 4.8. Adolescents’ Mean Differentiation of Self Scale Scores and Sub-Scales Scores Associated with Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>Males</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Reactivity</td>
<td>57.40</td>
<td>53.32</td>
<td>34.85</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>78.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I” position</td>
<td>68.98</td>
<td>70.18</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>46.97</td>
<td>86.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional cut off</td>
<td>62.22</td>
<td>63.16</td>
<td>31.82</td>
<td>31.94</td>
<td>91.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fusion with others</td>
<td>51.81</td>
<td>50.17</td>
<td>25.93</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>70.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiation of self</td>
<td>60.10</td>
<td>59.21</td>
<td>46.08</td>
<td>43.24</td>
<td>75.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in Bowen’s scale</td>
<td></td>
<td>(7.97)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was little difference between adolescent male and female differentiation of self mean scores. When the subscale scores were added together, the male adolescents’ mean score was a little higher ($M = 60.10, SD = 7.61$) than the females ($M = 59.21, SD = 7.97$), but this difference was not statistically significant ($t(89) = 0.527, p = .599$).

When examining the differences among male and female respondents on the subscales, females had a little higher score in taking an “I” position ($M = 4.21, SD = 0.71$) compared to males ($M = 4.1, SD = 0.70$), although this difference was not statistically significant ($t(89) = -0.470, p = .639$). Skowron and Fiendlander (1998) found that
emotional reactivity for females was significantly higher than for males in their study. A reverse of this pattern was found in this sample (females: $M = 3.20, SD = 0.84$; males: $M = 3.44, SD = 0.79$). Males scored higher on emotional reactivity than did females although there was no significant difference found between male and female scores ($t (89) = 1.377, p = .172$).

Using the created variable, Parents’ Birthplace, a one-way fixed effects ANOVA analysis was carried out to observe if there were any differences between the adolescents’ differentiation of self scores by parents’ place of birth (Table 4.9). The mean differences in adolescents’ differentiation of self scores across parents’ place of birth was not considerable, and not statistically significant ($F(5, 92) = 1.646, p = .143$). As it can be observed in Table 4.9, no significant between group differences were obtained.

**Table 4.9. One-way Fixed Effects ANOVA on Adolescents’ SDI Scores and Parents’ Place of Birth**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>570.601</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>95.100</td>
<td>1.646</td>
<td>.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>5257.027</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>57.770</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5827.629</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using the created variable, Parents’ Birthplace, a one-way fixed effects ANOVA analyses also was performed associating adolescents’ total score on the MEIM with the created variable Parents’ Birthplace. Table 4.10 presents the results. Just as with SDI, there were no significant differences in multi-group ethnic identification scores across Parents’ Birthplace ($F(5, 89) = 1.322, p = .256$).
Table 4.10. One-way Fixed Effects ANOVA on Adolescents’ Multi-Group Ethnic Identification Score and Parents’ Birthplace

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1.961</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.327</td>
<td>1.322</td>
<td>.256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>21.765</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>.247</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23.726</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next, a series of correlations explored the relationship between adolescents’ and parents’ SDI and MEIM scores. These are reported below and summarized in Table 4.11. Adolescents’ multi-group ethnic identification scores were significantly correlated with adolescents’ SDI scores ($r = -.205, p = .046$). The direction of the correlation was negative. As adolescents’ multi-group ethnic identification scores increased, the adolescents’ differentiation of self scores decreased. Thus, Hypotheses 1 that adolescents’ levels of multi-group ethnic identification are associated significantly with adolescents’ differentiation of self was accepted.

Table 4.11. Parents’ and Adolescents’ SDI and MEIM Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
<th>4.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adolescent SDI</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adolescent MEIM</td>
<td>-.205*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent SDI</td>
<td>.427**</td>
<td>-.345**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent MEIM</td>
<td>-.120*</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>-.174</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = <.05  ** = <.01

Parents’ multi-group identification scores were not significantly correlated with parents’ differentiation of self scores ($r = -.174, p = .106$). Thus, Hypotheses 2 that
parents’ multi-group ethnic identification scores were not significantly associated with the parents’ differentiation of self scores was accepted.

Parents’ self-differentiation scores were significantly correlated with adolescents’ self-differentiation scores ($r = .427, p < .001$). This finding is similar to what was expected from the literature review when Bowen (DATE) proposed that children’s’ differentiation of self is highly influenced by the parents’ differentiation of self. Thus, Hypothesis 3 was accepted: Parents’ level of differentiation of self scores significantly associated with adolescents’ differentiation of self scores.

Parents’ multi-group ethnic identification scores and adolescents’ ethnic identification scores were not significantly correlated ($r = .129, p = .238$). Thus, Hypothesis 4 that parents’ multi-group ethnic identifications scores are significantly associated with adolescents MEIM scores was rejected.

Parents’ multi-group ethnic identification scores were highly correlated with adolescents’ self-differentiation scores ($r = -.345, p = .001$). The direction of the correlation was negative. As parents’ multi-group ethnic identification scores increased, the adolescents’ differentiation of self decreased. Thus, Hypothesis 5 that parents’ multi-group ethnic identification scores will affect the children differentiation of self was accepted.

**Multi-level regression analysis**

To control for the non-independence between parents’ and adolescents’ differentiation of self scores, as conceptualized in the research literature and presented in Chapter Two, a multi-level regression model studied the actor effects and partner effects of multi-group ethnic identification scores on self-differentiation scores. The model used a regression analysis that permitted the observation of the random effect of SDI scores.
across dyads or families in this case. The model was estimated by creating a new
database in which each of the cases were duplicated making each participant an actor and
a partner, which allowed for multi-level models of the actor and partner effects. Hence
for this analysis, the adolescents’ SDI scores were analyzed in relationship to the
adolescents’ MEIM and parents MEIM scores, and the parents’ SDI scores were analyzed
in relation to the adolescents’ MEIM and parents’ MEIM scores.

Figure 4.1 presents the multi-level regression model used to explore the effects of
parent and adolescent multi-group ethnic identification scores on parent and adolescent
differentiation scores. In this model the parents’ and adolescents’ error variance is
allowed to correlate. This allows for the fact that adolescents SDI scores may be more
similar to their parent’s SDI scores than to other parents. Thus, this correlation is the
partial intra-class correlation of SDI.

**Figure 4.1. The parents’ and adolescents’ interdependence regression model**

![Diagram](attachment:diagram.png)

Actor effects are found when, for example, parents’ MEIM scores significantly
predict the parents’ SDI scores, or when adolescents’ MEIM scores significantly predict
adolescents’ SDI scores. These two actor effects were tested. Parents’ and adolescents’
self-differentiation scores had a significant intra-class correlation, \( ICC = .371, p < .001 \).
That is, as was seen before each adolescent’s SDI score was similar to their parent’s SDI score (Table 4.12).

Hypothesis 7 stated that for each group (parent or adolescent), the direction of the relationship between their MEIM scores and their SDI would be the same (actor effect). It will be a positive relationship. When MEIM scores are higher SDI scores will be higher and there will be no difference in this relationship between the two groups. Contrary to Hypothesis 7, there was differences between parents and adolescents in how much their own ethnic identification effected their self-differentiation (actor effect) \( (b = .006, t = 0.070, p = .945) \). The actor effect was negative—the more one was identified with their culture, the less they were self-differentiated, \( b = -.164, t =-2.045, p = .043 \). The actor effect was negative. The more one was identified with their culture, the less they were self-differentiated, \( (b = -.164, t =-2.045, p = .043) \). The correlation noted in the previous section suggested that while the MEIM/SDI correlational pattern for parents was not significant \( (r = -.174, p = .106) \), it was significant \( (r = -.205, p = .046) \) for the adolescent group, but the current analysis suggested that these correlations might not be significantly different between groups.

The difference between the parents’ SDI mean scores was greater than adolescents’ mean SDI scores, but this difference did not reach statistical significance, \( (b = .403, t = 1.438, p = .154) \).
Partner effects are when one group’s (e.g. parents) scores on the independent variable predict another group’s (e.g. adolescents) scores on the dependent variable. For example, parents’ multi-group ethnic identification scores may have a noted statistical relationship with the adolescents’ self-differentiation scores. Using multi-level regression modeling, two partner effects were estimated: 1) the effect that parents’ MEIM scores had on adolescents’ SDI scores and 2) the effect that parents’ SDI scores had on adolescents’ MEIM scores.

The test revealed that there was a significant effect of the adolescent group’s MEIM scores on the parent group’s SDI scores (Table 4.12). This was a negative relationship. The more adolescent group’s MEIM scores were higher, the lower the parent group’s SDI scores were (b = -.375, t = -3.045, p = .003). Therefore, Hypotheses 8 that there is a significant relationship between the parents’ SDI scores and the adolescent’s MEIM scores was accepted.

The effect of the parent’s MEIM on the adolescent’s SDI was not significant, b = -0.094, t = -0.868, p = .388. Additionally, there was no difference in the partner effects between parents and adolescents (b = -.141, t = -1.672, p = .097). The partner effect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>5.243169</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>9.901</td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>4.840242</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>11.740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adolescent</td>
<td>4.437316</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>9.534</td>
<td>Mean difference</td>
<td>4.02926</td>
<td>.154</td>
<td>1.438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent’s actor effect</td>
<td>-1.58172</td>
<td>.204</td>
<td>-1.280</td>
<td>Overall actor effect</td>
<td>-1.64033</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>-2.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adolescents’ actor effect</td>
<td>-1.69893</td>
<td>.121</td>
<td>-1.568</td>
<td>Overall partner effect</td>
<td>-2.34865</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>-2.929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents’ partner effect</td>
<td>-3.75408</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>-3.045</td>
<td>Difference in actor effects</td>
<td>.005860</td>
<td>.945</td>
<td>.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adolescents’ partner effect</td>
<td>-0.94323</td>
<td>.388</td>
<td>-0.868</td>
<td>Difference in partner effects</td>
<td>-1.40543</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>-1.672</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
averaged across parents and adolescents was negative. That is, the more the partner was self-differentiated, the less the actor was identified with their culture \((b = -0.235, t = -2.929, p = .004)\).

For both the parent group and the adolescent group, the direction of the relationship between their MEIM and SDI scores followed the same statistical correlational pattern (i.e. higher MEIM scores were related to lower SDI scores). Therefore, Hypotheses 9 was accepted: There will be a significant intra-class relationship between the parents’ MEIM scores and adolescents’ SDI score. For this model, the \(R^2\) for parents was .106, and the \(R^2\) for adolescents was .019, indicating that the predictive power of the model was fairly weak, while significant.

**Linear regression analyses**

Next, selected factors were analyzed for their power to predict adolescents’ self-differentiation scores. The dependent variable in the first linear regression analysis was adolescents’ self-differentiation scores. The independent variables included were 1) adolescents’ MIEM scores; 2) how often adolescents did something with Hispanic friends; and 3) with church groups. The model explained 27% of the variance in adolescents’ differentiation of self scores \((R^2 = .278)\). The overall model was significant, \((F(4,86) = 8.27, p < .001)\). Tables 4.14 and 4.15 present the model summary and ANOVA on the linear regression analysis.

**Table 4.14. Model Summary of Linear Regression Analyzing Adolescents’ Differentiation of Self With Selected Predictive Factors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>(R)</th>
<th>(R^2)</th>
<th>Adjusted (R^2)</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.527*</td>
<td>.278</td>
<td>.244</td>
<td>.40697</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: * Model 1 included adolescents’ MIEM scores, how often adolescents did something with Hispanic friends, and with church groups.
Table 4.15. ANOVA on Linear Regression of Adolescents’ Self-differentiation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>5.481</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.370</td>
<td>8.273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>14.244</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19.725</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.16 presents the coefficients for each of the variables in the model. Not all the variables were significant contributors of the model. However, they contributed to the overall $R^2$ of the model. Adolescents’ differentiation of self scores were explained best by including in the model the parents’ differentiation of self score ($b = 0.296, t = 3.610, p = .001$), and the frequency of church group participation (negative relationship) ($b = -0.073, t = -3.066, p = .003$). Both of these factors had significant predictive ability, but the parents’ SDI scores explained more of the differences ($b = .356$) than did frequency of affiliation with church groups ($b = -287$). The direction of the frequency of church group attendance was significant and a negative relationship. As self-differentiation scores increased, affiliation with church groups decreased.

Thus, Hypotheses 10 that four factors --Adolescent MEIM scores, combined with some social aspects of adolescence and parents’ SDI scores --will have the power to predict adolescent SDI was accepted.

Table 4.16. Coefficients For Adolescents’ Self-differentiation With 4 Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>2.867</td>
<td>.506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adolescents’ MEIM</td>
<td>-.119</td>
<td>.094</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How often do you do something socially with your Hispanic friends

Church groups
Parents’
Differentiation of Self

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>.070</th>
<th>.045</th>
<th>.143</th>
<th>1.544</th>
<th>.126</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.073</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>-.287</td>
<td>-3.066</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.296</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>.356</td>
<td>3.610</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In further analysis, the subscales comprising the SDI score were examined. Another linear regression analysis was carried out to explore the effect each SDI subscale score had relative to predicting the other SDI subscales score. The same variables were included in this model as in the previous linear regression analysis: 1) adolescents’ MIEM scores; 2) how often adolescents did something with Hispanic friends; and 3) with church groups. In this analysis, the dependent variable was changed four times so that each of the SDI subscales became the dependent variable and the others became independent variables (Table 4.17).

**Table 4.17. The Predictive Power of Each Adolescent Self-differentiation Subscale To Predict The Other SDI Subscale Scores**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SER</td>
<td>.193</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEC</td>
<td>.320</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFO</td>
<td>.176</td>
<td>.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIP</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>.073</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When emotional reactivity subscale scores were used as the dependent variable, this subscale had the ability to predict 19% of the variance ($R^2 = .193$) in the other three subscales and was significant at the 0.01 level, $F(4) = 5.14, p = .001$. The model was not significant when the dependent variable used was the ability to take an “I” position, $F(4) = 2.21, p = .073$. When the fusion with others subscale was used as the dependent variable, the model was significant, $F(4) = 4.587, p=.022$). Fusion with others scores
predicted 17% of the variance ($R^2 = .176$) in the other subscale scores. Finally, using emotional cut off as the dependent variable, the model was significant at the 0.001 level, $F(4) = 10.095$, $p = ,$ and explained 32% of the variance $R^2 = .320$. Therefore, the SDI Emotional cut off subscale had the greatest power to predict the other scores in the Self-differentiation Inventory.

In conclusion, through a variety of analyses, all the hypotheses were tested. Table 4.18 presents a summary of which hypotheses were accepted and rejected.

**Table 4.18. Summary of Acceptance and Rejection of Hypotheses**

| H1 | Parents birth place is not significantly correlated with their teen’s MEIM scores. Accepted |
| H2 | Adolescents’ levels of ethnic identity are significantly with Accepted adolescents’ differentiation of self. |
| H3 | Parents’ multi-group ethnic identification scores are significantly associated with the parents’ differentiation of self scores. Rejected |
| H4 | Parents’ level of differentiation of self scores significantly associated with adolescents’ differentiation of self scores. Accepted |
| H5 | Parents’ and adolescents’ multi-group ethnic identification scores are significantly associated with one another. Rejected |
| H6 | Parents’ multi-group ethnic identification scores will significantly associate with adolescents’ self-differentiation scores. Rejected |
| H7 | Parents’ self-differentiation scores are significantly and positively related to adolescents’ multi-group ethnic identification scores. Rejected |
| H8 | Within each group (parent or adolescent group), multi-group ethnic identification scores will have the same effect on their self-differentiation scores. If parents multi-group ethnic identification scores had a positive relationship on parents self-differentiation scores, the same relationships will be found in adolescents (intra-class relationship). Rejected |
| H9 | There is a significant intra-class relationship between the parent’s self-differentiation scores and the adolescent group’s multi-group ethnic Accepted |
identification scores.

H10 There is a significant intra-class relationship between the parents’ multi-group ethnic identification scores and the adolescents’ self-differentiation scores.

H11 Adolescent self-differentiation scores will be partially predicted by adolescent multi-group ethnic identification scores, parent self-differentiation scores and some of the factors associated with adolescents’ patterns of socialization such as: group participation, student clubs attendances, church attendances, etc.

H12 Given the relation of the subscales that comprise the self-differentiation inventory scores, each subscale will partially predict at some level each of the other sub-scales that compose the overall SDI score.

Summary

In Chapter Four the study results were presented. Following presentation of a basic profile of the adolescents and parents that participated in the study, bivariate analyses were carried out on all key variables to determine the significance of the relationship between MEIM and SDI scores for both parents and adolescents, and the relationship that existed between parent MEIM and adolescent MEIM scores, and between parent SDI and adolescent SDI scores. In addition, the correlations between parent MEIM scores and adolescent SDI scores were reported. Using a multi-level regression analysis procedure, the intra-class actor and partner effects were examined. A linear regression was done to determine selected variables ability to predict the adolescents’ SDI scores. Finally, a regression analysis was done to determine which adolescent SDI subscale scores had the most power to predict the other SDI subscales scores. Chapter Four ended by presenting a summary of hypotheses that were accepted and rejected based on the analysis conducted.

Chapter Five discusses the findings.
CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to examine the strength of Hispanic adolescents’ level of ethnic identity and their parents’ level of self-differentiation and ethnic identity in predicting second generation Hispanic adolescents’ level of self-differentiation. One hundred and two (102) Hispanic adolescents ages 13 to 18 and their parents were surveyed in 2010. The adolescent research participants attended one of three high schools in Greenville County, South Carolina. Bowen’s (1978) self-differentiation theory and Phinney’s (1993) multi-group ethnic identification theory provided the theoretical framework for the study’s directions and analysis plan.

This chapter presents a discussion of the findings followed by the limitations of the current study, and the implications of the study in light of self-differentiation and multi-group ethnic identification theoretical advancements. This chapter concludes with the implications for practice and training in addition to offering a few suggestions for future research.

Discussion of findings

The prediction of differentiation of self from ethnic identification scores

This study’s primary focus was on the differentiation of self of adolescent Hispanic immigrants. Only a limited number of previous studies could be found that focused on Hispanic differentiation of self (McCoullough, 2005, Skowron, 2004, Rumbaut, 2001, Phinney, 1993, 1996, 2004). In addition, only a few studies could be found that associated the concept of differentiation of self with Hispanic ethnic identity.
(Phinney, 2004, Skowron, 2004, Skowron & Fiendlander, 2004). Due to the increase of the Hispanic population in the United States and the use of the internet which more adequately maintains connections across cultures, the dynamics of immigrants’ assimilation into a host society have changed. Hispanic adolescents in the U.S. grow up between two somewhat autonomous cultural groups (Holcomb-McCoy 2005). Metaphorically speaking, they are wrapped in a membrane that separates them from the American community. Even when they are exposed to the culture of other ethnic groups, there is a fine line of separation that distinguishes these immigrant teens from the broader society (Chavez & Guido-DiBrito, 1999).

The dual context in which these adolescents grow up makes their ethnic identity development, as well as the implication of such identification for others aspects of their psychological development, an interesting field of study (Holcomb-McCoy 2005). Building an identity in a dual cultural context is not a matter of giving up one’s culture and replacing it with another. In addition, this identity-building process is different for each individual. Many factors affect identity formation, such as an individual’s family life, their context, their educational level, the stereotypes associated locally with their ethnicity, other ethnic groups’ interfere in the development of a self-identity, and the individual’s perception of his or her place in the world in relation to others (Chavez & Guido-DiBrito 1999). Yet, having a strong ethnic identity allows individuals to make sense of the world and find pride in “who” he or she is. A well-developed ethnic identity provides the structure in which the individual negotiates with his or her own culture and with the culture of others (Chavez & Guido-DiBrito 1999). Hence the individual’s development of ethnic identity is central to developing healthy relationships with people
with whom they interact (Skowron, 2004). The nature of ethnic identity in Latino adolescents and their parents is a central factor examined in this study.

This study associated Bowen’s (1978) concept of differentiation of self, using Skowron’s and Fiendlander’s (1998) self-differentiation inventory (SDI) to the ethnic identification of immigrant adolescents using the Multi-group Ethnic Identification Measure (MEIM) designed by Phinney (1992). The nature of a person’s self-differentiation also affects the relationships that he/she establishes. The level of differentiation of self achieved determines the individual’s capacity to maintain an objective perspective of the world and the people surrounding him or her (Ibáñez et al., 2010).

Parents’ levels of multi-group ethnic identification did not correlate significantly with their levels of self-differentiation. This result was not unexpected. Participating parents may have been more acculturated and had higher levels of self-differentiation than may be the case in the larger population of Hispanic immigrants in Greenville County. However, adolescents’ levels of multi-group ethnic identification and self-differentiation were significantly correlated but with a negative effect. For this population, the less the adolescents identified with his or her culture of origin, the more likely they were to have a better level of self-differentiation.

Two of the Self-differentiation Inventory subscales significantly correlated with the adolescents’ multi-group ethnic identification scores. There were significant associations between the Emotional Reactivity and Emotional Cut Off subscale scores and their multi-group ethnic identification measures total score. No significant relationship was found for the other two Self-differentiation Inventory sub-scales, the Taking an “I” position and Fusion with Others sub-scales, and adolescents’ multi-group
ethnic identification scores. Thus, it was established that there was some significant associations between the levels of multi-group ethnic identification that adolescents said they had and some aspects of the nature and extent of their self-differentiation.

Both the findings of this study and those reported by Phinney (2005) indicated that there was a significant statistical relationship between the nature and levels of self-differentiation of second generation immigrant adolescents and their levels of multi-group ethnic identification. One challenge for future research is to determine what factors affect the direction that these relationships take and their effects on second generation immigrant adolescents’ lives. Exploring further why two of the self-differentiation inventory sub-scales had a significant correlation with levels of multi-group ethnic identification and two did not is also important to understand in order to clarify interpretation of findings.

For this particular population, higher levels of adolescents’ multi-group ethnic identification had a significant negative effect on their levels of self-differentiation. This finding was contrary to the findings of Phinney (1992), Skowron (2004), Cross 1978, and Ponterollo and Pederson, (1993). The negative relationship found between the levels of self-differentiation and the levels of multi-group ethnic identification for second generation Latino immigrant adolescents may be explained using acculturation theories (Berry, 2001; Idler, 2005; Brown, 1999). In Brown’s (1999) acculturation theory, it was postulated that the majority of immigrants go through four stages of adjustment as they acculturate into a new society’s cultural traditions. In the ‘Euphoria’ stage, the immigrant is said to be elated or infatuated by their new surroundings and new ways of thinking and behaving. In the ‘culture shock’ stage, the person becomes aware of the differences between his or her and the members of majority cultural ways of thinking and acting.
Disorientation and anger may characterize this stage. In another stage, ‘anomie’, some acculturation problems is resolved, while others prevail. During this stage, the individual may feel detached from his culture, but does not feel a part of the new culture either. Finally, the last stage of the acculturation process is ‘assimilation’ or ‘adaptation’, characterizing an acceptance of major aspects of the new culture, but also accepts that they are a unique blend of two or more cultures, and has determined what cultural traditions will be embraced (Brown, 1999). It is acknowledged that some individuals seem to skip some stages and some get stuck in a particular acculturation stage.

To link the stages of acculturation to the multi-group ethnic identification process, Kokurina’s (2006) vacillating acculturation theoretical model is useful because it accounts for a broader number of outcomes from the acculturation process. According to this model, one of the possible outcomes of the acculturation process is “de-attachment” (using Kokurina’s label) from one’s culture of origin without necessarily developing an attachment to the host culture. By doing so the individual creates a new and unique conception of self and his or her place in both cultural worlds (Kokurina, 2006). In Kokurina’s model, individuals and ethnic community groups follow similar acculturation stages. However, during the adaptation process to a new culture, the individual creates a new identity that expresses some of the value, beliefs, and behavioral rules found in both cultures. Thus, it would seem plausible that individuals choose to affiliate with various community groups, some that are ethnic-based and some that are host-culture dominated, and that these groups are chosen relative to the ‘fit’ they have with the evolving sense of self. If this is the case, then one would hypothesize that those with higher levels of self-differentiation have lower levels of multi-group ethnic identification.
Participants in this study can be in an acculturation stage where detaching themselves from their culture of origin can help the individual to better adapt to the host culture’s values, beliefs, and traditions. This behavior would be characteristic of Brown’s (1999) ‘anomie’ stage. The acculturation process is a social and individual process. The host culture’s social condition and situation in which the subordinated individual and immigrant community interact should be taken into consideration. In other words, findings of this study need to be contextualized within the social and cultural environment of the Latino adolescents and parents involved in this study.

When examining the demographic profile of South Carolina over the past fifty years, South Carolina does not have a long history of immigrant Hispanic settlement. In the past SC population has been predominately composed by Caucasians from Anglo Saxon origins or Blacks from African or Caribbean origins. These settlements were well established with historical roots covering centuries of settlement. The respondents may be mostly in Brown’s (1999) stage one of acculturation in which they may be infatuated with the host culture’s ways. If so this could also explain why their levels of multi-group ethnic identification had a negative association with their levels of self-differentiation.

Another explanation may be that when a new immigrant community has yet to have an established foothold in a recipient culture, it is counterproductive for its members to associate solely with ethnic-based groups. In addition, there may be fewer ethnic-based community groups available or those available might be dominated by one country of origin background (i.e. Latino but largely from Mexico or the Dominican Republic). It could be hypothesized that in new settlements, and smaller, more rural communities, there may be a need on the part if immigrants to more quickly reconcile cultural
differences in order to meet the demands of more closely knit cultural settings where people expect outsiders to conform to their traditions, or at least to not upset them.

The relationship between parents’ multi-group ethnic identification and adolescents’ multi-group ethnic identification was also studied. This study found no significant relationship between parent and adolescent multi-group ethnic identification. Analysis was done to determine if participation in various ethnic-based and other types of groups, the use of English and/or Spanish at home and with friends, and the activities that adolescents did with both Hispanic or American friends had some type of influence on participants’ development of a strong multi-group ethnic identification. No significant relationship existed for either parents or adolescents. In addition, the country of origin of the participants’ family members did not significantly correlate with either the adolescents’ self-differentiation scores or their multi-group ethnic identification scores. While Latinos’ cultures of origin are quite different, it appears that whatever happened when these individuals came to the U.S., the self-differentiation and multi-group ethnic identification processes were not necessary influenced by their family’s culture(s) of origin.

The associations between parent SDI and MEIM scores and adolescents SD

Actor and partner effects were explored to determine further the relationships that existed between adolescents and their parents.

Actor Effects. Relative to actor effects significant intra-class correlations were found. Each adolescent’s SDI score was similar to their parent’s SDI score. There were differences between parents and adolescents in how much their own ethnic identification affected their self-differentiation. In addition, the more one was identified with their culture (i.e. higher MEIM scores), the less they were self-differentiated (lower SDI
scores. There appeared to be no significant difference in the MEIM/SDI associational pattern for adolescents and parents. While parents’ SDI mean scores were greater than adolescents’ mean SDI scores, the difference was not significant.

**Partner effects.** Partner effects are when one group’s (e.g. parents) scores on an independent variable predict another group’s (e.g. adolescents) scores on a dependent variable. The test revealed that the higher adolescent group’s MEIM scores were, the lower the parent group’s SDI scores were. The effect of the parent’s MEIM on the adolescent’s SDI was not significant. Additionally, the more the partner (adolescent group and parent group) was self-differentiated, the less the actor identified with their culture.

For both the parent group and the adolescent group, the higher the MEIM scores, the lower the SDI scores. This finding theoretically did not support the prevailing theory of ethnic identity formation and its relationship to self-differentiation. Theoretically, the prevailing view is that affiliation with multiple ethnic groups increases the levels of self-differentiation (Skowron, 2004; McCullough, 2005; Phinney, 2005). More study is needed to determine whether the findings of this study can be replicated or whether they are peculiar to the convenience sample involved in this study.

**Study limitations**

This study had a number of limitations. First, the survey was administered to second generation Latino adolescents in Greenville County, South Carolina. In Greenville County, Hispanic immigration has a number of peculiarities that makes its immigrant communities different from other settings. The Latino immigrant population in South Carolina is a rather recent phenomenon. The results found may represent levels of self-differentiation and multi-group ethnic identification that immigrants have that are still in
early acculturation stages of adaptation. Their feelings and perceptions may differ from Hispanic individuals who live in longer established Hispanic immigrant communities elsewhere in the U.S., such as New York.

A second limitation was that a valid sample size was not achieved. The number of adolescents and parents who agreed to participate may have been affected by the presence of a very cautious Latino immigrant group in South Carolina because of current state laws regarding legal resident checks and the fairly large number of immigrants who still need to resolve their legal status in the United States. The state’s manufacturing, service, and agricultural industries brought in many Latinos during the 1980s and 1990s. There are still many unresolved legal resident status issues present. In addition, this researcher, while working in a Latino family center in Greenville County, found that participants were quite fearful about giving too much information about themselves to people they did not know, or lacked legal status, or did not want to give out information for fear they would be targeted in some way by local authorities. This study collected some personal information from participants. Hence there were difficulties in motivating people to participate. Only 86% of a reliable sample size was reached. Thus, these results may be more limited in application than is ordinarily found with a non-probability sample. Thus, the findings cannot be generalized.

Another limitation of this study was that the survey contained self-report measures. These measures have been used by other researchers, and validated with Hispanic populations and with individuals of the age group that was studied (Phinney, 1993; Skowron, 2004). However, there is always a risk with self-report instruments that the desire to present positively or to be perceived in a certain ways may interfere with the answers reported by participants. Thus, actual levels of self-differentiation and multi-
group ethnic identification for parents and adolescents may be different from what was reported.

Another limitation of this study was that the sample was a convenience sample of adolescents and parents who volunteered without any risks of participation and with little benefit to them. This study’s findings may represent Hispanic immigrants who are more trusting of the host culture and of those they do not know. The data may represent findings of a more culturally adjusted group of Latino parents and adolescents.

**Study implications**

Two major theoretical frameworks were used in this study: the Differentiation of Self theory (Bowen, 1978) and multi-group ethnic identification theory (Phinney, 1992). Hence, this study explored two aspects of psychological development and its relationship to the life of Latino immigrant adolescents, as well as parents’ current levels of self-differentiation and multi-group ethnic identification and how parents’ levels of both may affect adolescents’ level of self-differentiation. In the following two sections, a few of the implications of this study’s findings relative to theory development are presented.

**Implications for the differentiation of self theory**

In this study, a significant relationship between the adolescents’ multi-group ethnic identification and their levels of self-differentiation were found. A negative relationship was found. The lower the multi-group ethnic identification was, the higher were reported levels of self-differentiation. This is contrary to Phinney’s (1993, 1996, 2005) and Skowron’s findings (2004). These results provide an opportunity for future inquiries about the role of multi-group ethnic identification in the development of a differentiated self. In addition, the adolescents’ levels of multi-group ethnic
identification correlated significantly with two of the SDI’s subscales: Emotional cut off and Fusion with others. More inquiry is needed to determine whether these associations are present in a larger, valid sample of Latino adolescents and, if so, what about these two dimensions of self-differentiation influence or are influenced by adolescents’ ratings on the multi-group ethnic identification measure.

The differentiation of self theory is based on an individual’s balance of autonomy and connection. Learning to be autonomous and connected at the same time is a progressive interaction within the individual that evolves to achieve set goals. The process is part of psychological development and progresses throughout an individual’s life time. According to Bowen (1978), at the moment of birth the individual is at its lowest level of self-differentiation, but starts a progressive evolution thereafter.

The nature and level of one’s differentiation of self plays a major role in what happens when an individual faces stressful situations. Migration and the process of adapting to a new culture generate stress in individual and family life. Having a well differentiated self allows immigrant individuals to deal with acculturation stresses (Phinney, 2005; Bowen, 1989, Berry, 2001). Having a well differentiated self implies a balance of autonomy and connectedness that permits a healthy adaptation to a new culture (Skowron, 2004). Managing a healthy understanding of who one is in relation to host culture individuals, and his or her homeland’s culture is extremely important to one’s psychological well-being (Skowron, Stanley, & Shapiro 2009). All adolescents are in the process of achieving their own identity separate from their family (Erikson, 1950; Phinney, 2005). Being affiliated with a cultural group different from the host culture adds yet another layer of values, beliefs, and behavioral rules to consider and adopt or reject. According to Bowen (1978) parents and grandparents teach their children the
way of life and how to live successfully. They are contributors in the formation of an “I” in an individual’s personality. But in a new culture, familiar values, beliefs and behavioral rules are challenged or less effective. Thus, immigrant parents’ teaching processes may be off.

Also it is typically understood that adolescence is a time of separation from parents in order to achieve autonomy. All these processes are made harder and more stressful for immigrant families. Erikson indicated (1950) that if parents allow children to explore, they will develop their own identity. However, if parents continually push their teens to conform to their views, the teen may face identity confusion. Because parents are from a cultural tradition different from the host culture, it may be that parents of second generation immigrant adolescents give adolescents a great deal of freedom to form their own ways and view, because parents know that their traditional views and actions do not always work well in the new culture. Thus, immigrant adolescents self-differentiation may be facilitated, if parents allow their children the freedom to explore who they are and what they want to be. But, if the parents are protective and try to isolate their teens, then self-differentiation processes may be hindered. This study found that parents did have an effect on adolescents’ levels self-differentiation, when examined using multi-level regression analysis.

Differentiation of self theories have been studied in collective cultures, including Latino cultures, and parents’ self-differentiation was significantly correlated with adolescent self-differentiation (Phinney, 2005). Parents self-determination was also found to significantly predict adolescents’ levels of self-determination. In addition, adolescent self-differentiation levels were found to be significantly associated with adolescent multi-group ethnic identification levels. This study showed that using multi-
level regression analysis may help determine the actor and partner effects and whether, while some factors significantly correlate with each other using correlation analysis, that the same patterns are found significant when the data is subjected to more statistical controls and a different type of analysis.

**Implications for ethnic identity theory development**

Since Eric Erikson’s (1950) stages of human development became popular, it has been commonly accepted that during the adolescent years individuals are forming a self-identity. It is the major human development task of the teen years. Adolescence is seen as the time when individuals try to find how they fit in the world. According to Erikson (1950) failure to achieve an identity can lead to confusion and despair so it is important to better understand the processes and factors involved in identity formation (Holcomb-McCoy, 2005).

Following Erikson’s (1950) perspective, Phinney (1993, 1996, 2005) emphasized the importance of developing an identity during the adolescent years. Some of her work prioritized the internalization of an ethnic identification during the process of constructing a self-identity. Using her perspective, ethnic and racial attitudes appear to consolidate around ten years of age. The importance of ethnic identity from her perspective is that ethnic identity is formed partially through affiliation with various group and exploring the feelings and attitudes evoked through such memberships (Holcomb-McCoy, 2005).

Phinney (2005) created a model that explained the development of an ethnic identity. She considered this model applicable to all ethnic groups. She expressed that there are two elements that occur in resolving ethnic identity. First, members of the non-dominant cultural group have to resolve stereotyping and prejudice treatments from
members of the dominant population. Second, the members of non-dominant cultural groups have to resolve clashes of value systems from the non-dominant group and the dominant group, and the ways the members of the minority group will negotiate their bi-culturality. Phinney also recognized that ethnic identity achievement differed among various individuals and groups because of the different historical and personal experiences each encountered.

Most of the work that has been done in studying the development of ethnic identity in minority populations has reinforced the desirability of having a strong ethnic identity (e.g. Skowron, 2004; Wang, 2006, Marger, 2006, McCullough, 2005). According to Phinney’s (2005) model, a part of the developmental process of ethnic identification is the search for knowledge and the individual’s submergence in his or her own culture of origin so that he or she can emerge with a stronger sense of self and identification with his or her group. However, the findings of this research do not support that notion. While there may be positive aspects to individuals deepening their understanding of their culture of origin, there may also be negative effects.

Group identity is highly influenced by the value that society places on group membership. An individual who belongs to ethnic groups may have to adjust the nature of their affiliations in order to better adjust to the broader society (French, Allen, Aden, & Seidman, 2006) and one that may not be group membership oriented. Certainly, those immigrant adolescents who attend public high schools will have opportunity to join many different kinds of groups. Using Phinney’s (2005) theoretical framework, a separation and negation of one’s own cultural identity has a negative effect on the individual’s emotional structure. However, the findings of this study present insight into another possibility. Detaching oneself from the culture of origin and affiliating with a broad
variety of different groups, ethnic-based and others, may be a defense mechanism that actually protects the adolescent during a human developmental stage when there are also other confusing things happening in their lives and when they are at the height of trying to figure out how they “fit” in this world.

Another consideration that is brought out by the findings of this study is how the attachment to one ethnic group may interfere with the development of a more globalized individual that is capable of adapting to different cultures and societies. Another hypothesis is that bi-culturality (Phinney, 2005) is affecting the development of ethnic identify of immigrant adolescents, but is somehow contributing to the development of a more balanced (autonomy/connectedness) individual who is more in tune with the contextual realities of their communities.

_Suggestions for future research_

As mentioned earlier, Bowen’s (1978) theory’s applicability has not been broadly studied in the Latino population. To explore the generalizability of Bowen’s concept of self-differentiation to cross-cultural settings, more research needs to be done that examines immigrants who interact in dual cultures. Research that focuses on individuals who are at different stages of the acculturation process is also needed. Research done in collective cultures (Berry, 2001) using this study’s central concepts would also be constructive. Also future research could be done using this study’s survey but on a larger sample of Latinos in the U.S to see if regional variations exist. Achieving significant sample sizes of Latinos from various countries of origin will also help reject or confirm this study’s findings.
The concept of bi-culturality (Phinney, 2005) might be included in future research that explores the differentiation of self of immigrants in relation to their ethnic identity formation. This study found a negative relationship between the levels of self-differentiation and multi-group ethnic identification in adolescents. However, it did not measure the participants’ identification with the host culture, just with ethnic groups. Further research should also consider expanding the exploration of self-differentiation and include the individuals’ levels of acculturation, and feelings and perceptions about both the interacting cultures.

Longitudinal studies might be a good option for researchers who are interested in exploring the role of acculturation in the development of ethnic identity and self-differentiation. Studies that explore self-differentiation and ethnic identity formation from early acculturation stages through several years of adjustment would shed valuable insights into how acculturation affects self-differentiation and ethnic identity formation. Examining the effects of newly immigrated teens’ exposure to host culture teens and adults at school and various social activities could provide a more accurate insight of how individuals’ self-differentiation and ethnic identification are affected by the interactions with the host culture. Friendship formation patterns could also be studied.

Longitudinal studies that explored adolescent development throughout their high school years may also be valuable to better understand how self-differentiation and multi-group ethnic identification processes proceed under various acculturation and socialization contexts. From a human development perspective, adolescence is a time when ethnic, as well as other kinds of identity crises, occur (Erikson, 1950). It is also a time when adolescent interactions increase with people outside of their family circle. It is a time when the individual is more likely to be exposed to differing values and beliefs
expressed in music, TV, books and when using cell phones and the internet. These values and beliefs may be very different from what they were/are taught at home by their parents or that relate to their parents’ own experiences. Additional research could explore how these factors are associated with adolescents’ ethnic identity formation.

Further research could also consider contextual aspects of immigrant adolescents’ development of self and ethnic identity. This study took place with a Latino population that is relatively newly settled and within a host culture that was less used to having to be multicultural in perspective or actions. Examining the contextual environment, particularly the host cultural environment, along with self-differentiation and ethnic identity formation may help identify the affects that the host cultural context have on the development of multi-group ethnic identification and the development of a differentiated self.

This study considered how the interactions of adolescents with friends from both their same ethnic background and different ethnic backgrounds, as well as the use of English and Spanish language in a variety of contexts, and their participation in various community groups, affected their multi-group ethnic identification and the nature and extent of self-differentiation. No significant relationships were found. However, future research could explore adolescents’ perceptions of how the members of the host culture perceive their ethnic group, and how they think that being “Hispanic” or “Latino” is valued by host culture individuals, and the associations between those perceptions and what they did and did not do in their community and to their sense of community. It would also be useful to include parental educational and economic levels as research questions to examine their relationships to the levels of self-differentiation and ethnic identification indicated.
Previous research on Hispanic self-differentiation has centered on individuals’ or Hispanic couples (Phinney, 2005; Skowron, 2004). However, not many studies were found that examined the family dynamics present and affecting adolescent self-differentiation. This study focused only on the parent-child dyad, and excluded other family members in its assessment. It would be interesting to assess the whole nuclear family dynamics present, as well as the differences and similarities that can be found between siblings’ development of self-differentiation. Observing cultural variations that may be generated by different perceptions of gender roles, ages and positions between siblings in developing self-differentiation in children would be a good contribution to existing literature.

Conclusion

Hispanic immigrants’ differentiation of self is a broad and relatively unexplored field of study. This field offers a great number of inquiry possibilities and it is challenged to capture insights into immigrant growth and development in contexts that are evolving, and in ethnic communities that are growing in the United States. The Hispanic population in the U.S. is as any living culture, a changing entity, but because it is an immigrant culture that is growing so fast, it is a culture that is changing more rapidly than other ethnic groups in this country. Community leaders must better understand the social and psychological processes involved in the healthy development of Hispanic children in the United States. These children are part of this country and the more that can be known about their development, the more that professionals and community leaders will be able to provide resources and social settings that best facilitate healthy development.

In this study, a significant relationship was found between self-differentiation and multi-group ethnic identification in Hispanic second generation, immigrant adolescents.
The higher the levels were of participating adolescents’ self-differentiation, the lower the levels were of their multi-group ethnic identification. The same relationship was found for parents. Adolescents involved in this study affiliated less with Hispanic cultural groups. Several possible explanations for this phenomenon were examined, but more research should be done to explore the viability of these reasons and whether or not the same findings are present using different samples and with a larger sample size.

Even when Bowen’s (1978) concepts appear applicable to other than the Anglo-American cultures and his theories on how parents’ self-differentiation affects children’s self-differentiation can be applicable for this population, there is a need for deeper understanding of other factors that contribute to the development of a well differentiated self in second generation Hispanic adolescents. It is not possible to understand human behavior without considering the cultural context in which a person develops. As this study found, Hispanics’ (both parents’ and adolescents’) differentiation of self affects their ethnic identity. A more thorough understanding of both processes is important to understanding the psychological and social development of immigrant adolescents in the United States. Unless we better understand these processes, public services are apt to be less effective.
APPENDICES
INSTRUCTIONS
In the envelopes enclosed, you will find two sets of documents.

The first set is for the parents. (Note: only one of the parents needs to complete the survey and sign the consent letter.)

1) Please read the consent letter for participation in this survey and sign it. The consent letter is in English on one side and in Spanish in the other. You only need to sign once.

2) Two surveys are enclosed in the parent’s packet. Complete the survey, place it in the attached envelope along with the signed consent letter. The survey is written in English on one side and Spanish on the other. Only answer the questions once on either the English or Spanish version of the survey.

3) Keep a copy of the consent letter for yourself and return the rest of the documents with your teen’s documents.

4) Ask your teen to return the envelope to school.

The second set of documents is for the teen to complete.

1) Give your parents their set of documents.

2) Read and sign the consent letter found in your set.

3) Complete the survey.

4) Return your survey and consent letter in the same envelope that your parents’ documents are included.

5) Return the envelope to school.

Thank you for participating in this study!
Parental Permission Form for Participation of a Child in a Research Study
Clemson University

Exploring the Impact of Family and Cultural Traditions in the Individual Differentiation of Hispanic Children Being raised in the United States

Description of the research and your child’s participation
Your child is invited to participate in a research study conducted by Dr. James McDonell and Nizel Fernandez. The purpose of this research is to better understand the role of cultural traditions in Hispanic families having settled in this part of South Carolina. Your child’s participation will involve answering questions about how much they see themselves as an individual within the family and their ethnic identity. We will also ask some background questions, such as age, year in school, things they like to do, and related matters. Your child’s participation should not take any longer than 30 minutes.

Risks and discomforts
Your child may become mildly anxious about answering the questions, much as if they would if they were taking a test in school. In addition, the content of some of the questions may make them a little uneasy. These discomforts will pass quickly and will not harm your child. However, should you or your child wish to speak with someone about how they are feeling, we will recommend a counselor to you.

Potential benefits
The research will not benefit you or your child immediately. However, the results of the research will help us to understand the things that are important in helping Hispanic families adjust to coming to the U.S. and to South Carolina, and help in planning services to help Hispanic families adjust to a new setting.

Protection of confidentiality
We will do everything we can to protect your privacy. Your child will not put his or her name on the questionnaire. We will use a unique number to identify your child’s answers and the list of names and numbers will be kept away from the answers on a password-protected computer to which only members of the research team have access. The questionnaires and the signed parental permission form will be stored in separate locked filing cabinet drawers in a locked office at Clemson University.

In rare cases, a research study will be evaluated by an oversight agency, such as the Clemson University Institutional Review Board or the federal Office for Human Research Protections and this would require that we share the information we collect from your child. If this happens, the information would only be used to determine if we conducted this study properly and adequately protected your child’s rights as a participant.

Voluntary participation
Participation in this research study is voluntary. You may refuse to allow your child to participate or withdraw your child from the study at any time. Your child will not be penalized in any way should you decide not to allow your child to participate or withdraw your child from this study.

Contact information
If you have any questions or concerns about this study or if any problems arise, please contact Dr. James McDonell at Clemson University at (864) 450-4663. If you have any questions or concerns about your rights as a research participant, please contact the Clemson University Institutional Review Board at 864.656.6460.

Consent
I have read this parental permission form and have been given the opportunity to ask questions. I give my permission for my child to participate in this study.

Parent’s signature: ___________________________________________ Date: __________________

Child’s Name: _______________________________________________
STUDENT CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN A RESEARCH STUDY

Exploring the Impact of Family and Cultural Traditions in the Individual Differentiation of Hispanic Children Being raised in the United States

You are being invited to participate in a research study. Below you will find answers to some of the questions that you may have.

What is it for?

- We hope to learn the role that cultural traditions play in the adjustment of Hispanic families that have settled in this part of South Carolina.

Why me?

- Because you are a teenager of Hispanic background who is growing in a multicultural setting.
- Participation in this study will not affect you or your family in any negative way, and we hope it will benefit Hispanic families living in the United States.

What Will I Have to Do?

- You will need to take some information home for your parents and you to review and sign giving us permission to ask you and your mother or your father some questions.
- You, and your mother and father will need to answer some questions that have been written out for you. These questions ask about cultural traditions, languages used at home and away from home, what it is like for you to be living in the U.S. and in South Carolina, and about your family and friends. There are also some questions about your age, gender, how long you have lived here, and other parts of your background. The questionnaire will only take about 20 minutes to complete.
- You will bring the signed permission forms, and your parent’s and your answers to the questions back to school in a sealed envelope. A member of the research team will come to the school to pick up the sealed envelopes that you and other students have returned to the school.

Did My Parents Say It Was Okay?

- Your parents are being asked to give their permission for you to participate. They have the choice of saying no, even if you want to take part, and you have the choice of saying no even if they say it is okay. You will only need to answer the questions if you and your parents agree and sign the parental permission and assent forms. We hope to have 180 young people and one parent of each of the 180 teens participate in the research.

Who Will Be Helped By This Research?

- This study will help the people who are working with Hispanic children and adolescents, and their families. It will help us provide better services and create programs that will be beneficial for the Hispanic community.
What If I Want to Stop? Will I Get In Trouble?

- Your participation is voluntary; you and your parents can choose not to participate at any time. No negative consequences will be applied to you or your family, if you choose not to participate or decide to stop participating after you started.
- Your decision to participate or not participate in this research will not affect your life at school in any way. That is, it will not have any impact on your grades or the way that your teachers, school or classmates relate to you.

Are There Any Other Choices?

- No. To participate in the study, you and your parents have to agree and fill out the answers on the questionnaire. If you choose not to participate or your parents do not give their permission for you to participate, then you do not need to fill out the answers on the questionnaire.

By signing below, I am saying that I have read this form and have asked any questions that I may have. All of my questions have been answered so that I understand what I am being asked to do. By signing, I am saying that I am willing and would like to participate in this study. I also have received a copy of this form to keep.

________________________________________  ______________________
Signature of Child/Student                  Date
Differentiation of Self Inventory

Parents’ Version
These are questions concerning your thoughts and feelings about yourself and relationships with others. Please read each statement carefully and decide how much the statement is generally true of you on a 1 (not at all) to 6 (very) scale. If you believe that an item does not pertain to you (e.g. you are not currently married or in a committed relationship, or one or both of your parents are deceased), please answer the item according to your best guess about what your thoughts and feelings would be in that situation. Be sure to answer every item and try to be as honest and accurate as possible in your responses.

Scale: 1 (not at all true for me), 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 (Very true for me)

1. People have remarked that I'm overly emotional.
2. I have difficulty expressing my feelings to people I care for.
3. I often feel inhibited around my family.
4. I tend to remain pretty calm even under stress.
5. I'm likely to smooth over or settle conflicts between two people whom I care about.
6. When someone close to me disappoints me, I withdraw from him or her for a time.
7. No matter what happens in my life, I know that I'll never lose my sense of who I am.
8. I tend to distance myself when people get too close to me.
9. It has been said (or could be said) of me that I am still very attached to my parent(s).
10. I wish that I weren't so emotional.
11. I usually do not change my behavior simply to please another person.
12. My spouse or partner could not tolerate it if I were to express to him or her my true feelings about some things.
13. Whenever there is a problem in my relationship, I'm anxious to get it settled right away.
14. At times my feelings get the best of me and I have trouble thinking clearly.
15. When I am having an argument with someone, I can separate my thoughts about the issue from my feelings about the person.
16. I'm often uncomfortable when people get too close to me.
17. It's important for me to keep in touch with my parents regularly.
18. At times, I feel as if I'm riding an emotional roller coaster.
19. There's no point in getting upset about things I cannot change.
20. I'm concerned about losing my independence in intimate relationships.
21. I'm overly sensitive to criticism.
22. When my spouse or partner is away for too long, I feel like I am missing a part of me.
23. I'm fairly self-accepting.
24. I often feel that my spouse or partner wants too much from me.
25. I try to live up to my parents' expectations.
26. If I have had an argument with my spouse or partner, I tend to think about it all day.
27. I am able to say no to others even when I feel pressured by them.
28. When one of my relationships becomes very intense, I feel the urge to run away from it.
29. Arguments with my parent(s) or sibling(s) can still make me feel awful.
30. If someone is upset with me, I can't seem to let it go easily.
31. I'm less concerned that others approve of me than I am about doing what I think is right.
32. I would never consider turning to any of my family members for emotional support.
33. I find myself thinking a lot about my relationship with my spouse or partner.
34. I'm very sensitive to being hurt by others.
35. My self-esteem really depends on how others think of me.
36. When I'm with my spouse or partner, I often feel smothered.
37. I worry about people close to me getting sick, hurt, or upset.
38. I often wonder about the kind of impression I create.
39. When things go wrong, talking about them usually makes it worse.
40. I feel things more intensely than others do.
41. I usually do what I believe is right regardless of what others say.
42. Our relationship might be better if my spouse or partner would give me the space I need.
43. I tend to feel pretty stable under stress.

Multi-group Ethnic Identification
In this country, people come from many different countries and cultures, and there are many different words to describe the different backgrounds or ethnic groups that people come from. Some examples of the names of ethnic groups are Hispanic or Latino, Black or African-American, Asian American, Chinese, Filipino, American Indian, Mexican American, Caucasian or White, Italian American, and many others. These questions are about your ethnicity or your ethnic group, and how you feel about it or react to it.

Please fill in: In terms of my ethnic group, I consider myself to be ____________________

Use the numbers below to indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement.

(4) Strongly agree    (3) Agree    (2) Disagree    (1) Strongly disagree

1- I have spent time trying to find out more about my ethnic group, such as its history, traditions, and customs.
2- I am active in organizations or social groups that include mostly members of my own ethnic group.
3- I have a clear sense of my ethnic background and what it means for me.
4- I think a lot about how my life will be affected by my ethnic group membership.
5- I am happy that I am a member of the group I belong to.
6- I have a strong sense of belonging to my own ethnic group.
7- I understand pretty well what my ethnic group membership means to me.
8- In order to learn more about my ethnic background, I have often talked to other people about my ethnic group.
9- I have a lot of pride in my ethnic group.
10- I participate in cultural practices of my own group, such as special food, music, or customs.
11- I feel a strong attachment towards my own ethnic group.
12- I feel good about my cultural or ethnic background.
13- My ethnicity is
   (1) Asian or Asian American, including Chinese, Japanese, and others
   (2) Black or African-American
(3) Hispanic or Latino, including Mexican American, Central American, and others
(4) White, Caucasian, Anglo, European American; not Hispanic
(5) American Indian/Native American
(6) Mixed; Parents are from two different groups
(7) Other (write in): _________________________

14- My father's ethnicity is (use numbers above)
15- My mother's ethnicity is (use numbers above)

The following questionnaire is a part of a research project on second generation Hispanic immigrants who have been living in the U.S. for more than 5 years. The questionnaire will ask some general information questions such as: age, gender, grade, place of birth, family composition, etc. and some questions about your cultural life, school activities and social activities.

There are no right or wrong answers, any answer you choose to give is the correct answer. All of your answers are anonymous; that is, we are not asking for any information that could link you to the answers you give.

We appreciate your cooperation.

1) What language do you usually speak with your friends?  
   English  
   Spanish

2) What language do you usually speak at home?  
   English  
   Spanish

3) How often do you do something socially (e.g., go out to eat, go shopping, go for a walk, visit in their home or your home) with your Hispanic friends?  
   Never  
   Once or twice a week  
   Two times or more a month  
   Daily

4) How often do you do something socially with no Hispanic friends?  
   Never  
   Once or twice a week  
   Two times or more a month  
   Daily

5) The following is a list of organizations that are available in some schools and communities. Please mark the box that best shows how often you participate in each of these organizations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Once or twice a year</th>
<th>More than twice a year but less than once a month</th>
<th>Once or twice a month</th>
<th>Every week</th>
<th>More than once a week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School study groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School special interest clubs, specify</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic oriented clubs such as: Hispanic 4H, barrio Hispano, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports club</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Hispanic oriented youth group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish church groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other clubs or groups that you may be part of please specify</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6) There are many reasons for a person to be proud of their own cultural background. Can you tell us 3 cultural characteristic or values that you most like about your own ethnical and cultural background?  

102
7) What was the country of your birth?

- US
- Mexico
- El Salvador
- Ecuador
- Puerto Rico
- Colombia
- Dominican Republic
- Other (specify)

8) How much do you identify with the country of your birth? ___ Not at all  ____ A little  ____ Moderately  ____ Strongly

9) If you were not born in the US, what age were you when you moved to the US? __________

10) Where was your mother born?

- US
- Mexico
- El Salvador
- Ecuador
- Puerto Rico
- Colombia
- Dominican Republic
- Other (specify) ___________

11) If your mother was born outside of the U.S., how long ago did your mother come to the US to live?

- My mom has never lived in the US
- Less than a year
- More than a year but less than 5 years
- More than 5 years less than 10
- More than 10 years

12) How much do you identify with the country of your mother's birth?

- Not at all  ____ A little  ____ Moderately  ____ Strongly

13) Where was your father born?

- US
- Mexico
- El Salvador
- Ecuador
- Puerto Rico
- Colombia
- Dominican Republic
- Other (specify) ___________

14) If your father was born outside the U.S., how long ago did your mother come to the US to live?

- My father has never lived in the US
- Less than a year
- More than a year but less than 5 years
- More than 5 years less than 10
- More than 10 years

15) How much do you identify with the country of your father's birth?

- Not at all  ____ A little  ____ Moderately  ____ Strongly

16) Do you consider yourself Hispanic or Latino?  ____ Yes  ____ No

17) Please fill in the chart below by providing the information for each member of your household. The blank spaces at the bottom are for children beyond the first three, or for other people who live in the household that we did not consider. If any of the mentioned people do not live in the same household as you please leave it blank.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Born in USA</th>
<th>Born outside of USA</th>
<th>Mark Parents If living with biological:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Your Mother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your Father</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mother  Father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oldest sibling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Next oldest sibling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your Grandfather</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your Grandmother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your Aunt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your Uncle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your Cousin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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